

Roman Pisidia - a study of development and change.

Jean Greenhalgh

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

087 11862 1

Thesis L3320

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Department of Archaeology
University of Newcastle
upon Tyne

October 1987.

To the memory of my grandfather
and the future of my son.

ABSTRACT

The first part of this thesis is concerned with the assimilation of Pisidia into the Roman Empire, reviewed against a background of general expansion and development. Hellenistic and Roman influences contributed to the transformation of a district with a basically tribally-structured society, primitive communications and a self-sufficient agrarian economy, into a Roman province which had adopted Roman culture and urbanisation, whose road network was part of an Empire-wide system and whose economy was integrated with that of the Empire as a whole. Still it appears that, for fundamentally geographical reasons, Pisidia retained some of her independent characteristics and the process of assimilation of the highlands into the Empire was, on the whole, more retarded than that of the lowland and coastal regions.

The second part of the thesis is concerned with aspects of later Antiquity, beginning with the archaeological evidence for Christianity in Pisidia. This is of major importance because Christianity was one of the critical and most influential aspects of change in the Roman world and because the churches are very often the only evidence which bears witness to the occupation of a site after the 4th century.

There is thought to have been an Empire-wide decline during late Antiquity, resulting in urban decay, economic dislocation, depopulation and discontinuity of city life and traditions. The main cause seems to have been political instability, in particular almost continual warfare from the mid 3rd century. These and other possible factors of decline are assessed against a background of general transformation and development, the symptoms reinterpreted, whenever justifiable, as reflections of changing traditions and changing needs. The closing chapter considers more specifically the questions of continuity, decline

and change in Pisidia, exploring the possibility that Pisidia's element of independence and her geographical isolation protected the district to a certain extent from adversities which were not the result of natural causes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my especial thanks to the following:

1. My supervisor, Martin Harrison, for suggesting the project in the first place and providing help and encouragement throughout.
2. Michael Ballance, David French, Alan Hall, Stephen Hill, Shelagh Jameson, Barbara Levick, Stephen Mitchell and Marc Waelkens for additional help, advice and information.
3. My travelling companions, Hazel Dodge, Andrew Farrington, Elizabeth Hilsdon, Mary and Ruth Summers, without whom visits to sites would have been restricted and less enjoyable; Hazel especially, for instruction on the materials and techniques of ancient construction.
4. My parents, for providing encouragement and moral support.
5. My husband, Mistık, for his patience and for testing the endurance of his car beyond its limits on a number of occasions.
6. The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, the Department of Education and Science, the European Science Foundation and my father, for financial support.
7. Museum directors and assistants, in particular Orhan Atvur, Kayhan Dörtlük and Durmuş Kaya, for providing advice and transport, and countless villagers for their helpfulness and hospitality at sites.
8. Tuğrul Çakar, for making an excellent job of printing the photographs, despite the bad quality of some of the negatives.
9. Abdi Güzer, for additional photographic assistance and for drawing the church plans and maps.
10. Alison Ersen, for typing the text, Canan Phillips, for typing the references, and Wendy Dennis, for typing the rest.
11. Lindsay Allason-Jones, for making final corrections and dealing with binding.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Volume I	
List of Figures	
List of Plates	
Introduction	1
CHAPTER I. The Topography of Pisidia	12
CHAPTER II. Historical Background	22
CHAPTER III. Provincial Boundaries	36
CHAPTER IV. Communication Systems	45
CHAPTER V. Tribe, City and Territory	66
CHAPTER VI. Production and Trade	121
CHAPTER VII. The Churches of Pisidia	153
CHAPTER VIII. Late Antiquity - Decline, Continuity and Change	256
CHAPTER IX. Continuity, Decline and Change in Pisidia	320
Volume II	
Appendix	419
Notes to the text	512
Abbreviations	579
Ancient sources abbreviated in the notes	582
Bibliography	585
Figures	
Plates	
Map (insert in back pocket)	

FIGURES

1. Antiocheia, basilica (Woodbridge's plan, reproduced by Kitzinger).
2. Antiocheia, basilica, showing surviving walls.
3. Antiocheia, basilica; details of the mosaic floor.
4. Antiocheia, church on the main site.
5. Antiocheia, church on the main site (photograph taken during the excavations).
6. Antiocheia, church at the sanctuary site.
7. Sagalassus, 'Ionic' basilica (adaptation of Lanckoroński).
8. Sagalassus, transept basilica (adaptation of Lanckoroński).
9. Sozopolis, basilica.
10. Apameia, church (after Ballance).
11. Islamköy, mosque converted from church (photograph, Rott).
12. Adada, church.
13. Cremna, rough plan of site, showing relative locations of basilicas.
14. Cremna, basilica 'A' (after Ballance).
15. Cremna, basilica 'A', outer wall of narthex (Lanckoroński's fig. 140).
16. Cremna, basilica 'B'.
17. Cremna, basilica 'C'.
18. Cremna, basilica 'D'.
19. Cremna, basilica 'E'.
20. Cremna, basilica 'F'.
21. Cremna, basilica 'G'.
22. Cremna, basilica 'H'.
23. Pednelissus, basilica (after Paribeni and Moretti).
24. Penelissus, lower extra-mural church (after Paribeni and Moretti).
25. Selge, basilica 'A' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
26. Selge, basilica 'B' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
27. Selge, basilica 'C' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).

28. Selge, basilica 'D' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
29. Selge, basilica 'E' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
30. Selge, basilica 'F' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
31. Selge, basilica 'G' (after Machatschek and Schwarz).
32. Etenna, large basilica.
33. Etenna, small basilica.
34. Döşemealtı, basilica 'A' (after Rott).
35. Döşemealtı, basilica 'B' (after Rott).
36. Erenler Dağı, church (after Swoboda).
37. Bey Etjo Kozu, church (after Strygowski and Swoboda).
38. Ali Suması Dağı, church (after Bell).
39. Barla, church (adaptation of Pace).
40. Kızılören (?Sinethandus), rock-cut chapel (after Swoboda).
41. Avdan, rock-cut chapel (after Pace).
42. Gaziri, rock-cut chapel (after Pace).
43. Yeşil Adası, church of St. Stephen (after Rott).
44. Sinethandus, double column.
45. Asar Kalesi, double column.
46. Erenler Dağı, rectangular pillars.
47. Erenler Dağı, window divisions.

PLATES

1. Bridge over the Eurymedon below Selge,
2. The Eurymedon below the bridge.
3. Turkish bridge over the Eurymedon below Aspendus.
4. Ak Çayı.
5. Upper section of the aqueduct which supplied Side,
6. Aspendus: basilica (conglomerate rock).
7. Hills on the outskirts of Burdur.
8. Roman road leading to Selge.
9. Farmer driving two bullocks and plough (Konya Museum).
10. Valley of the Eurymedon.
11. Apollonia-Sozopolis: plain extending eastwards below the site.
12. Antiocheia: cultivated fields below sanctuary of Men.
13. Amblada: vineyards south of the site.
14. Parlais: view from the church above Barla to Lake Eğridir.
15. Sagalassus: valley running by Ağlasun below the site.
16. Cremna: cultivated valley below the site.
17. Valley of the Aksu/Koca Çayı north of Adada.
18. Fertile plain south of Dağ.
19. Antiocheia: north aisle of basilica, from east.
20. Antiocheia: south curve of apse of church, inner face,
21. Antiocheia: church, south end of apse,
22. Antiocheia: church at sanctuary site, font.
23. Antiocheia: church at sanctuary site, narthex from south.
24. Antiocheia: church at sanctuary site, frieze fragment,
25. Antiocheia: epistyle block and octagonal column (Yalvaç Museum).
26. Antiocheia: decorated capital (Yalvaç Museum).
27. Antiocheia: font (Yalvaç Museum).
28. Sagalassus: narthex of 'Ionic' basilica, from southwest,

29. Sagalassus: 'Ionic' basilica, from north.
30. Sagalassus: transept basilica, outer face of apse.
31. Sagalassus: transept basilica, inner face of apse, upper part.
32. Sagalassus: transept basilica, inner face of apse, lower part.
33. Sagalassus: transept basilica, from narthex to east.
34. Adada: apse of church.
35. Adada: south wall of church.
36. Barla: entrance in south wall of church.
37. Cremna: apse of basilica 'A'.
38. Cremna: basilica 'A', south wall.
39. Cremna: basilica 'A', west wall of narthex, looking east.
40. Cremna: basilica 'B', double column of narthex, looking east.
41. Cremna: west wall of basilica 'C'.
42. Cremna: building to west of basilica 'C'.
43. Cremna: basilica 'D', doorway in north wall of narthex.
44. Cremna: apse of basilica 'E', from south.
45. Cremna: north aisle of basilica 'F', looking west.
46. Ariassus: apsed structure, from east.
47. Selge: apse of basilica 'A'.
48. Selge: apse of basilica 'B'.
49. Etenna: apse of upper church.
50. Etenna: apse of large basilica, detail,
51. Etenna: south aisle of large basilica, from east.
52. Amblada: double-columned mullion shaft in Kızılcā.
53. Pidron: fragments of ecclesiastical decoration (Yalvaç Museum).
54. Sagalassus: theatre.
55. Selge: theatre.
56. Lake Eğridir: looking towards Mt. Viarus and the site of Prostanna.
57. Eğridir: Seljuk fortress.

58. Pogla: looking from acropolis over Çomaklı and the Boz Ovası.
59. Pogla: ?market hall.
60. Termessus: late wall adjoining odeon.
61. Termessus: juncture of odeon and late wall.
62. Vasada: looking from site across to plain of Bostandere.
63. Parlais: hillside above Barla.
64. Side: inner fortification wall, incorporating theatre.
65. Adada: wall running beside defile, looking towards early occupation area.
66. Ariassus: triple city gate, from north.
67. Ariassus: triple city gate, from south.
68. Ariassus: wall of field stones below earlier wall on western hillside.
69. Ariassus: ?Byzantine house.
70. Sagalassus: lower agora.
71. Sagalassus: late wall around west side of lower agora.
72. Sagalassus: stretch of curtain to west of upper agora.
73. Sagalassus: late wall within lower agora.
74. Cremna: south gate.
75. Cremna: civic centre from east end of colonnaded street, looking towards propylon, basilica and forum complex, bath-house, theatre and basilica 'D'
76. Sozopolis: site from west.
77. Sozopolis: fortification wall on west side of site.
78. Sozopolis: gate towards south end of west wall.
79. Antiocheia: wall of late houses behind church.

INTRODUCTION

This work is not intended to be a comprehensive study of all aspects of Pisidian archaeology and history, nor does it profess to make an exhaustive chronological examination of the province during Antiquity. The purpose is rather to attempt to elucidate some of the more important questions concerning development and change, continuity and decline, during the period under consideration. In many cases no concrete conclusions may be reached, due to the paucity of positive evidence, but it is hoped that a thorough treatment of the problems will help to clarify the generally murky picture of the state of affairs during late Antiquity in this particular region of Asia Minor, and, more importantly, the reasons behind the course of events.

Chronological limits are not rigidly fixed. The work was originally intended to cover in detail roughly those centuries from about the 3rd to the 8th century AD. This, however, was found to be an unrealistic goal, for two main reasons; firstly, the material available at the present stage of research on Pisidia is not sufficient to be able to create a thesis which examines these centuries alone, and in the second place, a certain amount of additional information needs to be provided for the preceeding centuries since no study of Hellenistic and early Roman Pisidia has already been compiled in a concise and reasonably detailed form. Broadly speaking, Chapters I-VI deal with basic background topics and Chapters VII-IX deal more specifically with aspects of later Antiquity.

Likewise, geographical limits are not absolutely precise. It is very difficult to define a region of study in provincial terms when the study covers a broad span of time during which provincial boundaries were rearranged fairly regularly. The more natural relationship between the ethnic and geographical boundaries becomes clear when juxtaposed against

the unnatural provincial divisions instituted by the Romans, and the partial inadequacy of these administrative boundaries is shown by the fact that they fluctuated frequently throughout the period of Roman and Byzantine rule. Of course the pattern of boundary changes was not totally unnatural, but it suited the politics of the times rather than the geography of the country. The very fact that the district of Pisidia did not coincide with the official provincial boundaries indicates an artificial and unsatisfactory aspect of the administrative divisions, and is in itself sufficient justification for using a natural and static definition. The region under examination, therefore, is defined in geographical terms, as far as a definition is necessary. Its focal point is the ethnically defined area that was called Pisidia by the Greeks and Romans before the administrative province was formed. It includes most of the province of Pisidia as defined by Hierocles and the Notitiae Episcopatum, stretching from Apameia in the northwest to the geographical division created by the Sultan Dağları to the north and east of Antiocheia, together with the mountainous Taurus area which is a natural southward extension of this region but which was included in the province of Pamphylia during much of Antiquity. The western boundary runs from Apameia via Lake Burdur towards Lycia, and the eastern boundary is the mountainous area to the east of the Cilician plain, running southwards to the Taurus via Lake Suğla. This is not to say that the region so defined is taken out of its geographical context and treated as a single entity. It is considered in the light of its surroundings to which it is inextricably joined by economic, administrative and ecclesiastical ties, and by lines of communication. For the purpose of this thesis, however, the term 'Pisidia' is loosely applied to the whole region under examination, and, whenever doubt arises, 'Provincia Pisidia' is used to denote the province specifically.

Very little detailed study has been carried out on the period of late Antiquity, and also very little on Pisidia itself during any period of history. The early travellers in Asia Minor took the first steps towards understanding the archaeology of Pisidia. During the last century in particular, much basic groundwork was undertaken, sites were identified, monuments and inscriptions recorded, and in some instances there were attempts to explain the archaeological remains in terms of historical development. Ramsay was certainly the most outstanding exponent of this approach. Despite his overzealous attempts to find an explanation for everything, and his frequently erratic conclusions, his humanistic approach, whereby he did not merely examine sites and monuments per se but tried to find reasons for their existence, was a breakthrough in the field of archaeological study. His work on the Historical Geography of Asia Minor is invaluable as background for any more advanced examination of Pisidia;¹ although some of his ideas must be treated with caution and many of them can now be proved erroneous, he was a prominent pioneer in his field, and his many theories concerning Pisidia provide substantial food for thought, whether the final decision is acceptance or rejection. Since Ramsay's day, however, there has been little detailed interest in Pisidia as a province. Pisidia has been brought into several major works of contemporary historians, such as Magie, Broughton and Jones,² whose scope encompasses a broad geographical area and time span, but the very nature of these works allows no concentration on any particular region. The province has also been treated as a fringe district of the principal regions covered by Jameson's thesis on Lycia-Pamphylia,³ Mitchell's thesis on Galatia⁴ and Ballance's on Phrygia and Lycaonia.⁵ Levick's study of the colonies of Augustus is the only work which has examined an important aspect of Pisidia's history in depth, and her approach admirably treats the colonies in the light of their surroundings,

incorporating valuable observations on conterminous settlements and territories.⁶ Bean and Hall have produced surveys of specific districts of Pisidia in the manner of the 19th century travellers, but with the advantage of improved knowledge and expertise, recording sites, monuments and inscriptions hitherto unpublished; Bean's detailed study covers the southwestern district of Pisidia,⁷ Hall's the eastern.⁸ However, virtually all of the works which touch on Pisidia have concentrated on the Hellenistic and early Roman periods with only a passing regard for subsequent centuries. Nevertheless, they provide a useful historical and archaeological starting point for any study of central Asia Minor during late Antiquity, particularly when used in conjunction with those works of broader scope which examine specifically the later centuries.⁹

Justification of a regional study is hardly necessary. It is hoped that by assembling and relating a series of regional studies the result will surely be a more improved understanding of Asia Minor as a whole. Jameson's thesis on Lycia-Pamphylia has greatly elucidated the Hellenistic and early Roman history of central southern Asia Minor, and Mitchell's thesis has provided a similar insight into the history of Galatia. The principal danger of a regional study is in treating the region in isolation with no regard for environment, immediate and far-reaching. The same danger must be avoided on a smaller scale - every city of the ancient world, exceptions being Rome and Constantinople, comprised the main occupation area, often walled and containing the usual public buildings which made it a centre of activity, together with its hinterland on whose agricultural resources the city relied for survival, and villages and farms which accommodated the agricultural workers.

The choice of Pisidia as the focal point of the thesis requires little explanation. Whilst many regions of Asia Minor have already been examined in detail, Pisidia is one of the few which have never been studied in depth or as a whole. Much of the research for the earlier centuries has, however, been carried out, although not yet consolidated in a single work, and it is hoped that the introductory chapters of this thesis will provide a synthesis of the scattered knowledge of Hellenistic and Roman Pisidia sufficiently adequate for an understanding of the traditions on which the developments of later Antiquity were based.

Organisation

Both geographical considerations and earlier historical events were partially responsible for the shape of developments which took place in the later Roman and Byzantine periods, and an awareness of these is essential to an understanding of the later history of Pisidia. There is, however, no concise and self-contained information regarding Pisidia's geographical make-up and early history to which satisfactory reference can be made. For this reason a basic but reasonably detailed background to the main body of the thesis is provided in Chapters I and II. Chapter I describes the physical make-up of the region and Chapter II gives a basic historical and political introduction. Chapter III gives an outline of boundary changes and Chapter IV discusses the development of communication systems,

Chapter V expands on the historical outline sketched in Chapter II, considering the nature of settlement developments, drawing on both documentary and archaeological sources, which are sufficiently abundant throughout the Imperial period but diminish towards late Antiquity.

Chapter VI discusses natural resources, land use and production, together with trade and economic developments.

Chapter VII comprises a description, site by site, of the ecclesiastical remains of Pisidia. In the discussion, there is an attempt to compare the different elements of planning and construction used in Pisidia, to see to what extent the Pisidian churches fit into the pattern of surrounding districts and to find evidence for inspiration from elsewhere.

The following two chapters consider the major problems of late Antiquity, the questions of decline, continuity and change. These issues are of importance for the whole of Asia Minor, and indeed for much of the ancient world during the so-called 'Dark Ages'. Chapter VIII, then, does not focus on Pisidia but presents the general political climate of late Antiquity and assesses the evidence - its values, its use, its ambiguities and the pitfalls of dogmatic interpretation - for decline. Environmental, demographic and economic issues, and the use of the archaeological evidence, are discussed with the aim of shifting the emphasis to change and development whenever an argument in favour of decline is in question. Also treated in this chapter is one of the most important and influential aspects of change, that of Christianity and the Church. It is concluded that, although there was an element of decline, this must be seen in its context, in relation to the more important process of development and transformation. The background presented in Chapter VIII is necessary for the more specific discussion in Chapter IX of the evidence for continuity, decline and change in Pisidia. It is suggested that the rate and the pattern of reaction to some influences of change and decline varied in different regions, for fundamentally geographical reasons, and there is an attempt to view Pisidia in this light.

An Appendix is provided which assesses the availability, the value and

the limitations of the evidence, and includes a gazeteer of the sites, together with ancient and modern references to both located and unlocated, named and unnamed settlements. The reason for the inclusion of such a gazeteer is two-fold. Firstly, no comprehensive survey of the archaeology and settlements of Pisidia has been previously compiled; in the second place, documentation of the region being markedly limited and most of our information concerning settlement in Pisidia being drawn from archaeological sources, the archaeological evidence must be emphasized.

The choice of approach to the subject needs a little elucidation. The most logical and straightforward approach might be to deal with individual settlements, tracing their development chronologically through artificially defined periods and tying the evidence together in the hope of creating a fuller picture of the region as a whole; a scheme which draws principally on facts can hardly be criticised. However, the state of research in Asia Minor is still in its infancy, and for this reason hard facts are not readily available, particularly in Pisidia where anything remotely resembling intensive research has so far been very limited. The situation is comparable to the state of research in Britain fifty years ago. Many ideas which were then proposed by eminent scholars have since been refuted due to the rapid progress of subsequent archaeological investigation of individual sites. This, however, does not render futile the hypotheses which were put forward in those early years. One inevitable consequence of delving into history, often into the unknown, is that conclusions are seldom one hundred percent infallible. Hypotheses and speculations are made to be challenged, whether the result is confirmation or refutation. Inevitably, future archaeological and scientific research will either confirm or refute suggestions made herein.

Methodology

The method of research entailed an initial familiarity with the travellers, with the ancient sources and with the works of contemporary historians. By piecing together this information, a vague historical and archaeological outline of the region does emerge. However, documentary sources directly pertaining to Pisidia are scant, and additional research has been necessary. A certain amount of the archaeological evidence drawn upon is based on personal observation. Although the early travellers and more recent researchers have greatly enriched our knowledge of Pisidian archaeology, and their accounts of sites, monuments and inscriptions which have since disappeared are particularly valuable, much of the material has, nevertheless, escaped unrecorded. The early travellers can hardly be blamed for their prime enthusiasm for the more splendid and upstanding monuments of Hellenistic and early Roman date, and their lack of interest in late Roman and Byzantine material. The interest of more recent researchers has likewise been focused on the Hellenistic and Roman material, anything of dubious date and unimpressive appearance rarely described in detail and generally dismissed as 'late'.

Limitations, and Research Strategies

There are a number of limitations to this thesis, the most obvious of which is a lack of evidence of every kind for late Antiquity in particular. The nature of the evidence and its limitations are discussed in detail in the Appendix. Documentary sources directly concerning Pisidia are especially scarce, and archaeological research has been minimal. By no means has every corner of Pisidia been travelled by any explorer. The very nature of the terrain poses hardships for the traveller, and exploration for sites as yet undiscovered would involve time-consuming

excursions into very difficult terrain. It is mainly for this reason that Pisidia has escaped the more thorough investigations which have been carried out with greater ease in more accessible regions such as the Pamphylian plain, the Aegean coastland, the plateau area of Anatolia and some parts of Caria. As a result the picture that emerges of the region as a whole tends to be somewhat unbalanced.

Identification problems often crop up due to the differences in geographical nomenclature - many villages mentioned by travellers in the past have since been assigned new names, and the sometimes distorted appearance of the early maps and plans, due to an understandable ignorance of the basic topography of the region, can make identification especially difficult.

One shortcoming of this thesis is that there has been no attempt to be consistent in using the most recent name of a modern settlement apart from in the Appendix where, in the event of the name of a village having been changed, both the most recent name and the name known to travellers are given.

Other problems are those associated with terminology. Opinions of modern historians differ as regards the meaning of terms such as 'Byzantine' or 'continuity'. The main period under examination in the latter chapters of this thesis has variously been referred to as 'late Roman', 'early Byzantine', 'late Antiquity' and 'the Dark Ages', a major reason for this being that it is generally impossible to determine a definite division between one 'period' and the next, and, indeed, such divisions are usually artificial. Whenever doubt arises, the term 'late Antiquity' will be used herein, but the adjectival 'late antique' will be avoided. The definition of 'continuity' is more problematic, but this is discussed in the relevant Chapter VIII. A similar difficulty arises in employing appropriate terms to describe or categorize the

status of various settlements or communities, a problem which is covered briefly in Chapter IX.

Certain topics have been consciously omitted, all of which would repay further research. The machinery of municipal government has not been examined apart from the occasions where it has a direct bearing on other topics. In Chapter VI, a discussion of the control of commerce, the merchants and the negatiores has been purposely avoided because it was considered that the evidence is too ambiguous to merit merely a brief discussion. Also in this chapter, the slave trade has not been examined in any depth because there is no direct evidence for its importance in Pisidia itself. An apology must be made here for Chapter VI which is highly derivative. Another subject which would repay further research is a thorough examination of gravestones and the frequency and distribution of types and formulas. A discussion of pagan religion has been omitted, apart from brief references where it is relevant to the development of Christianity. Although a pertinent topic in a dissertation on Roman Asia Minor, the amount of space which could here be devoted to a study of paganism and the deities worshipped in Pisidia would not do justice to the wealth of material available, enough material, in fact, on which to base a whole thesis. This illustrates another basic short-coming of this thesis, that it embraces such a wide range of topics that not all of them can be examined in detail.

Further future research strategies may be proposed, all of which are time-consuming and mostly dependent on substantial financial backing and permission from the Turkish authorities. An exhaustive examination of obscure historical documents may prove fruitless, but at least would allow their elimination as possible sources of information. Since there has been a marked lack of scientific archaeological research in Pisidia, our knowledge of known sites would naturally benefit from systematic

surveys, if not excavation, and investigation of the hinterland of the sites might uncover traces of dependent villages, which were an integral part of the settlement system but whose nature makes identification difficult. Scientific research into land usage and deforestation, by coring and pollen analysis, is as yet in its infancy, but the results obtained so far in a number of regions, particularly Greece, indicate that this would be a profitable venture in all parts of the ancient world.

Often more frustrating than the total absence of evidence is the frequently impossible task of dating late Roman and Byzantine monuments. Accurate dating is essential for an understanding of occupation periods and prosperity of individual settlements; unlike those of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, however, monuments of late Antiquity are less abundant, less substantial and less well understood, and therefore comparative dated evidence is hard to come by. Denuded of their architectural decoration, the basic structures of many of these monuments are often indistinctive, and attempts at dating without additional evidence are often unjustified.

A technique for radio-carbon-dating the ceramic content of mortar has recently been discovered; this would doubtless be a time-consuming process but may be the only sure way of determining a terminus postquem for monuments which are impossible to date on stylistic grounds alone, providing of course that mortar was used in the construction and samples are available.

A final possible research project, and one that is much-needed, would be to study intensively the pottery of Anatolia for which no established chronology is available. If pottery sherds were examined site by site on a random selection basis this would give an idea of the frequency of particular types. A successful survey of the local wares would prove difficult, but dates of imported pottery might be determined if types could be correlated with dated wares from sites such as Anemurium. Leaving aside the difficulties posed by the possibility of aceramic traditions, an awareness of the pottery is essential to an understanding of economic questions.

CHAPTER I

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF PISIDIA

Pisidia is predominantly a highland region, bounded on the south by the Taurus mountains, and to the north and east by the Sultan Dağları range which continues southwards in broken stretches to join the Taurus. A broken range to the north-west presents a less formidable barrier and affords easy communication with the north via Dinar. South of Burdur Gölü, the Pisidian highlands merge into the Lycian mountains. The Taurus, the southern counterpart of the Pontic ranges, constitutes a series of complex folded mountain ranges which rise to heights of over 3000 metres, and along much of its length it severely separates the central plateau from the coast. The mountains mostly fall steeply into the Mediterranean sea, and the only coastal plains of any note occur around Antalya and Adana. The Antalya plain, directly to the south of Pisidia, is very fertile, composed of alluvium carried down from the mountains by numerous streams and rivers. The difficulty of access is reflected in the fact that there is no rail connection across the mountains, and there is only one decent road, that via the Çubuk Boğazı, to connect the Antalya plain with the interior.¹

The orientations of the various mountain ranges bounding Pisidia create a roughly triangular wedge, within which the terrain is of a varied physical character and is susceptible to a diversity of climatic and vegetational conditions. High mountains alternate with lakes, deep valleys and undulating plains to create an overall physical appearance more varied than any other region of Turkey. To the west of Eğirdir Gölü, the plain which permits an easy route from Uluborlu through Senirkent and around the northern end of the lake is separated from the plain to the north of İsparta, through which the modern railway runs from Dinar to Eğirdir, by a mountain range whose principle peaks, Kapı Dağı and Barla Dağı, reach heights of up to 2700 metres. The road

around the northern tip of Eğridir Gölü runs into undulating terrain of a higher altitude, the southern extension of which is thought to be the Cillanian Pedion of Strabo and the Cillanicus Tractus of Pliny.² This terrain is bounded on the east by the Sultan Dağları, but a little further south, to the east of Beyşehir Gölü, more gentle breaks in the range permit communication eastwards with the Konya plain. The gently undulating terrain continues in a south-easterly direction from the lake and affords a route, via Suğla Gölü, to the southern part of the Konya plain.³ Between Eğridir Gölü to the west and Beyşehir Gölü to the east, the extensive Anamas Dağı ensures that west-east communication south of Gelendost and Şarkıkaraağaç is no easy feat.

The most remarkable feature of the Pisidian landscape is the presence of a number of lakes of varying sizes and capacities. The most westerly Pisidian lake, Burdur Gölü, at 845 metres above sea level, has been identified as the Ascania of Arrian.⁴ It is generally classified as a salt lake,⁵ although the water is nowhere near as salty as that of Acı Gölü to the west and Tuz Gölü in Cappadocia, which are so impregnated with salt that a crust is clearly visible around the shore-line; however, Burdur water supports no life. On enquiring why no fish lived in the lake, Leucas, in the early 18th century, was told that this was on account of a bitter weed which grew in profusion in the lake, covering the whole surface of the water.⁶ Two thousand years ago, Arrian described the lake as being so salty that the deposits were collected by the locals who had no need of additional supplies.⁷ This implies either that the composition of the lake has altered significantly since early Antiquity, or that Arrian has confused the properties of lakes Burdur and Acı. The small lakes of Yaraşlı, Pınarbaşı and Karataş, to the south and south-west of Burdur Gölü, are equally bitter with no underwater drainage, and Pınarbaşı today is almost dry. Kestel Gölü, to the south-

east of Burdur, is of a similar altitude, but is totally unsalted, composed almost entirely of rainwater which gives a depth of no more than two metres. The small unsalted lakes of Anhaban and Yureğil, to the south of Kestel dry up in summer. One of the largest lakes in the Pisidian highlands, at a height of 924 metres above sea level, is the double lake of Hoyran and Eğridir, usually referred to as a whole as Eğridir Gölü. The water of this lake is most definitely fresh,⁸ and is renowned for a variety of edible fish, in particular crayfish. There is no foundation for Hirschfeld's assumption that this lake was called Limnai in ancient times.⁹ The river which runs from the south end of this lake helps to feed the smaller Kovada Gölü, which is also freshwater. The other large freshwater lake in the region is Beyşehir Gölü, 1116 metres above sea level and supplied mainly by underground sources. Both Leucas¹⁰ and Arundell¹¹ describe this water as salty. Leucas' description is so detailed that there is no possibility of him having confused Beyşehir with some other lake - the salt forms little peaks on the surface of the water and is collected and dried by the inhabitants - implying that the character of the lake has changed since the early 18th century. If so, the large quantities of fish which lived in the lake two and a half centuries ago, according to Leucas, must have since been replaced by fish suited to fresh rather than salt water. The excess water of this lake has an exit at the south-east corner, and Suğla Gölü, to the south-east, is fed mainly by the outflow of Beyşehir via the river Irmak. Since the 1930s, the waters of Beyşehir and Suğla have been used for the irrigation of the arid Konya plain, and the Irmak has been partially diverted around the north side of Suğla Gölü.¹² There is no doubt that Suğla is the ancient Lake Trogitis.¹³ There is a slight controversy, however, concerning the identification of the ancient names of Lakes Eğridir and Beyşehir. The ancient name Caralis

or Coral¹⁴ is generally accepted to have applied to the modern Beyşehir Gölü. An ancient lake Pasgousa is also known, from Byzantine sources,¹⁵ but there have been diverse opinions on whether this was the Byzantine name of Eğridir or of Beyşehir. Pasgousa features in the march of John Comnenus in 1142 when he captured the islands of the lake which were inhabited by Christians. One problem is caused by the fact that it was apparently possible to travel from Iconium (Konya) to Lake Pasgousa and return in a single day. Obviously Eğridir is too far from Iconium for this to have been feasible, but even Beyşehir is about 100 kilometres from Iconium by the shortest route. Ramsay surmised that Eğridir was more appropriate to John Comnenus' route, yet he was still of the opinion that Beyşehir was the more favourable contender.¹⁶ Both lakes possess islands which were known to have had Christian inhabitants in Byzantine times.¹⁷ Cinnamus says that Lake Pasgousa was formerly called Sclerus¹⁸ which Cramer suggests could be a corruption of Caralis,¹⁹ and it does seem more likely that the modern equivalent of the ancient Pasgousa is Beyşehir Gölü, although the argument for this is certainly not foolproof.

Strabo records a very large salt lake, called Capria, between Sillyum and Aspendus.²⁰ The fact that he mentions this lake along with the salt lakes of Phrygia and Cappodocia, that is Acı Gölü and Tuz Gölü, implies that Capria was a true salt lake and of no mean proportions. A salt lake at Aspendus, doubtless the same, is confirmed by Pliny.²¹ There is no lake in the Pamphylian plain today; it is unlikely that the two authors should independently be mistaken, and an examination of the travellers reveals that the lake was still visible at the turn of the century.²² One must conclude that the lake has dried up, probably due to the draining of the plain at the beginning of this century, when it was extensively reinhabited, as a measure against malaria

hazards caused by marshland.

The presence of high mountains ensures that rivers and streams, fed variously by springs, rain and melting snow, are plentiful in many parts of Pisidia. The largest perennial rivers have their sources high in the Taurus, with small branches periodically joining the mainstream to flow in a roughly north-south direction down through the mountains to the Pamphylian plain and the Mediterranean sea. The most notable of these rivers are the modern Aksu Çayı, Köprü Irmağı and Manavgat Çayı. The upper section of the Aksu, known as the Koca Çayı, has sources as far north as the İsparta Ovası, Davras Dağı and lakes Eğridir and Kovada, with numerous small tributaries amplifying its capacity until it flows past ancient Perge and modern Aksu and into the sea. Further east, the Köprü Irmağı begins in Anamas Dağı and flows to the east of Selge (Zerk) where it is crossed by a Roman bridge, still standing and in use, (Pl. 1 and 2) and down to the sea via Aspendus, where a Seljuk bridge with Roman foundations is still passable today (Pl. 3). The source of the Manavgat Çayı, to the east of the Köprü Irmağı, is less northerly, beginning to the north-west of Cevizli, and is fed by few small branches until about 5 kilometres north of Manavgat, where the more substantial tributaries of the Narsas Çayı and the Ak Çayı add volume to the river before it passes through Manavgat and into the sea just to the east of Side. One of these larger tributaries, the Ak Çayı, (Pl. 4) was the source of supply for one of Side's aqueducts. During the construction of the recently completed Oymapınar dam in the foothills of this part of the Taurus, rock-cut channels of Roman date were exposed by the side of the river, and the original Roman engineered construction chambers through the massive rock were used by the modern workers. The water was presumably diverted thus from the main-stream and conveyed thence to Side by a water conduit

supported on a huge arched aqueduct. Standing sections of the aqueduct are visible today along its course to Side (Pl. 5). The descriptions of the ancient sources have enabled identification of the Köprü Irmağı as the Eurymedon,²³ the Aksu as the Cestrus,²⁴ and the Manavgat Çayı as the ancient Melas.²⁵

In the more northerly parts of Pisidia, the landscape is criss-crossed by small rivers and streams, many of which are not perennial. Sources in the Sultan Dağları feed streams and small rivers which flow down the north-east slopes of the mountain range and into lakes Eber, Akşehir and Ilgın. Those which run down the south-western slopes lead mainly across the plain and ultimately into the lakes of Eğridir and Beyşehir. The most notable of the small rivers crossing the plain is that which flows through Yalvaç, known from coins of Antiocheia as the ancient river Anthius.²⁶

The character of two of the Taurus rivers is known to have altered since Roman times, as Strabo relates that boats could be navigated 60 stadia up the Cestrus to Perge and an equal distance up the Eurymedon to Aspendus,²⁷ a feat which would be impossible today because of accumulative silting. Unfortunately, it is impossible to speculate accurately on any changes in capacity or course of rivers and streams without thorough investigation.²⁸

Turkey as a whole has the most complex geological structure of all the Mediterranean lands, and the presence of several faults which cross the country has resulted in a number of seismic disasters during the past two thousand years at least.²⁹ The dominant rock of southern Anatolia is a hard limestone, of which the Taurus for the most part is composed. Also fairly widespread in the southern Taurus is a conglomerate rock, which was evidently used as a common building material in

Antiquity, particularly at Etenna, Selge, Aspendus and Side (Pl. 6). The soft rocks characteristic of central Anatolia - tufa, chalk, clay and mari - most notably found in parts of Cappadocia and Phrygian Galatia, are in clear evidence to the east of Burdur Gölü, where the nature of the rock and soil precludes spontaneous vegetational growth (Pl. 7).³⁰

Turkey is subject to a variety of climatic conditions, the most striking difference being between the coastal areas and the interior. The variety and quality of the agricultural produce of the Aegean coastland regions are sufficient indication of the fact that this is the most climatically favoured region of Turkey. The Mediterranean coastland areas are influenced by a similarly temperate climate, with mild winters and heavy winter rainfall, particularly on the south-facing slopes of the western Taurus. The summers are more extreme than those of the Aegean, with a temperature often above 28°C and a susceptibility to drought. The Anatolian interior suffers the more extreme conditions of a semi-continental climate. Winter temperatures often fall below freezing, and the tendency towards aridity is amplified by frequent summer droughts, a problem most pertinent to agriculture which has recently been alleviated to a certain extent by irrigation schemes. July mean temperatures in Pisidia are generally 20-25°C, with extremes of 15-20°C in the Sultan Dağları and the mountains around Suğla Gölü. In January, mean temperatures range from the Anatolian norm of below freezing in the eastern districts to 0-5°C in the west, and 5-10°C on the southern Taurus slopes. Precipitation varies with relief and altitude, the annual mean of Pisidia decreasing gradually from over 1000 mm in the southern regions and the Taurus, to 400-600 mm in the Sultan Dağları.³¹

The availability of moisture is very important for agricultural

production, which in Antiquity was even more the mainstay of the population than it is today. Humid conditions in the Taurus present few problems in this respect, but the sub-humid northern parts of Pisidia suffer from moisture deficiency in summer, and the semi-arid conditions of the main plateau area aggravate the problem on the west and especially the north and east fringes of the Pisidian districts. An additional climatic hazard suffered by the plateau, that of violent winds and rainstorms, is especially evident on the east side of Lake Burdur.

The state of climatic conditions in Antiquity is difficult to evaluate, and, as is the case with vegetation, even if the conditions of, for example, the 1st century were known, those of the intervening centuries between then and present day would not be certain due to the probability of climatic and vegetational change. Although climatic and vegetational change are controversial subjects and their study is still young, they are discussed in Chapter VIII as a possible contribution to decline and change in settlement patterns.

Climatic conditions are the principal determinant of vegetation, although composition and concentration may vary according to altitude and soil type. Here we are concerned only with general distribution and density in order to create a more detailed picture of the physical make-up of Pisidia, and with the vegetational state of the region in Antiquity, in order to be aware of both the natural resources available for economic purposes and the environmental aspect of ancient settlements. The contrast between highland and lowland produces correspondingly varied vegetation. Today, the south-facing Taurus slopes support a predominantly coniferous forest, mainly pines with some fir, cedar and cypress, and occasional deciduous trees such as Turkey oak;

the inner slopes of the Taurus bear a less dense cover of a similar distribution of forest. To the north of the Taurus range the forest cover gradually diminishes until eventually there is scarcely a tree to be seen. In the damper level valleys and beside rivers and streams, willow, poplar and chestnut are fairly common where they have not been cut down for agricultural reasons, but the hillsides and moisture-deficient valley areas which are used for grazing rather than for agriculture are capable of nourishing little more than coarse grass or a discontinuous cover of garrigue or phrygana. On the Taurus slopes and on many of the hillsides of the Pisidian landscape the hardy juniper flourishes, most notably to the south of Beyşehir Gölü and in the İsparta Ovası. True dry steppe conditions of much of the Anatolian plateau, and especially the eastern plains, are hardly in evidence in Pisidia.³²

Evidence for the vegetation of Asia Minor in Antiquity may be gleaned from the ancient sources and by the analysis of pollen samples. The sources make it clear that the Taurus mountains had a reasonably abundant forest cover, although not as dense and varied as that of Thrace, Macedonia and the Pontic and Euxine regions, on account of a less regular rainfall. In particular, the cedars of Cilicia and Lycia were rated highly,³³ and one might safely assume that the Pisidian Taurus bore forests of a similar density and quality, although the only specific reference to the timber of this region is found in Strabo, where he praises the forests of the territory of Selge.³⁴ The term 'Cilicia', however, probably covered the whole section of the Taurus between Lycia and Cilicia proper. The remarks of Cicero³⁵ and Vitruvius³⁶ regarding the tree-less aspect of the Phrygian landscape during the Roman period suggest that those parts of Pisidia which are at a similar altitude and are influenced by a similar

climate suffered from a similar lack of tree cover during the same period. It can be inferred from Strabo that the landscape of the lowland areas around Lakes Beyşehir and Suğla was as deficient in tree cover in Antiquity as it is today.³⁷ Parts of early Empire Pisidia might have had a similar character to the adjacent bare lands of Lycaonia which were not given up to agriculture but used instead as a grazing ground for such as Amyntas' excellent flocks of the 1st century BC.³⁸

The use of core sampling and pollen analysis to establish vegetational conditions and changes of ancient landscapes has been employed successfully for the Neolithic period in particular, and investigations of this kind into the historical period in Asia Minor have been carried out recently. However, dating for short time spans is not refined enough to be able to relate the data for vegetational change accurately to particular centuries.³⁹

There is a reasonable amount of evidence to produce a fairly clear picture of the vegetation of Roman Pisidia, but little is known about the Byzantine period. Speculations have been made from vegetation and deforestation patterns and pollen analysis. These are examined in Chapter VIII, along with other possible aspects of physical change. Production and the land are discussed in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

When we enter upon the documented period of the history of Asia Minor, the whole country is found to be inhabited for the most part by communities whose organisation was basically tribal. From the time of the establishment of the first colonies, Asia Minor was subjected to a succession of civilising influences which left their mark on different regions to varying degrees. The relative effects of these external influences were dictated largely by the areas of greatest activity of the imposition of foreign ideas and by the lines of communication systems. An important additional factor was the adaptability of different regions to the influences, together with the measure of acquiescence or resistance of individual indigenous communities.

The first Greek emigrants settled on the shores of Asia Minor around the 12th or 13th century BC.¹ This movement was followed sporadically over the following few centuries by more geographically adventurous colonisation, so that by the time of Alexander, Greek settlements were dotted along the coastlands, and formed a kind of cordon around Asia Minor. Motives, whether for mere exploration, cultural and commercial expansion, or military strategy, do not concern us here. What is important is the immediate consequence of these settlements in that they presented an opportunity for inroads into the interior, the success of which varied according to geographical considerations and the character of the settlements of the interior themselves. The nearest these early settlements came to Pisidia was the Pamphylian plain,² but the Taurus mountains presented a formidable barrier to any infiltration of settlers into the highlands, a barrier which was broken down very slowly during the first four centuries BC.

In the mid 6th century BC, Asia Minor was absorbed into the Persian Empire. Persian rule seems to have been fairly lenient and the only

evident imposition the Persians made on the interior was the setting up of the 'Royal Road' as a trade route and a secure means of reaching the West coast from their Eastern satrapies.³ We learn from Xenophon that Cyrus the Younger was active in central Asia Minor, but his campaign supposedly directed against the Pisidians in 401 BC shows only that this was a troublesome area and probably interfered with Persian access to Pamphylia and Lycia. There is no evidence that Cyrus imposed any significant restraints on Pisidia itself.⁴ Persian domination of Asia Minor was put down by Alexander⁵ who, after his conquest, revived the colonisation movement,⁶ and as a result of his actions and those of his successors, cities in the Greek tradition began to spring up in as yet unmapped areas of the country. The intricacies of governmental changes need not be discussed here, but it seems that Alexander began a move towards a centralised bureaucratic governmental system. In those parts of Asia Minor which, either by acceptance or imposition, were more easily swayed by the Hellenistic influences, the new forms were adopted and local self-government was eliminated to a certain extent; however, many settlements retained their civil autonomy, and the more isolated tribal communities were scarcely affected.⁷

Throughout the years of Seleucid and Attalid rule, all regions of Asia Minor were in the hands of one or other of the dynasties in power during that period. Effective control, however, seems to have been restricted to those more civilised areas on the west coast in particular, and the south coast to a more limited degree. There was certainly activity in the interior, but the indications are that the hinterland was not influenced or controlled to a great extent by any of the powers. Alexander had marched through Pisidia, and put his mark in the history books, but he put no great stamp on the region. Selge showed friendship, probably only because her old enemy Termessus was resisting

Alexander's advances, but there is no evidence for a formal alliance or any weakening of Selge's independence. Alexander's march took him through Milyan territory to Pamphylia via Phaselis and the Climax Gorge. Following this, he approached Termessus, forced the Termessus pass, but, having received overtures of friendship from Selge, abandoned Termessus and proceeded to Sagalassus. Following hostilities with the Sagalassians, he continued northwards to Celaenae and Gordium, capturing villages by Lake Ascania on the way.⁸ On Alexander's death, his general Antigonus took control, nominal at least, of Lycia and Pamphylia.⁹ Antigonus marched through Pisidia in 319 BC on a campaign against Alcetas, but Diodorus gives no indication of his relationship with the cities, Cretopolis and Termessus, by which he passed.¹⁰ At the end of the 4th century, Alexander's successors fought for power at the battle of Ipsus. Seleucus I emerged victor.¹¹ Celaenae, the capital of Phrygia, was relocated in the plain by Seleucus' son, Antiochus Soter, and renamed Apameia after his mother.¹²

During the 3rd century control of Lycia and Pamphylia vacillated between Seleucids and Ptolemies, but the effectiveness of this control is questionable.¹³ Pisidia was in the hands of the Seleucids, but their grip on these regions was slack. Around the mid 3rd century a series of colonies was established by the Seleucids along the northern border of Pisidia, all but one of which were located on the Seleucid road which ran through this region. The fact that this road skirted the highland districts of Pisidia does not indicate in itself that Pisidia was a failure for the Seleucids, for a road through more central or southerly Pisidia would have been impractical due to the nature of the terrain. The setting up of colonies, however, does imply that protection and firmer control of the road and the district through which it passed was considered necessary. The colonies along the road included Apameia,

Apollonia, Antiocheia, Neapolis and Laodiceia Catacecaumene; the more southerly Seleuceia Sidera may suggest that Seleucid control was not quite as ineffective in Pisidia as one might otherwise have thought.¹⁴ The colonies may not in fact have been actual garrison towns, with a primarily military purpose, but their strategic locations do suggest that control of the road, if not of northern Pisidia, was an important consideration.

Additional foundations were set up in the interior by one of the lesser Macedonian dynasties. These included Themisonium, Docimium, Lysias, Philomelium and Derbe, which formed a kind of arc around the Sultan Dağları.¹⁵ Without further evidence it is uncertain whether this indicates that these territories had been sufficiently tamed to enable the establishment of new foundations, or whether it was a step towards influencing as yet uncivilised areas which proved successful.

After Alexander and Antigonus, central Pisidia did not figure in history until the late 3rd century. Achaeus, commander of the Seleucid armies, set himself up as an independent monarch, opposing Antiochus III's rightful rule over central Asia Minor. One result of the usurpation was that Antiochus joined forces with his Pergamene rival Attalus I, and together they defeated Achaeus in 215 BC. Before this, Achaeus made an incursion into southern Asia Minor. In an attempt to enlarge the domains of Seleucid rule, he launched a campaign to conquer those districts where Seleucid power had thus far been no more than nominal. In 218 BC his lieutenant, Garsyeris, was sent as his agent to try and bring the cities of Pisidia and Pamphylia under control. The nebulous region of the Milyas was successfully brought under Garsyeris' sway, and part of Pamphylia was similarly affected. The more troublesome and resistive Taurus district to the east of the Milyas and to the north

of the Pamphylian plain proved a more difficult challenge. A detailed account of Garsyeris' struggle with Selge is given by Polybius.¹⁶ Her strong resistance was broken only through the treachery of Logbasis, but she was apparently allowed to preserve her independence by a payment of 700 talents.

A change in the control of Asia Minor occurred at the beginning of the 2nd century BC, when the army of Antiochus III was defeated by Eumenes II, aided by the Roman army, at the battle of Magnesia in 190 BC.¹⁷ Under the chairmanship of Gn. Manlius Vulso, a treaty was drawn up and signed at Apameia according to which Antiochus' domains north of the Taurus were given up to the victors and divided mainly between Eumenes and the Rhodian Republic.¹⁸ Eumenes now controlled much of central Anatolia, including Greater Phrygia, Lycaonia and the Milyas.¹⁹ Despite the fact that the extent of the Milyas is uncertain, it can be assumed that most of Pisidia, nominally at least, was now in the hands of the Pergamenes, although the southern boundary is not clear.²⁰ By the terms of the treaty it appears that Antiochus still had control of Pamphylia, but this is not an established fact. Since it was not clear what constituted the line of the Taurus, it seems that the terms of the treaty might have been twisted in order to give Eumenes control of Pamphylia as well.²¹ Alternatively, the problem may have been solved by allowing Pamphylia to remain independent.²² Manlius had ordered the Seleucid garrison in Perge to disband, and Eumenes seized this opportunity to claim Pamphylia with the Senate's consent. However, the cities which had been declared free by Manlius remained independent from Eumenes' actual control.²³ It is not known if those Pisidian cities which had paid indemnities to Manlius were also regarded as free.²⁴ The Pergamene kingdom certainly extended to western Pamphylia by the mid 2nd century because Attalus Philadelphus founded Attaleia at some date

between 165 and 138 BC.²⁵ According to the treaty the Rhodians gained possession of much of Caria and at least the coastal plains of Lycia. However, the Rhodian power was diminished by a war against the Cretans around 155 BC.²⁶

Before the conference at Apameia, Manlius marched against the Galatians, who had been allies of Antiochus. He took a detour via Caria and Pisidia, both for lucrative reasons and to show the strength of the new power to the inhabitants. Termessus was compelled to give 50 talents to Manlius, after he had prevented the Termessians from attacking the Isindians who had appealed to him for aid. Cities of the Pamphylian plain sent envoys to donate similar amounts, by which they hoped to deter Manlius from invading their territory. His northward route towards Galatia took him via Sagalassus whose citizens were also deprived of 50 talents and forced in addition to provide 40,000 measures of barley and wheat. His other accomplishments in this district included the capture of Cormasa, the surrender of Lysinia, devastation of the Metropolitan Campus and the exaction of 200 talents from the Oroandians.²⁷

The achievements of Manlius have been taken as evidence that western Pisidia fell into Pergamene hands even before the treaty of Apameia,²⁸ but payment of tributes as a deterrent against devastation does not in itself imply that allegiance to the Romans on behalf of the Pergamenes was effected at this time. Nor do the capture of Cormasa and the acceptance of the surrender of Lysinia confirm more than that these two settlements were unfortunate enough to lie in the path of Manlius. Livy²⁹ informs us that the Oroandians were used as spies by the Romans, which suggests that sufficient pressure was exerted to persuade this tribe at least to comply partially with the new authority, but their

later rebellious nature, indicated in the campaigns of Servilius, suggests that they were not altogether willing accomplices.

It seems that Eumenes exerted more unwelcomed pressure on his new domains that Antiochus had previously done. At least Selge felt it necessary to send representatives to Rome in 164 BC, presumably to complain about his aggressive behaviour.³⁰ The Selgians later successfully resisted the attempts of Eumenes' successor, Attalus II, to bring their city and lands under Pergamene subjection.³¹ Termessus, however, must have complied with Attalus' demands, for he presented the city with a portico,³² indicating that friendship was either proffered voluntarily by Termessus or effected by bribery on Attalus' part. Despite the resistance of Selge, Attalus was sufficiently successful in his mission to be able to found the new port of Attaleia.³³

The walls in the pass below Termessus are an enigma. Their position and character have persuaded Stark and others that they were constructed not by the Termessians themselves, but by the Pergamenes as a means of defining and protecting their new territory around Attaleia, implying that the Pergamenes were not at all confident of their relationship with Termessus.³⁴ Bean disagrees with this interpretation,³⁵ convinced that they must have been built by the Termessians. Even if Bean is correct and the Termessians were responsible, still a measure of mutual distrust between Termessians and Pergamenes is implicit.

Antiochus' possessions had diminished by now, and although the Seleucids held the Cilician plain until into the 1st century BC, their control steadily weakened. This was a contributory factor to the increase of brigandage and piracy, especially in Cilicia Aspera. In 133 BC, Attalus III died, having bequeathed his kingdom to Rome.³⁶ The Romans were now obliged to take a more active interest in the affairs of Asia

Minor, but although the province of Asia was formed from Attalus' western territories, the Senate was not prepared to handle the more troublesome highland regions and these were left in the hands of a series of client kings.³⁷

It is not certain whether the problems caused by the pirates and the highland brigands would have been minimised had the Romans taken immediate control of the whole of Asia Minor on the death of Attalus III. However that may have been, the Senate consented to administer only the more manageable western regions, and the central parts of the country were left very much to their own devices. Already natural refuges for brigands and pirates, the highlands and southern littoral nurtured these deviant elements of society until the problem increased to such a state that the Senate had to intervene before the whole region from the northern Taurus to the sea became completely unruly and uncontrollable. The brigands and pirates were not only a hazard to the native settlements of the Taurus, but also posed an indirect threat to Rome herself. Communication and trade routes across Asia Minor became unsafe and ships voyaging to and from the Eastern Mediterranean were continually in jeopardy of being attacked by the pirates. Particularly hazardous were the waters and harbours of Rhodes, Cyprus and the southern coast of mainland Asia Minor. It was not even possible to rely on the 'civilised' cities to help to deter the pirates, or to provide a safe haven for an obligatory halt on a long voyage. Side, for example, permitted the pirates to make use of her harbour, whereby she probably received a percentage of their profits,³⁸ and a ready supply of slaves was probably not totally disagreeable to the Romans.

During the half century following the bequest of the Pergamene Empire to Rome, a number of attempts were made to deal with the marauders, but

these were not seriously carried out or followed up, and the problem remained.³⁹ The first serious expedition was that made by Publius Servilius Vatia, between 77 and 75 BC. His first campaign was directed against the pirates, and he succeeded in eliminating the threat of the pirate chieftain, Zenicetes, whose stronghold was near Olympus in Lycia and who had control over much of the Lycian and Pamphylian coastlands.⁴⁰ The aim of Servilius' second campaign was to check the troubles caused by the brigands of the Taurus, whose chief centres of banditry were Isaura Vetus and Isaura Nova. Servilius received the name Isauricus as recognition of his efforts against the Isaurian brigands.⁴¹ Doubt has been thrown on the extent of his success.⁴² It is clear, however, that he performed a fairly effective service, if only he caused the temporary discouragement of such activities, and the sources testify that he not only captured the brigand strongholds but also confiscated certain territories which were given as ager publicus to Rome.⁴³

Had Servilius' achievements been followed up immediately, the trouble may have been eliminated. However, piracy and brigandage were only temporarily retarded,⁴⁴ and it was left to Pompey to clear the seas of pirates, and to Augustus to take the first decisive steps towards the pacification of the mountainous interior of Asia Minor. In 67 BC a special command was created to deal with the pirate problem. The office was given to Gn. Pompeius Magnus. Brilliant organisation, and large numbers of troops and fleet ships assured him of success. Piracy did continue, but it was on a small enough scale to be of no great danger either to Rome or to the coastal settlements of Asia Minor.⁴⁵

The troubles of the interior caused by brigandage and banditry were more firmly rooted and could not easily be wiped out in a single sweep as was possible with the pirate problem. Servilius had made some headway

in this direction, but without follow-up the highlands reverted to their formerly unruly state. The way was partially paved for Augustus by the efforts of Amyntas, king of Pisidia from 39 BC until his death in 25 BC. Amyntas had originally been secretary to Deiotarus of the Galatians,⁴⁶ but had changed his allegiance at Philippi,⁴⁷ and was appointed by Antony to bring the highlands into line with the rest of the country.⁴⁸ His domains, power and success increased considerably,⁴⁹ until he was killed on a campaign against the Homonadeis.⁵⁰ Among his achievements was the sacking of Cremna, a difficult task as it was a strong Pisidian fortress.⁵¹ Nearby Sandalium, however, resisted his attempt to take control of this too.⁵² It is not known whether Isaura Vetus, which had been taken by Servilius almost half a century earlier, had reverted to its former position as a refuge for brigands and an enemy to Rome and had to be retaken by Amyntas. However, he made it his centre of operations and was on the verge of completing new fortifications when he was killed.⁵³ His adoption of Isaura Vetus as his capital was a wise move as it was in the heart of brigand territory and needed to be allied to Rome in order to deprive the brigands of an organised and established centre from which to perform their activities.

It is uncertain how much actual control Amyntas had over the highlands, but it may be supposed that he made considerably more headway than had his predecessors, partly due to the fact that he was on the spot. This is one of the reasons why the client king system was favoured by the Romans. Not only did it prevent Roman governors from abusing their authority, but native leaders, ruling on Rome's behalf, had a better chance of success because they were more attuned to the needs, the character and the way of life of the indigenous communities.⁵⁴ An additional reason may have been that some of the settlements were offering less resistance to outside influences than they had previously done,

from a need for protection against the marauding brigands and a desire to embrace a more peaceable civilisation.

Amyntas' death was a crisis for Augustus. The region was still infested with hostile tribes, and an apathetic attitude to the problem would doubtless undo whatever results had been achieved already. Augustus, in fact, took a more involved interest in central Asia Minor than had his predecessors. His programme aimed at the total pacification of the highlands was fulfilled by the creation of the administrative province of Galatia, the establishment of a number of colonies in and around Pisidia and the improvement of the road system.⁵⁵

The six major colonial foundations were Antiocheia, Parlais, Cremna, Olbasa, Comama and Lystra, but it has been argued convincingly that he placed settlers in other cities of the same region.⁵⁶ The colonies and their roles have been discussed adequately and in detail by a number of scholars;⁵⁷ here it is necessary to draw only a general outline so far as the colonies fit into the historical development of Pisidia. It is generally agreed that Augustus' prime motive was to establish in a troublesome area a measure of firm control on which further developments towards policing the highlands could be based. Additional motives have also been proposed, although these are secondary to the main - control of communication routes in anticipation of the completion of the Via Sebaste road-building programme, consolidation of settlements and districts which had already been conquered by his predecessors and which he could not allow to slip out of Rome's hands, settling of veterans after Actium,⁵⁸ civilisation of an area so far considered to be mainly heathen. As befitted their purpose, the colonies were of a military character, but as the region became more peaceable, the original Latin character of the colonies became less marked and they

gradually blended into the environment.

Dates have been postulated for the individual settlements.⁵⁹ There is, however, no conclusive evidence to fix a precise date for any of the foundations, nor to suggest that they were all settled in the same year. However, there is nothing to support an argument against an early date. One would indeed expect that Augustus would act as quickly as possible in order to retain any advantage he might already possess. This would have been particularly true in the case of Cremna which had been virtually impregnable before its capture by Amyntas and which, had it been given the chance to fall back under enemy influence, would doubtless have required a great deal of time and effort to bring under control once again. Moreover, nearby Sandalium had successfully resisted Amyntas' attempts at capture, and influence from a still independent and hostile settlement might easily have swayed the loyalties of Cremna. This reason for a probable early foundation date for Cremna is applicable to all of the colonies, as it was imperative that Pisidia as a whole should not slip back into enemy hands.

The individual characters of the colonies were not identical, and despite the general purpose, there were other factors involved whose emphasis may be stressed to different degrees, depending on the individual foundation. The availability of land was an important consideration. Land was available at Antiocheia, a legacy from Amyntas,⁶⁰ and the same may apply to the other colonies, although details are not known. Control of the major routes through Pisidia was also important. Strategic siting on already existing routes, in particular on the line of the proposed Via Sebaste, would be essential in order to provide easy access for the policing of these routes. Antiocheia was positioned on the main artery of the Via Sebaste which at this point followed a route

which had been in common usage since the 3rd century, when a Seleucid foundation had been located at the same site. Cremna was probably on an already existing north-south route from Pamphylia via the Aksu valley, and Comama was possibly situated on the line of a route which connected the East-West highway with the Pamphylian plain.⁶¹

Five of the six colonies are known to have been superimposed on already existing communities, those of Antiocheia, Cremna, Olbasa, Parlais and Comama,⁶² and in Cremna's case at least it would have seemed imperative thus to make sure of the loyalty of a settlement which had such an excellent defensive position. No practical reason can be found for the locations of Parlais and Olbasa, and they may well have had no additional function other than providing a home for veteran soldiers and adding to the overall presence of Roman power in the area. Availability of land may have been a major factor, and Olbasa's position on the extreme western fringe of Pisidia would have helped to 'contain' the region, in the same way as Lystra to the east. The strategic importance of Lystra has also come into question;⁶³ but apart from the possibility of it being situated on a pre-Augustan road, it was surely not unwise to position a colony on the eastern side of one of the most hostile districts of the highlands, that area between Lake Beyşehir and the Konya plain which had caused so much trouble to Amyntas and whose most notorious tribe, the Homonadeis, had been the cause of his death. The fact that no colony was planted any closer to this region suggests that hostilities in these mountains were strong, and that such a move would have been rash and impractical at this time.

Mitchell has argued convincingly for evidence of seven additional settlements of Augustus in and around Pisidia, namely Iconium, Attaleia, Isaura, Apollonia, Neapolis, Germa and Ninica.⁶⁴ The settlement

at Isaura, Amyntas' old capital, was a far-seeing move on the part of Augustus, firstly because it was important, as at Cremna, to make certain of retaining the allegiance of what had once been a hostile settlement, and secondly because it was a reliable base close to troublesome territory. Mitchell suggests that settlement of colonists at Attaleia, Isaura and Neapolis was made possible through the availability of ager publicus which had been confiscated by Servilius for Rome.⁶⁵

Like Antiocheia, Apollonia was on the course of an existing route, and both Apollonia and Neapolis were on the line of the main artery of the Via Sebaste.

The colonies were Augustus' first step towards the pacification of Pisidia and adjacent troublesome regions. The next step was the construction of the Via Sebaste. The chronology is not certain, but the two projects complemented each other and were probably devised simultaneously.⁶⁶ Thus the lowland plains of Pisidia were well under Rome's control, and the next move was to extend this influence to the highland regions where bands of brigands still held out.

It has been agreed that the colonies were not founded strictly for the purpose of conducting a war with the highland tribes; however, they were certainly instrumental, by virtue of their proximity, in bringing about the success of the Romans in the ensuing war with the Homonadeis around 4-3 BC.⁶⁷ This was a great step forward in Augustus' pacification policy, since once the most hostile and powerful of the subversive highland tribes had been subdued and dispersed, there was a lack of cohesion among the highlanders as a whole, and subsequent attempts at civilising the unruly areas were sure of meeting with less hostile resistance.

Augustus' policies produced few immediate miraculous effects, but it is indisputable that they heralded a course of new and expansive developments in central Asia Minor.

CHAPTER III

PROVINCIAL BOUNDARIES

Strabo's comment that the administrative divisions created by the Romans followed neither the ethnic nor the geographical divisions of the country¹ accurately describes the situation throughout Antiquity. As Broughton points out,² these divisions are rather a reflection of the chronology of Roman occupation and of the various influences imposed on Asia Minor.

The district occupied by the Pisidians quite naturally was known as Pisidia,³ and the name was retained when the province of Pisidia was officially instituted at the end of the 3rd century. Over the three centuries prior to this, Roman officialdom imposed its stamp on Asia Minor by assigning those regions whose shady delimitations had so far been dictated by tribal supremacy and chieftain kingdoms to administrative provinces. Thus the region that was to emerge as Provincia Pisidia was apportioned variously to the official provinces of the first three centuries of our era - Galatia, Asia, Lycia and Pamphylia. Although Pisidia during these years was not an independent administrative entity, it still retained its ethnic epithet, and one must be aware that references to Pisidia before the late 3rd century relate to an ethnic or geographical region and not to an administrative province. The same caution must be applied to other regions of Asia Minor, in particular to Cilicia.

The Romans first intervened in Asia Minor after the defeat of Antiochus III at the battle of Magnesia, but until Augustus took on the responsibility of direct control Rome was content to regulate the affairs of Asia Minor from a distance. The country for the most part remained in the hands of a series of rulers with only nominal control over highland areas in particular and client kings who were generally left to their own devices. Even when Attalus III bequeathed the

Pergamene kingdom to Rome in 133 BC, the Senate was unwilling to undertake total administrative responsibility, and only the western part of the Pergamene Empire was incorporated into the new province of Asia. This included the Troad, Mysia, Lydia and Caria.⁴ The more distant and troublesome easterly regions were placed under the jurisdiction of client kings. Cilicia was given to the king of Cappadocia,⁵ and it is possible, as Jones assumes,⁶ that here the term 'Cilicia' covers Pamphylia and Pisidia. Otherwise it is not clear what became of Pamphylia. An alternative is that the region remained independent.⁷ Phrygia was at first under the rule of Mithridates V of Pontus, but became part of Provincia Asia in 116 BC.⁸ That part of the Moagilid kingdom around Cibyra was added in 84 BC,⁹ but at least Bubon and Balbura of its fellow members of the Tetrapolis were included in independent Lycian territory.¹⁰

One of the consequences of Rome's failure to administer more direct control over the eastern regions of the Pergamene kingdom was the increase in piracy. It was not until about 100 BC that the 'province' of Cilicia was established to deal with the problem. Until the intervention of Pompey, Cilicia was not so much a regular administrative province with fixed boundaries as a standing military command, set up to effect control of the pirates from a closer base, its limits defined by the governor's sphere of activity. According to Cicero, the districts which came under the authority of the governor of Cilicia in 80 BC were Pamphylia, Pisidia, Phrygia, the Milyas and Lycia,¹¹ the latter being nominally an independent people but plagued by the same problem of piracy which ravaged the regions further east. Pompey annexed the region of Cilicia Pedias to the province of Cilicia,¹² in 58 BC Cyprus was attached¹³ and in 56 BC the three Phrygian dioceses of Laodiceia, Apameia and Synnada were detached from Asia and added to

Cilicia.¹⁴ The important function of Cilicia was not restricted to control of the pirates. Its strategic position gave it the role of a buffer between Asia and the uncivilised East, and, as indicated by the annexation of the three Phrygian dioceses, protection of the East-West highway was an equally important consideration. Levick¹⁵ notes that the importance of the province is reflected in the fact that all proconsuls of Cilicia from Servilius to Cicero were of consular rank. It seems that Cilicia had served its purpose by the early 40's, for it was gradually disassembled over the next few years; in 49 BC the dioceses of Laodiceia, Apameia and Synnada were returned to Asia,¹⁶ Side was detached by 43 BC, probably in 49 or 47,¹⁷ and Cyprus was given to Arsinoe and Ptolemy the Younger.¹⁸

In 39 BC Antony began a policy which set the client king Amyntas on the road to controlling much of central Asia Minor, paving the way for Augustus who, on Amyntas' death, continued the major task of subduing the unruly highland tribes. Initially, Amyntas was set up as king of Pisidia,¹⁹ but when Castor, the grandson and successor of Deiotarus, died three years later, Amyntas was appointed king of Galatia.²⁰ With Rome's blessing he increased his domains until his kingdom incorporated much, or the whole, of the regions of Galatia proper, Phrygian Pisidia, Lycaonia, Isauria, Pamphylia and Cilicia Tracheia. Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia had at first been given to Polemo,²¹ but in 36 BC Antony gave Cilicia Tracheia to Cleopatra,²² Galatia, Lycaonia, Isauria (Isaurike) and at least part of Pamphylia to Amyntas,²³ Cappadocia to Archelaus,²⁴ and Polemo was compensated with Pontus and Armenia Minor.²⁵ Strabo confirms that Amyntas retained his original Pisidian territory when he was made king of Galatia.²⁶ Augustus deprived all of the client kings, except for Amyntas and Archelaus, of the lands over which Antony had appointed them and gave Cilicia Tracheia

to Archelaus.²⁸

When Amyntas was killed in 25 BC, Augustus involved himself directly in the administration of central Asia Minor and created the province of Galatia out of Amyntas' kingdom.²⁹ There are, however, difficulties concerning the extent of the new province.³⁰ The discovery of Amyntas' tetradrachmas at Side³¹ cannot alone prove that his territory must have included Side, since it is not certain that the coins were actually minted at Side.³² Even if Amyntas had possessed Side, it is still not clear how much of the surrounding territory had belonged to him. Neither is it certain how much of the southerly regions of his kingdom was incorporated into the province of Galatia. Strabo twice states that the whole of Amyntas' kingdom formed the new province,³³ but Dio implies that Pamphylia was independent.³⁴ Strabo's assertion that Sagalassus and Selge were in Galatia³⁵ is no clue to the fate of the Pamphylian plain as both cities were part of the district of Pisidia and generally considered as Pisidian rather than Pamphylian during the 1st century BC. The most favourable solution is to follow Syme's interpretation of Dio³⁶ - Dio's 'certain parts of Pamphylia' need not necessarily mean the coastal plain; it may represent the Pisidian Taurus or even Cilicia Tracheia, and when Dio says that parts of Pamphylia were given to Amyntas, he is also implying that parts were not. However, if the Pamphylian plain did not form part of the province of Galatia, there is a question both of its status and of the date at which it did become an individual provincial entity. Levick suggests that Amyntas probably did hold a large tract of the Pamphylian coast conterminous with Cilicia Tracheia, and she follows Syme in the opinion that Pamphylia was united with Galatia when Augustus created the new province, whether or not Pamphylia was a part of Augustus' inheritance.³⁷ This latter view is supported by Pliny's statement, if the correction

from Actalenses is not erroneous, that the Attalenses were a Galatian community.³⁸

Lycia had been declared free in 169 BC,³⁹ but internal trouble prompted Claudius to annex Lycia to Pamphylia, both as a punishment and as a measure of firmer control.⁴⁰ It was probably at the same time, AD 43, that Pamphylia was detached from Galatia. Ruge has postulated a boundary line for the provinces of Galatia and Lycia-Pamphylia,⁴¹ but there is no archaeological evidence for this. About AD 55, a legatus provinciae Galatiae, Rutilius Gallicus, seems to have had control over Pamphylia as well as Galatia,⁴² There is, however, no evidence to suggest a formal division of Lycia and Pamphylia during Claudius' reign and at least part of Nero's; both may have briefly come under the command of the Galatian legate, as an emergency measure, perhaps to give Corbulo unhampered access to the sea.⁴³ Licinius Mucianus is attested as governor of both Lycia and Pamphylia in AD 61 or later.⁴⁴

Not until late in Nero's or during Galba's reign was the pre-Claudian arrangement resumed for certain,⁴⁵ and Lycia and Pamphylia were again separated. This arrangement lasted for a very short time. In AD 74, Vespasian reorganised provincial boundaries, taking independence from Lycia and reuniting it with Pamphylia.⁴⁶

As noted above, there is no evidence for a boundary line between Galatia and Lycia-Pamphylia during the 1st century AD. There is, however, more evidence from the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Comama had been in Galatia when the Via Sebaste was constructed,⁴⁷ but an inscription honouring Q. Voconius Saxa Fidus, governor of Lycia-Pamphylia in the mid 2nd century, found at Comama,⁴⁸ implies that Lycia-Pamphylia extended northwards to include Comama by the mid 2nd century. It is uncertain when the expansion took place. A date of Vespasian is possible,⁴⁹ but there is no specific evidence to confirm it.

Zosimus describes Cremna as being in Lycia towards the end of the 3rd century.⁵⁰ That Lycia here represents Lycia-Pamphylia is confirmed by a recently discovered inscription from Cremna dated to AD 278.⁵¹ The boundary, then, was north of Cremna during the late 3rd century. That Adada was also in the same province is suggested by a 3rd century inscription from that city, honouring Aufidius Coresnius Marcellus, legate of Lycia-Pamphylia.^{51a} Ptolemy includes Cremna and Adada, along with Prostanna, Seleuceia Sidera, Conane and Baris in Pamphylia,⁵² while the district of Phrygia Paroreios containing Apollonia, Antiocheia and Neapolis remained in Galatia.⁵³ Provided that Ptolemy is not erroneous, this suggests that Cremna and Adada were already in Lycia-Pamphylia in the 2nd century and that the boundary between the two provinces was roughly on the line of Kapi Dağı, Barla Dağı and Anamas Dağı, using these high mountains and the lakes of Burdur and Eğirdir as a natural geographical frontier. There is, of course, the possibility that Ptolemy was influenced by the fact that this was a suitable, rather than an actual, boundary line and allocated the settlements of Pisidia accordingly. An additional problem here might be that there is no certain evidence that Sagalassus was ever in Lycia-Pamphylia. Ptolemy's inclusion of Sagalassus in Lycia is no proof as it is clear that he meant Acalissus.⁵⁴ There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Sagalassus was never in Lycia-Pamphylia. The styling of Sagalassus as first city of Pisidia during the 2nd and 3rd centuries⁵⁵ is no cause for concern since 'Pisidia' at this time refers to the district of Pisidia, as the province was not yet formed. Sagalassus could hardly boast that she was first city of Lycia, Pamphylia or Galatia as it was obvious that there were more worthy claimants to any of these titles. If Ptolemy is correct, the 2nd century boundary between Lycia-Pamphylia and Galatia was on the line

of the Pisidian lakes and mountains. If he is wrong, Lycia-Pamphylia extended north of Comama by the mid 2nd century, and north of Cremna and Adada by the 3rd. The temporary annexation of Isauria, or part of Isauria, to Lycia-Pamphylia at the end of the 2nd century is suggested by an inscription from Attuda.⁵⁶

In about AD 134, Lycia-Pamphylia was made a senatorial province,⁵⁷ and the alliance of the two provinces continued until at least AD 313.⁵⁸

Galatia and Cappadocia had been united as a dual province with consular status under Vespasian.⁵⁹ This association lasted for over 40 years

until the province was bisected by Trajan and Galatia once more became a praetorian province.⁶⁰ Galatia's territory was much reduced by now,

including only Paphlagonia of its formerly extensive northern lands, and apparently conceding much of Lycaonia to Cappadocia.⁶¹ At a date

not long after this, possibly in the last years of Trajan or early Hadrian,⁶² but definitely by the time of Antoninus Pius,⁶³ the new

province of the Tres Eparchiae was formed from the districts of Cilicia, southern Lycaonia and Isauria.⁶⁴ The boundary between Galatia and the

Tres Eparchiae is fixed by numismatic evidence to be somewhere to the south of Laodiceia Catacecaumene and Iconium, and to the north of

Barata, Dalisandus, Derbe, Hyde, Ilistra, Laranda and Savatra.⁶⁵

Further south, the two provinces probably met somewhere in the region of Lake Suğla, between Vasada and Isaura, since a governor of Galatia

of the late 2nd or early 3rd century is attested at Vasada,⁶⁶ and

Isaura was one of the chief cities of the Tres Eparchiae. The northern limit of Lycia-Pamphylia probably converged at roughly the same point.

Apart from a slight extension of Galatia to the north in the early 3rd century,⁶⁷ provincial boundaries remained unchanged until Diocletian.

Diocletian pursued a policy involving the formation of smaller

provincial areas, the major aim of which appears to have been to restrict the power of provincial governors by giving them a smaller area to control.⁶⁸ Also apparent is the separation of civil and military command, an idea which seems to have been first put into practice by Gallienus and completed during the later years of Diocletian.⁶⁹ While the number of new territorial units was increased, the provinces were at the same time bound together within a total of 12 dioceses, clearly intended to cope with supervision problems resulting from the existence of a larger number of provinces. Each diocese was under the control of a vicarius who was responsible to the praetorian prefects.⁷⁰ The programme was perhaps initiated during the time when Diocletian ruled jointly with Maximian, and applied over subsequent years as occasion dictated until the reorganisation was completed.⁷¹ The earliest surviving provincial record is thought to be the Laterculus Veronensis⁷² which probably dates from a few years after Diocletian's retirement.⁷³ According to this list the eastern provinces were organised into three dioceses - Asiana, Pontica and Oriens. Provincia Pisidia was born as part of the reorganisation programme, included in the diocese of Asiana which consisted of a total of 9 provinces.⁷⁴ Pisidia is first recorded as a province under Galerius.⁷⁵ The province incorporated parts of Galatia and Asia, including the district of Phrygia Paroreios - Apameia, Metropolis, Apollonia, Antiocheia, and Philomelium were among the cities which fell within the northern limits of the new province - and the northern part of Lycia-Pamphylia, including Sagalassus which, presumably, had previously been part of the latter province. Antiocheia was elevated to the position of metropolis of Pisidia.

It seems that Pisidia was under a praeses from its conception as a province,⁷⁶ a situation which continued until the early 5th century at least.⁷⁷ Some time later, however, possibly by the mid 5th century,⁷⁸

but definitely by the time of Justinian,⁷⁹ Pisidia was governed by a consularis. The provinces of Lycia and Pamphylia were still united under a praeses in AD 313,⁸⁰ but in the records of the Council of Nicaea of AD 325⁸¹ they are recorded as individual provinces and remained separate throughout Antiquity. In the 4th century, Pamphylia was governed by a comes,⁸² but the Notitia Dignitatum Orientis,⁸³ which seems to reflect the state of affairs in the early 5th century,⁸⁴ and Hierocles⁸⁵ place Pamphylia under a consularis. According to the Notitia Dignitatum,⁸⁶ Lycia was under a praeses, but it is not certain if this was a post which had continued unchanged from the time when the provinces were united. By the time of Hierocles,⁸⁷ Lycia was also under a consularis. Pamphylia was divided into two for ecclesiastical purposes at least,⁸⁸ perhaps because of the rivalry between Perge and Side.

The next major change in territorial organisation took place in the early 7th century. The Arabs had become an increasingly troublesome threat and as this was a military problem the only way to deal with it was to use military tactics. As a result, the old provincial boundaries were abandoned, apart from their retention as ecclesiastical divisions, and a completely new structure of territorial division and administration was enforced. Asia Minor was divided into large military zones called themes.⁸⁹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus attributes the reorganisation to Heraclius.⁹⁰ The theme system was based on the settlement of soldiers, and both military and civil affairs of each theme were under the authority of a strategus.⁹¹ The initial four themes were Armeniaci, Anatolici, Opsikion and Caravisionorum.⁹² In the 8th century, under Leo the Isaurian, the Anatolic theme was restricted in area and that part of it by the coast became known as the Cibyrraeotic theme.⁹³ The theme system existed until the 12th century.⁹⁴

CHAPTER IV

COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

Until a few centuries before Christ, travel in Asia Minor was very much restricted, settlements by necessity being self-contained and self-sufficient, and there being minimum communication with other than most immediate neighbours. Movement when it did take place was principally of a migratory nature, or else took the form of intermittent tribal raids. The establishment of the first colonies on the shores of Asia Minor was doubtless accompanied by desires for cultural interchange and expansion, fulfilled by exploration inland, but the real interior seems to have been relatively untouched. It was probably not until the Persian involvement in Asia Minor, followed by Alexander and the earliest Roman campaigns, that the inhabitants of the interior began to feel an awareness of a greater geographical perspective. Highland cities such as Termessus, Selge and Pednelissus had intimate, if hostile, relations with each other from these or even earlier times, but it is likely that their means of communication were nothing more than forced routes through unpathed mountain passes and plains.

The earliest routes across Asia Minor from the Aegean coast to Persia and Syria traced a course running through the more easily-traversable regions in the northern part of the country. The exact course of the Persian Royal Road described by Herodotus is uncertain.¹ Levick follows Calder in suggesting that after its course through the Hermes valley the Royal Road took a southern swing to Philomelium and Laodiceia Catacecaumene, and thence to the East.² A more southerly route for the first section of this West-East journey was also popular. This connected Ephesus with the East via the Meander valley, Laodiceia and Apameia,³ and probably came into common usage at a later date than the Royal Road. It was a route that was to remain important throughout history. On it were based both the major East-West highway of Roman times, from Syria to the Aegean coast, and the modern road from the

East to İzmir via Konya, Dinar and the Meander Valley.⁴ According to Artemidorus,⁵ the common road, the κοινὴ ὁδός, travelled by all who journeyed from Ephesus to Caesareia followed a course via Carura, Magnesia, Tralles, Nysa, Antioch on the Meander, Laodiceia, Apameia, Metropolis, Chelidonia, Holmi, Philomelium, Tyriaeum and Laodiceia Catacecaumene, and thence via Coropassus and Garsaura (Colonia Archelais) directly eastwards. The road so described avoided Iconium, but no doubt a route via Iconium and the Cilician Gates, as used by Cicero in 51 BC,⁶ was a common alternative. Under the Seleucid regime a variation on the normal East-West route came into more popular use, bringing into the system more southerly regions, so far bypassed by the ancient main routes. The old section of the Meander valley route from the Aegean to Apameia was retained as part of the new course, but from Apameia the road deviated directly eastwards, skirting the southern side of the Sultan Dağları and studded along its route by a series of Seleucid colonies.⁷

There were two main reasons why Pisidia was not fully involved in the early road system of Asia Minor. In the first place, the robbers and brigands of the whole of the Taurus and adjacent highland regions posed a threat to the safety of travellers on a road that might run through their territory, and a route further to the north in order to avoid this danger would be preferable to a through route across the highlands. The second reason is geographical. Much of the terrain of Pisidia is mountainous and makes for difficult access. The lines of many of the roads which did emerge in the highlands were conditioned by the river courses, valleys and mountain passes. The Sultan Dağları mountain range and its opposite number to the north-west of Pisidia have been described by Levick as two sides of a triangle with its apex to the north of Antiocheia.⁸ Natural routes in the west

are dictated by the northeast-southwest orientation of the ranges and their adjoining valleys, and in the east the mountain and valley orientation permits only northwest-southeast routes with ease.

Although mountains do present a formidable natural barrier to traffic, along most mountain ranges a pass or a river course will always allow the possibility of access, however arduous and dangerous it may be.

The native inhabitants of the highlands would be well practised in travelling through difficult and mountainous terrain. To the south the easiest routes in the Taurus mountains are of a north-south orientation, running along or parallel to the courses of the major rivers - the Cestrus, Eurymedon and Melas - and presumably branch roads, much like present-day forestry roads, led from the major routes to the many settlements in the highlands. The main body of Pisidia was connected to the Pamphylian plain via these north-south routes through the Taurus, and thus communication and trade could be carried out with Pamphylia herself or with lands further afield using sea transport from the coast. In a similar manner Pisidia communicated with the rest of Asia Minor by branch roads which led from northern Pisidia over mountain passes or through breaks in the ranges to the East-West highway. In the central parts of Pisidia meandering routes were dictated naturally by the terrain where obstacles of lakes and high mountains foiled the aspirations of any road builder to construct a typically straight Roman road.

It is obvious from the fact that the modern roads of Pisidia follow so closely the lines of the ancient routes that the terrain offers few alternatives. The modern Antalya-Burdur-Dinar highway through the Çubuk Boğazı runs through the mountains on a course probably not too far from the ancient route from Attaleia to Apameia. Although the earliest Roman route followed the northwest shore of Lake Burdur, a

Roman road doubtless ran along the southeast side, the route taken by the modern main road.⁹ The modern road from Manavgat to Beyşehir via Akseki traces roughly the ancient route from Side to Antiocheia and Iconium via Lake Beyşehir.¹⁰ The slogan 'all roads lead to Rome' could be readily adopted to describe Apameia, and the modern Dinar, Apameia's successor, is a converging point for roads leading from all directions. It is not surprising, then, that as a vital point of intersection on the road system of Asia Minor, Apameia was a prosperous city, receiving trade from all parts of the Empire, and reaping the benefits of her strategic location.¹¹

The most efficient method of transport in Antiquity, especially commercial transport, was by sea, which suited Asia Minor well, as three sides of the country might be served by shipping which travelled through the Black Sea, the Aegean or the Eastern Mediterranean.¹² A number of ports on the Mediterranean were regular stopping stages on a maritime journey from Egypt and Syria to the West. These included Cilician, Pamphylian and Lycian ports, as well as Cyprus and Rhodes, and Pisidian cities might use the Pamphylian ports of Attaleia and Side to export or receive trade goods. Although Asia Minor is poor in navigable rivers, according to Strabo boats could travel 60 stadia up the Eurymedon to Aspendus, and an equal distance up the Cestrus to Perge.¹³ However, sailing out of season was dangerous, and in winter communication and transportation, if essential, was probably carried out by road in preference to risking hazardous sea voyages.

A possible supplementary means of passage for travellers and armies on the march in the summer months, may have been the use of the beds of dried-up streams and rivers whose waters are not perennial. Drying up of streams and small rivers is a common occurrence in modern, and,

presumably, ancient Turkey. There is no documentary evidence but this must not be overlooked as a possible alternative means of communication.

Unfortunately, the evidence pertaining to the presence of and the dates of construction and repair of roads is not comprehensive enough to create a balanced reconstruction of the chronology of road building programmes. The information available from ancient documentary sources is not always acceptable. The Roman and Byzantine itineraries mention only the major highways and are not free from mistakes, usually copyists' errors, and the descriptions given by ancient geographers, historians and chroniclers are generally incidental to the main theme of the author, often resulting in a lack of accuracy. The accounts of the sources may be supplemented, confirmed or denied by archaeological discoveries, but this type of evidence, although more valuable as a source of information, is not always available. Sections of engineered roads and road cuttings surviving to present day are few and far between,¹⁴ and isolated incidents are not easily datable without additional information. Milestones testifying to road construction and repairs are generally our best source of information, as long as their provenance is known, since they frequently provide a date in the form of the name of an Emperor or an official. There is also the probability that certain types of boundary stones were set up in prominent positions along the courses of the roads, although one must be extremely cautious when using this kind of evidence.

One of the main difficulties in assessing the courses and the quality of pre-Roman lines of communication in particular, is that engineered roads, particularly along minor routes, were not always considered essential, and when the structure of a road amounts to little more than a well-worn dirt track, it is impossible to recognise the presence, let

alone the date of construction, of an ancient road. As far as we know road building as a large-scale engineering achievement did not emerge until early Roman times. The Persian Royal Road certainly set a precedent for the establishment of fixed grand routes across Asia Minor, but it is likely that this and other pre-Roman routes were merely well-travelled ways rather than products of skilled construction. The only reference we have to pre-Roman road 'construction' is a law of Eumenes II or Attalus II¹⁵ which stipulates that highways should have a width of not less than 30 feet and should be kept in good repair and free from encumbrances. French¹⁶ suggests that because the Flavian Emperors specifically stated on their milestones that they had paved a road (vias stravit/straverunt), pre-Flavian roads were unpaved.

Road construction as an engineering practice was a revolutionary step. It contributed ease and speed to travel, facilities which were valuable both for trade purposes and for military activities. In Pisidia and other Taurus regions, communication was particularly difficult, and although newly constructed roads did not generally forge new routes but rather followed old lines of communication, the resultant improved quality of the old paths and passes surely allowed closer and more frequent relations with adjoining settlements and regions, and thence, via the major highways, to important centres outside the immediate neighbourhood. An improved road network in Pisidia worked two ways. It gave rise to better communication with the outside for the inhabitants of the interior, and thus to better trading prospects and the spreading of new ideas, and it allowed Rome a firmer control over the unruly inhabitants of these mountainous areas. It is no coincidence that a new road building programme in Pisidia accompanied the foundation of the colonies in this area by Augustus. Although the

whole system was not designed purely with a view to keep the highlanders under control, it only seems reasonable that Augustus had general security in mind as well as providing an easy linkage system between the colonies.

Early Roman interest in the road system of Asia Minor began when the Pergamene Empire was bequeathed to Rome on the death of Attalus III in 133 BC and Asia was taken over as a Roman province. Among his many other achievements, Manlius Aquilius, proconsul of Asia from 129-126 BC, succeeded in improving the section of the old highway from Ephesus to Apameia, and he constructed a southerly arm from Apameia down the west coast of Lake Burdur, the boundary of the province of Asia.¹⁷

By the early Principate there already existed a skeleton main line communication system, but under the aegis of successive Emperors the road network was improved and consolidated with new routes and superior construction skills. Augustus' project to connect his Pisidian colonies by the Via Sebaste was well under way by 6 BC,¹⁸ under the supervision of the legate Cornutus Arruntius Aquila. This road laid the firm foundation not only for the development of a communication network to join all settlements both to each other and to the exterior, but also for the establishment of an organised militised road system for controlling the country.

The most important of the colonies was Antiocheia. Antiocheia communicated with Comama, to the south-west, by a road which skirted the northern edge of Lake Eğirdir and led via Apollonia to the northern end of Lake Burdur. From there it followed the north-west shore of the lake to Comama, a total distance of 122 miles.¹⁹ Ramsay was the first to suggest that Aquilius' route down this side of the lake was retained by the Via Sebaste and for at least three more centuries,²⁰

but due to complications presented by some milestone figures, Bean proposed that the main road in Imperial times led down the south-east side of the lake, with short arms on the other side leading to İlyas from the north and to Lysinia from the south, but not joining to create a through road.²¹ French has recently proved that the course of the road was indeed down the north-west side of the lake,²² but there is no reason why a second road might not have left the main road at the north end of the lake and run down the south-east side, through Sagalassian territory, but whether this would have been part of the original Via Sebaste programme is unknown.²³

Before the road reached Comama a branch probably broke from the main line and led directly south to Olbasa, and on reaching Comama it is likely that the road continued eastwards to Cremna where traces of a paved road have been noted.²⁴ Another of the colonies, Parlais, was in a very isolated situation on the west shore of Lake Eğridir, hemmed in on the east by the lake itself and to the north and west by high mountains, and it is difficult to see how the Via Sebaste brought this settlement into the system. The only decent natural line of communication was to the south, a route which is confirmed as far as Prostanna by a boundary stone found at Bedre.²⁵ A paved road leads past the site of Parlais and a possible milestone of Severan date was found at the site.²⁶ From here it is inconceivable that Parlais' only communication with Antiocheia was by an absurdly circuitous route which followed the Via Sebaste via Cremna, Comama and Apollonia. A shorter, but still indirect route would have led directly westwards from Prostanna along the naturally dictated line followed by the modern railway, via Seleuceia Sidera and Conane and joining the Via Sebaste at the northern end of Lake Burdur.²⁷ There is no evidence for a road to Antiocheia via the south and east shores of Lake Eğridir, and before

the modern road was built a road over these hills would have been fairly arduous as a major line of communication. However, this cannot be disregarded as a possibility.²⁸ Although there is also a modern road leading directly northwards from Barla(Parlais), which permits communication with Yalvaç and Uluborlu, this road has been the result of modern engineering skills and it is unlikely that the ancients forged a major route through these hills without leaving any trace. Before the modern road was constructed, Ramsay and Brown travelled along the west side of the lake and decided that there was barely sufficient room for a track, let alone a road.²⁹ However, a minor route from Parlais to Antiocheia may have led this way, passable by mules and pedestrians. The problem of more direct communication with Antiocheia seems to have been overcome quite ingeniously by using water transport. A sailing vessel is featured on coins of Parlais,³⁰ which implies that this was a notable conveyance of the colony and was probably the most common method of direct contact between Parlais and Antiocheia.

The most easterly of the six colonies, Lystra, communicated with Antiocheia by a road which led southwards from the latter colony down the eastern shore of Lake Beyşehir. A bridge at Görünmez and Augustan milestones at Selki and Pappa indicate that the road from Antiocheia turned eastwards near Kireli and led to Pappa via Selki.³¹ After Pappa, the only possible route is through the Barsakdere to Kızılören,³² then south through the valley between Loras Dağı and Kavaklıkoz Dağı to Lystra.³³

As noted above,³⁴ the exact date of construction of the various sections of the Via Sebaste is uncertain, and although it can be assumed that all six colonies were involved in the original system, it is not known to what degree Augustus' road-building policy extended to other routes and

settlements in and around Pisidia. Although Iconium was not one of Augustus' principle six colonies, that is, those he lists in his Res Gestae, it has been shown that he did indeed settle colonists there and a reference in the Acts of Paul and Thecla to a fork of the Via Sebaste proves a link between Iconium and the other colonies.³⁵ This may have been effected from Lystra, but it is likely that an additional route led directly to Iconium from Antiocheia and the Cillanian plain, either continuing due east where the road to Lystra turned southwards at Kızılören and following roughly the modern road to Konya, or departing from the Lystra road at Bulumya and running around the south of Loras Dağı. The former is the most direct route and is confirmed by a milestone of Nerva found near Değirmen.³⁶ The latter was probably an alternative, and easier, route on the grounds of Ramsay's discovery of two slight road cuttings in the rock and the word of his guide that the wagon road to Konya had until very recently taken a route to the south of Loras Dağı.³⁷

Where the Via Sebaste turned eastwards near Kireli, a branch continued southwards to the south-east corner of Lake Beyşehir. From there it led via Amblada, past the northern shore of Lake Suğla and on to Isaura Vetus, where Augustus is also presumed to have settled colonists and whence a further communication link with the Eastern provinces was possible via the Çarsamba valley.³⁸

It is inconceivable that the Seleucids and the Romans did not have a road across the mountains to connect Antiocheia with Philomelium and Laodiceia Catacecaumene, apart from a route from Philomelium skirting the Sultan Dağları and rounding its lower end to join up with the Via Sebaste, or a road crossing the Sultan Dağları by a low pass from Çetme, just north-west of Doğanhisar, to the Cillanian plain.³⁹ There

are two possible routes further to the north, one a bridle path leading almost directly from Yalvaç to Akşehir, and the second, to the south of the first, an engineered road from Engili to Örkenez.⁴⁰ It is likely that such a direct route was used in preference to a longer more southerly alternative, unless the gradient was too steep for certain loads or the bitter winter weather made a route of a lower altitude more favourable.

A branch road to connect the East-West highway with Antiocheia left the highway near Lysias. Whether or not this was a Seleucid conception,⁴¹ it was certainly important enough to undergo repairs at the end of the 1st century⁴² and merited the setting up of a custom's house at Lysias around the same time.⁴³

The Via Sebaste was certainly important, and not only for military reasons. The section of this road from Apameia via Apollonia and Antiocheia to Lystra and Iconium provided an alternative link between the Meander valley highway and the Cilician Gates, and was a stable major road on which all the other major and minor routes could converge. A link between Apameia and Apollonia hardly needs proving, but a boundary stone found at Çapalı suggests that its course ran over the low ridge of hills at this point.⁴⁴

There appear to have been a number of routes leading from the high-lands to the Pamphylian plain, with the seaports of Attaleia and Side as their ultimate destinations. The most westerly road to the plain broke from the Meander valley route at Laodiceia and ran via Themisonium, Cibyra and Isinda to the coast. The earliest evidence for this route is an inscription from Eriza, north of Cibyra, which suggests that it was an important line of communication by the third century BC.⁴⁵ Later use and upkeep are witnessed by milestones of

Severus and Diocletian.⁴⁶

A route from Laodiceia to Perge via Cormasa is recorded by the Peutinger Table.⁴⁷ Bean suggests that the bridge at Boğaziçi/Karaçal, south of Lake Burdur, was a stage on this road,⁴⁸ which fits in with his theory that Cormasa was at Çallica.⁴⁹ However, it has recently been discovered that the site at Çallica represents Hadriane rather than Cormasa.⁵⁰ It is unlikely that the road recorded by the Peutinger Table followed roughly the line taken by the modern Denizli-Yeşilova-Korkuteli-Antalya road;⁵¹ if so, Cormasa would have to be located south of Çallica, which is highly improbable since it is almost certain that the territory of Cormasa was conterminous with that of Sagalassus.⁵² The most likely solution is that Cormasa was north-east or east of Hadriane, and that at or near the station Cormasa the road joined the Via Sebaste, led to Comama, and thence to Perge. Because there are no intermediate stations mentioned by the Table between Themisonium and Cormasa, and between Cormasa and Perge, the precise course remains uncertain.

It has generally been taken for granted that a road did exist to connect the East-West highway with Pamphylia on the same lines as the modern Dinar-Antalya highway via the Çubuk Boğazı. There is no authority, however, for an ancient road having taken this route, apart from the knowledge that Alexander followed such a course on his journey from Termessus to Apameia via Sagalassus.⁵³ Although Alexander did not follow an actual built highway, his route would no doubt have been dictated by the nature of the terrain, which was one of the main criteria for the construction of roads. The Çubuk Boğazı is a natural route, although arduous because of the mountains, but there is a second defile just to the west. Because of the absence of

milestones it is impossible to postulate accurately the exact course of the ancient road through this part of the Taurus, but it is likely that the most commonly used of these two defiles was that to the west of the Çubuk Boğazı, the road passing by Ariassus and joining the Via Sebaste at Comama. It is probable that a subsidiary road went to Sagalassus and thence to Apameia via the south-east side of Lake Burdur.⁵⁴ The presence of four hans on the modern road from Antalya to İsparta shows that this was a major route in Seljuk times.⁵⁵

To the east of the Çubuk Boğazı is a third defile through which a minor modern roadway passes the villages of Karataş, Kocaeyüp and Varsak. Travellers have recorded a paved road, impressively lined with sarcophagi, running down the northern section of this defile.⁵⁶ This road emerged from the defile just to the north of the village of Dağ, where it presumably joined the route via Ariassus. Freya Stark was of the opinion that this road was already in common use in Alexander's day, but at that time it would have been a natural route through the Taurus rather than an actual paved road.⁵⁷ Doubtless Augustus would have ensured that there was at least one decent road to serve his colonists at Attaleia, and to link Attaleia with the other colonies.⁵⁸ The descriptions of the paved road imply that this was a substantial and major ancient route; wheel ruts prove that it was travelled by heavy traffic and signs of repair indicate long and continuous use. Considering this, it is more than likely the southern continuation of that road recorded by the Peutinger Table running from Laodiceia to Perge.

The Peutinger Table is the authority for another road from the plain to the plateau, that running from Side to Iconium.⁵⁹ The name of a station 80 miles from Side has been lost from the Table, but the

mileage and the fact that from this station one road led to Iconium and a second to Antiocheia suggest that the station was somewhere to the east of Lake Beyşehir. Arundell suggested Şarkikaraağaç,⁶⁰ Miller suggested Pappa,⁶¹ but if it was indeed so far north Kireli is probably a better estimation. An alternative candidate, and the most logical, is Mistea, which was probably situated at or near Beyşehir,⁶² The Ravenna geographer, although not specifically detailing roads, lists major cities which were presumably on major routes. By implication, Mistea was on a major route.⁶³ Bean and Mitford suggested that the station was at Cagrae (Cevizli), 40 Roman miles north of Side as the crow flies, which might work out at 80 miles by road over difficult terrain such as the Taurus between Side and Beyşehir.⁶⁴ Although Bean and Mitford assert that the road division could still be further north at a more convenient dividing point, it is more likely that the station and the road division were one and the same. The course is not described, and there are several alternatives. It was probably not the exact same course as that taken by the modern road from Side via Manavgat, Akseki and Beyşehir, which is neither the shortest nor the easiest route.⁶⁵ It is tempting to propose a route more on the line of the old Turkish road which led up the Melas and eventually joined the line of the modern road at Akseki or Cevizli,⁶⁶ since a road on such a course would more directly serve the settlements of Etenna, Cotenna and Erymna.

The route taken by St. Paul on his journey from Perge to Antiocheia has caused much speculation.⁶⁷ He may have travelled by one of the western routes and Sagalassus, or even by the road described immediately above.⁶⁸ An alternative route via Adada has also been suggested, and there are indeed remains of a grand road leading through Adada.⁶⁹ The most obvious course for this road is through the valley of the Koca Çayı,

and it might well be that St. Paul took this road as opposed to any other, since it would be more direct.⁷⁰

One of the few surviving vestiges of actual road construction in Asia Minor is found on the way to Selge (Zerk), to the north of Beşkonak. Strabo mentions bridges around Selge,⁷¹ and in addition to the extant sections of well-constructed road, two bridges still remain, one of which is the only means today of serving the mountain villages on the west side of the Köprü Irmağı (Pl. 1). This bridge is predominantly of Roman construction, and has survived with very little necessary repair for almost two thousand years. Selge's means of communication with the plain is thus explained. However, her method of communication with other highland zones and with central Pisidia remains unknown as no signs of a road leading northwards have yet been discovered. The description by Lanckoroński et al. of the road leading up the defile to the east of the Çubuk Boğazı indicates that its construction was similar to that of the road to Selge. The gradient is steep in both instances, and therefore a staircase type road was constructed⁷² (Pl. 8).

Apart from the Via Sebaste, there is little evidence for other major roads through Pisidia. Levick postulates a road from Antiocheia via Anabura and the west coast of Lake Beyşehir, across the grain of the mountains to Adada, Malus and Cremna, which would also serve Timbriada.⁷³ As long as routes like this were passable - and modern forestry roads show that routes over many mountain ranges were indeed possible - it seems likely that there did exist routes to connect all settlements of sufficient status, ranging from minor tracks and pathways to major engineered roads.

An inscription found at Burdur, concerning the roads of the territory

of Sagalassus, throws interesting light on what would otherwise be a gap in our knowledge.⁷⁴ Without this inscription there would be no tangible evidence for the involvement of Sagalassus, an important city throughout Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine history, in the road network of Asia Minor. The inscription stipulates the obligation of the city and the territory of Sagalassus to provide transport for those deserving it, as far as Conane to the north and Cormasa to the south. Mitchell argued that a road through the İsparta Ovası would necessarily go through Seleuceia Sidera, or its territory, before reaching Conane, and thus it is difficult to see why it is Conane which is named as the northerly settlement which was obliged to take over the responsibility or requisitioned transport from there. Mitchell has explained this by the possibility that Seleuceia was one of the self-governing cities which came under the jurisdiction of Sagalassus, at least for the purpose of transportation laws.⁷⁵ However, this argument is perhaps unnecessary. A milestone of the Constantines found at Deregüme, to the north-west of İsparta, suggests that a road may have led from Sagalassus to Conane without having to pass through the territory of Seleuceia Sidera.⁷⁶ The provenance of the Sagalassian inscription, near Burdur railway station, might lead to the supposition that a road from Sagalassus to Conane followed a course via Burdur and up the easily traversible south-east side of the lake. Such a road need not have passed through the territory of Baris.⁷⁷ However, as there is no evidence on the ground, it would be reckless to do more than present the alternatives, and doubtless a number of arteries of communication led from Sagalassus in various directions. The precise course of a road to connect Sagalassus with Cormasa cannot be ascertained as Cormasa has not been indisputably identified.⁷⁸ The inscription does imply, however, that Sagalassian territory was

conterminous with that of Cormasa.⁷⁹ It is not unlikely that similar inscriptions were set up on other major routes through Sagalassian territory, and almost certainly on the roads which passed through the territory of other cities.

By the 1st and 2nd century the road system of Pisidia had found all the natural routes permitted by the terrain, and where passage was otherwise problematic, but necessary in order to bring all settlements into the communication network, difficult routes had been engineered. Testimonies to the maintenance of the roads over the following centuries were generally recorded on milestones; continued use of particular routes may be witnessed by the Roman and Byzantine itineraries and by ancient writers, and by the setting-up or the replacement of milestones. Unless a milestone inscription specifically stated that the author had repaired a road, however, it is difficult to know whether this had been the case or whether an old and worn milestone had merely needed replacing. A milestone of Claudius found near Attaleia has been taken as testimony of a general repair of the roads of Pamphylia,⁸⁰ but one must be wary of making sweeping conclusions from a single example, although the wording of the inscription might suggest that Claudius did more than supply this one milestone.⁸¹

The period of the greatest road-building activity all over the Empire was under the Flavians.⁸² Milestones of Vespasian are commonly found, particularly along the more northerly roads of Asia Minor. The universality of the Flavian road-building programme is reflected in inscriptions of Domitian which record the repair of all the roads of Galatia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Pisidia, Paphlagonia, Lycaonia and Armenia Minor.⁸³

Post-Flavian road-building, or more precisely road repair, is evident

from milestones found in and around Pisidia until the beginning of the 3rd century and during the 4th. Besides his other road-building achievements, Nerva was responsible for the repair of the road between Antiocheia and Lysias.⁸⁴ Hadrianic milestones have been discovered between Apollonia and Lake Eğridir, and at Iconium, but it is uncertain whether or not these testify to an actual repair of the Via Sebaste at the beginning of the 2nd century.⁸⁵ Hadrian's visit to the region was in AD 129, after the erection of the stones - they may have been set up to celebrate the imminent visit of the Emperor and to flatter him.⁸⁶ Alternatively, it is possible that a substantial section of road did undergo some kind of renovation which was not specifically stated on the milestones.

An abundance of milestones found all over the Empire bear witness to the fact that Severan road-building was virulent and widespread, particularly during the term of office of C. Atticus Strabo, governor of Galatia in AD 198.⁸⁷ The Laodiceia-Attaleia road underwent maintenance at this time,⁸⁸ as did the section of the Via Sebaste which ran from Antiocheia to the southern end of Lake Burdur,⁸⁹ and in AD 202 there was possibly a repair of the road which skirted Lake Suğla and led to Isaura Vetus.⁹⁰

It appears that the domestic and external crises of the 3rd century led to neglect of the roads. Some improvements were made under Valerian and Gallienus,⁹¹ and Aurelius, Tacitus and Probus paid attention to the roads of the Aegean coastal provinces.⁹² The burden of maintaining the roads may have been by this time the sole responsibility of the municipalities, with no financial aid from central government, the obligations becoming more and more difficult to meet. However, as suggested by French, the erection of milestones may have been an early

Imperial form of propaganda, a fashion which died out in the later Empire.⁹³ Later repairs may have been carried out more frequently than has been supposed, but not acknowledged, though there probably was a general lack of concern, unavoidable due to a shortage of funds in central and municipal government.

A major change in communications occurred at the beginning of the 4th century, as a result of the capital being moved to Constantinople. Naturally, the increased importance of the 'New Rome' meant that a second major route from West to East emerged, connecting Constantinople directly with the East. The Meander valley route remained an important highway, because it was the most direct means of providing communication between the interior and the Aegean, and sea transport was still important; but now that there was an alternative major route across Anatolia, following a more northerly course, the southerly provinces might be by-passed by traffic, and thus by trade, whose ultimate destination from the East was Constantinople, and vice versa.

According to the Peutinger Table,⁹⁴ the major routes across and around Pisidia which were in use in the 4th century included the road which connected Laodiceia with the Pamphylian plain, and the road from Side to Iconium.⁹⁵ The Via Sebaste route from Apameia to Iconium via Apollonia, Talbonda (Tymandus) and Antiocheia, is also mentioned by the Table as a section of a major route across Anatolia, but the course of the Antiocheia-Iconium section is not clear.⁹⁶ The alternative route from Apameia to Iconium which skirted the north of the Sultan Dağları, via Euphorbium, Synnada, Iulia, Philomelium, Laodiceia Catacecaumene, Caballucome, Savatra and Pyrgus, is also recorded by the Table.⁹⁷ Milestones from the 4th century are fairly abundant,⁹⁸ and perhaps confirm the likelihood that road maintenance during the 3rd

century had been neglected rather than the erection of milestones being a fashion which died out during this century.

It was not only the upkeep of the road surfaces that concerned officials in charge of road maintenance. Other comforts were provided, such as the compulsory provision of transport for certain classes of traveller,⁹⁹ and the setting-up of stations along main routes. This latter improvement was not in evidence in the 1st century,¹⁰⁰ but the late Roman itineraries testify that the policy of providing mansiones and mutationes was common all over the Empire by the 3rd century.¹⁰¹

Towards the end of the Byzantine era, the type of evidence available for routes across Asia Minor is related to military matters, and generally concerns only the roads used during the Crusades and the campaigns of the Byzantine emperors to reach the East from Constantinople. Naturally enough a northerly route was favoured, but occasionally use was made of northern Pisidian roads since Iconium was frequently an ultimate or intermediate destination on such campaigns. Although the Apameia-Apollonia-Antiocheia-Iconium road would not be a usual section of a journey from Constantinople to the East, it might still feature in a journey from Ephesus and the Meander valley, and there is evidence to suggest that it was travelled fairly regularly.¹⁰²

It is clear that the terrain of Pisidia offers few alternative routes to those that had already been found by the Romans. Even when the Seljuk Turks changed the landscape of Anatolia with their castles and hans, their routes through highland country were dictated by the same physical conditions that had shaped the road network of Imperial times. The survival of the well-constructed hans shows that Seljuk routes through Pisidia, from western and eastern Pamphylia to Konya, traced roughly the courses of the roads of the Principate.¹⁰³ That there are

few alternative routes through the Pisidian highlands is confirmed by modern roads too, which, for the most part, have been constructed on the lines first mapped out on a large scale by Augustus.

CHAPTER V

TRIBE, CITY AND TERRITORY

In the brief historical and political background outlined in Chapter II it has been shown that Hellenistic interference and influence in the highlands was not excessive, and it will be seen that development of the highland settlements during the Hellenistic years was retarded in the sense that the basically tribal communities which had existed since pre-Alexandrian times continued, for the most part, to exist as such, apparently oblivious to the processes of urbanisation and Hellenisation which were taking place in more accessible regions of Asia Minor.

Even when the urbanisation of much of Asia and the coastal plains of the South was virtually complete, many of the highland communities continued in their old ways; those developments which did take place before and into the Principate were, in part, conducted on lines apart from Hellenistic traditions. Side by side with the tribal communities flourished a handful of settlements which had advanced organisations and constitutions from relatively early times, but which yet fought to preserve a measure of independence apart from the general Hellenisation which was taking hold of other parts of Asia Minor.

The sparsity of evidence in the sources for settlement in Pisidia before the Principate shows that this was a region little known in earlier times. Consequently it is difficult to judge with certainty to what extent the area was inhabited and the type of organisation of the settlements. Retrospective evidence from the 1st century onwards and comparative evidence from other regions does tend to confirm the impression given by the sources that Pisidia was scattered with small settlements whose organisation was basically tribal, and dotted with the occasional Hellenised city, such as Selge, Sagalassus and Termessus.

The earliest inhabitants of the area known from historical sources are the Solymi, first mentioned by Homer¹ who implies that they were neighbours of Lycia, and later by Herodotus who says that the land occupied

in his day by the Lycians was formerly inhabited by the Solymi.² The Lycians, then called Termilae, had been brought by Sarpedon from Crete; their name changed when Lycus later came from Athens to join Sarpedon. Both Herodotus and Strabo state that the Solymi were later called Milyae.³ Strabo's account is rather muddled, his confusion partly because he is writing long after the event, and partly because he misinterprets Herodotus. He understands that Herodotus and, possibly, additional sources disagree with Homer, saying, wrongly, he concludes, that the Lycians and Solymi were one and the same. Elsewhere, Strabo identifies the Solymi with the Cabalians.⁴ Pliny says that the Milyae were a tribe of Thracian descent.⁵ It seems that the Lycians (Termilae) must have driven the Solymi from Lycia, the Solymi retreated northwards to the district later known as Milyas, which they may already have possessed, and their name at some point changed to Milyae. Alternatively, the Solymi became integrated with an already existing tribe called Milyae, the name of the latter absorbing that of Solymi. The language of the Solymi survived,⁶ and proof of the presence and influence of the Solymi in the vicinity of Termessus is found on coins and inscriptions of the city.⁷ Zeus Solymus was worshipped at Termessus⁸ and the mountain behind the city was long called Mount Solymus.⁹

The extent of the district known as Milyas is unclear; a major reason for this is that the confines of Milyan territory fluctuated over the centuries, as did the territory of other tribal groups, possession of territory in those days depending on the strength of particular tribes, on the success or failure of their frequent conflicts with each other, as opposed to the provincial boundaries of later years which were dictated by the decisions of central government. The instability, in this sense, of the Milyas accounts partially for the vagueness and the sometimes conflicting descriptions of Milyan territory in the sources.¹⁰

Strabo says that it extended between Termessus, in the south, northwards towards Sagalassus and the confines of Apameia; Pliny says that Galatia touched on the Milyas around Baris.¹¹ As Sagalassus belonged to the Pisidians,¹² it can be assumed that the northern extent of the Milyas was in the region of the western side of Lake Burdur, towards Apameia and Baris, and bordered on the Pisidian territory of Sagalassus, but doubtless this boundary would have undergone modifications over the centuries. The western boundary of Milyas presumably bordered on the district of Cabalia.¹³ The southern extent of the Milyas is more difficult to determine, and in this case it is certain that tribal conflicts and consequent changing frontiers are responsible for the differing opinions of the sources who have used knowledge of the situation of their own day, with which they were often personally unfamiliar, together with their impression of the presumably different situation of previous centuries, thus creating a confusion which requires more information than we possess to disentangle. Strabo stretches Milyan territory southwards to Termessus,¹⁴ Pliny says that their town is Arycanda,¹⁵ and Arrian shows that the Milyas extended down to Phaselis.¹⁶ As we know that this district was Lycian at least at the beginning of the Principate, we must conclude that the sources were certainly, in this case, relying on authorities which dated to a time prior to the possession of this territory by the Lycians. Strabo also complicates matters by saying that the Pisidians were neighbours of the Cibyratae and had at one time taken over their city Cibyra.¹⁷ At the same time Pisidia bordered on Milyan territory. An invasion of Cibyra by the Pisidians would necessitate an invasion of Milyan territory, as defined by Strabo and Pliny, which is difficult to envisage without any serious repercussions in the Milyas, but the difficulty can be partially explained by the probability that Strabo is here referring to the years when the Solymi occupied northern

Lycia.

Obviously the confusions are caused mainly by the fluctuating limits of Milyan territory, the connection between Milyae and Solymi, and the inclination of the sources to combine contemporary and earlier information. Moreover, in Strabo's day such tribal divisions were not as marked or as important as they had been previously - for example, the Pisidians as a tribe had begun to break up into component units, and the emphasis was now on developing central settlements such as Sagalassus and Selge, rather than on a large tribal group - and were thus difficult to determine, especially by a geographer whose forte was neither the history nor the organisation of this particular region. Whatever the extent of the Milyas during the Hellenistic period, it can be ascertained from later evidence that the focal point during the early Principate was the area west of Lake Kestel, around the Boz Ovası.

Ptolemy records a settlement by the name Milyas.¹⁸ It would not be unusual for a people to name a settlement after their tribe, but as there is no further authority for a settlement of this name it is possible that either Ptolemy mistakenly assumed that there was such a place, or he indeed recorded the district, just as he listed other districts such as Cabalia and Pisidia, and, through corruption of the text, it has been misinterpreted as the name of a settlement.

An obscure tribe or people which did not survive in its own right was that of the Leleges. Very little is known about them, but they appear to have very ancient origins. They wandered Europe before the Trojan war¹⁹ and at some point reached the west coast of Caria where they left traces of their presence.²⁰ Their nomadic way of life brought them to the district occupied by the Pisidians where they seem to have settled and intermingled, being of a similar character to the Pisidians.²¹

Absorption into another already existing and established tribe would explain the disappearance of their own name, but without details one can do no more than speculate.

The Pisidians are first mentioned by Xenophon in his account of the campaign of Cyrus the Younger.²² Their origins are obscure, but they probably inhabited the central highland regions of Pisidia from much earlier times, and increased their power and influence until they became the dominant tribe of the region. While the Carians and the Lycians, under the influence of Hellenism, developed socially and politically, the Pisidians remained totally independent and troublesome. Xenophon describes them as a self-governing and unruly people, a reputation which they retained well into the 1st century BC.²³ It appears that their social organisation was fairly primitive, most of them living in small scattered village-like settlements, ruled by chieftains, and following a semi-nomadic way of life. Cicero contrasts the Pisidians, together with the Phrygians and Cilicians, with the more civilised Carians, saying that they were shepherds who overran both mountains and plains in summer and winter.²⁴ They must, however, have had some kind of cohesive social structure, otherwise they would not have had the power to resist for so long the Hellenistic invaders and influences. This purpose was fulfilled by fortresses which presumably protected and held together the rural settlements of the neighbourhood, served as crude centres of administration, and formed an organisational base during times of hostilities. These Pisidian strongholds were situated in strategic locations, usually off the beaten track, examples being Cremna and Sandalium, which caused much trouble to Amyntas, and Selge, Sagalassus and Termessus which, although they developed to a certain extent under the influence of Hellenism, yet retained their basic Pisidian characteristics. Their neighbours, the Isaurians, Lycaonians

and Galatians, had a similar settlement organisation, and between them they ensured that the highlands remained almost totally alienated from the rest of Asia Minor where Hellenism was slowly percolating, the cultural gap between highland and lowland regions increasingly widening. A letter from Basil to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, reveals that the social and political structure of Isauria was still very much tribal in the 4th century AD.²⁵

The extent of the district occupied by the Pisidians is reasonably well definable, although naturally the frontiers of their territory and the range of their influence would have varied.

The Selgians and Etenneis are described as Pisidian tribes which implies that Pisidian territory and influence bordered on Pamphylia somewhere in the region of the southern slopes of the Taurus.²⁶ Jones suggests that the Pisidians occupied the coast prior to the Pamphylian migration.²⁷ Artemidorus considers as Pisidian, in the 1st century BC, the district with the cities Selge, Pednelissus, Termessus, Sagalassus, Anabura and Amblada within its confines.²⁸ Sagalassus was Pisidian and Strabo describes her territory as 'facing' Milyas,²⁹ indicating that, at some time, the two districts has a common frontier in the region of the land to the south of Lake Burdur. There are, however, clear indications that Pisidian influence extended west and southwest beyond the limits of Sagalassian territory. Whether this means that the Pisidians had absolute hold over this area, or the signs of Pisidian influence represent brief periods of their presence and power is uncertain. The latter seems more likely since the district to the west and southwest of Sagalassus is known to have been controlled at various times by Solymi, Milyae, Lycians and Cabalians. A lengthy period of absolute control by the Pisidians would have resulted in the disappearance or the displace-

ment of these tribes. Strabo's account of the Pisidian occupation of Cibyra and the fact that they transferred the city to another site³⁰ does suggest a fairly lengthy period of Pisidian presence in this region, but possibly this took place at a time prior to the emergence of the tribes which later occupied northern Lycia and the districts of Cabalia and Milyas, after which Pisidian control was intermittent. The evidence does not contradict such a situation. Termessus definitely had the character and the history of a native Pisidian stronghold,³¹ and Arrian records an outpost built by the Pisidians in the vicinity of Phaselis.³² Arrian characterises the Pisidians as aggressive, threatening the peaceable farming community of Phaselis. Stark relies on onomastic evidence to suggest that the Pisidians must once have had control over the area around Idebessus and Acalissus.³³ Providing these were distinctly Pisidian names, there are grounds for arguing that settlements whose names ended in the suffix -essus, -issus, -assus, -asa had Pisidian origins. Examples are Sagalassus, Termessus, Pednelissus, Ariassus, Tityassus, Tymbrianassus, Tarbassus, Idebessus, Acalissus, Minassus (?), Olbasa, Cormasa, Colbasa, Corbasa, Orbanassa, Malgasa, demos Mulasseis. The argument is not entirely secure, as it is obvious from a glance at the Classical Map³⁴ that settlement names ending with variants of this suffix are not absolutely restricted to the confines and the periphery of Pisidia, and can be found fair distances away. It would be going too far to suggest that these distant settlements had at some time come under Pisidian influence. However, there is definitely a marked concentration of these names in Pisidia and the immediate neighbourhood, which does imply that this was a characteristic Pisidian suffix, and those situated close to the district of Pisidia, such as Idebessus and Acalissus, might very well have been results of Pisidian presence and influence, but it is unsafe to stretch this argument

further than the immediate environment without additional evidence.

Another fairly localised suffix is -ada - Adada, Timbriada, Vasada, Amblada, Andeda, Altada - but the same circumspection applies.

Pliny's brief description of the Pisidians attributes to them the colony of Caesareia Antiocheia and the towns of Sagalassus and Oroanda.³⁵

Whether or not there was a town called Oroanda is disputable and immaterial to this discussion, but it is probable that the Oroandians were a Pisidian sub-tribe, large and powerful enough to have recognition in their own right. Pisidian presence, then, must have extended to the mountain range east of Lake Beyşehir. Pliny's inclusion of Antiocheia in Pisidian territory would suggest that the Pisidians had a hold on the strip of Phrygia Paroreios to the south of the Sultan Dağları. Strabo's regional qualification of Antiocheia as being in Phrygia πρὸς Πισιδίᾳ,³⁶ towards Pisidia rather than within Pisidian territory, may appear to contradict Pliny. However, one must bear in mind that tribal frontiers did not define territorial possessions in the same way as did provincial boundaries, and it would be quite reasonable to assume that Pisidian influence extended to this region of Phrygia Paroreios, just as a Phrygian presence can be noted in areas which must otherwise have been indisputably Pisidian.³⁷

The Oroandians first appear in the history books in connection with the march of Manlius.³⁸ It is not known if Manlius invaded their territory but he certainly approached threateningly close enough to prompt them to pay 200 talents, presumably to avoid a conflict. Livy records that they were later used as spies by the Roman army.³⁹ However, the fact that their territory was confiscated by Servilius Isauricus in 78 BC and made ager publicus⁴⁰ implies that their subjection to the Roman authorities had been neither total nor constant. Oroandian territory

is minimally defined by the two settlements Pappa and Mistea which were the tribe's principal centres,⁴¹ so they must have possessed the land between the two. The natural western limit of their territory was Lake Beyşehir. To the south were the Homonadeis, to the north the Cillanian plain whose settlements were possibly not completely independent of Oroandian influence. There is no certainty of how far east of Pappa the territory stretched. Jones' suggestion that Sinethandus was part of the ager Oroandicus⁴² is probably correct, but the argument for Atenia is not convincing, particularly as Atenia has not been located.⁴³ Ramsay⁴⁴ uses epigraphic evidence⁴⁵ to suggest that Oroandian territory extended northeastwards as far as Sarayönü. This cannot, however, be taken as direct evidence for the extent of tribal Oroandian territory. After confiscation by Servilius, and presumably the breaking up of the Oroandians in the tribal sense, the name was retained by the Imperial government and also kept alive by the two centres Pappa and Mistea.⁴⁶

The most notorious tribe of the 1st century BC was that of the Homonadeis who were the cause of the death of Amyntas and no doubt supplied one of the reasons for Augustus' planting of his Pisidian colonies. There have been differences of opinion on the district occupied by the Homonadeis,⁴⁷ but it can be ascertained with high probability that the nucleus of the tribe was somewhere in the vicinity of Lake Trogitis. Levick suggests more specifically the southern shore of the lake.⁴⁸ As they were a powerful tribe in the 1st century BC, if not before, there is no reason to doubt that their sphere of influence over the surrounding territory was wide-ranging. This is supported by Pliny's report that they supposedly possessed 45 fortresses.⁴⁹ To the east they were bordered by the Isaurians, to the southwest by the Pisidian Selgians and Etenneis.⁵⁰ To the northwest Oroandian territory extended at least as far southwards to include the territory of Mistea.⁵¹ Between Mistea and

the Homonadeis, the only known settlements of any significance were Amblada and Vasada which are not known to have been enrolled in or associated with any particular tribe. Most likely Amblada and Vasada were independent of any formal affiliation with Oroandians or Homonadeis and their territories formed a kind of buffer between the two tribes.

The complication whereby the Homonadeis have been confused with the Cilicians can be explained by the likelihood that the Homonadeis and the Cilicians were one and the same, or that the Homonadeis were an element or an off-shoot of a larger tribal group known as Cilicians. Strabo describes the Cilician tribe as two-fold.⁵² This confusion has arisen through the distant location of the later provinces of Cilicia from the most likely nucleus of the Homonadeis around Lake Trogitis. The earlier 'province' of Cilicia, however, was not so far east, and comprised much of Pisidia, Pamphylia and Isauria; in this light an association of Homonadeis and Cilicians is not illogical.⁵³

Strabo describes the Homonadeis as cave-dwellers of the high and formidable Taurus mountains who tilled the fertile valleys of their territory.⁵⁴ Pliny says that they inhabited 44 fortresses which lay hidden in rugged valleys, in addition to their central settlement Homana.⁵⁵ If the two accounts are taken together it would seem that the fortresses provided the tribe's organisational structure and the rest of the tribe lived in more primitive habitats as indicated by Strabo. The central stronghold Homana has not been located, but was no doubt situated in the heart of Homonadeian territory, probably to the south of Lake Trogitis. Hall suggests two possible sites to the south of the lake.⁵⁶

The Homonadeis themselves were probably composed of smaller units or peoples, but it is unsafe to assume that each of the 45 fortresses

recorded by Pliny represented the centre of a separate people.⁵⁷

Constituent members of the tribe may have included the Gorgoromeis, Sedaseis, Pedaleis (?) and Psekaleis who are found to have occupied areas to the north of Lake Trogitis after the Homonadeian war, but as there is no clue to their precise relationship with each other, the implications of this possibility remain uncertain.⁵⁸

The Gorgoromeis have been identified and approximately located by inscriptions found at Akkise and Ortakaraören,⁵⁹ which lends credence to the theory that the ancient site at Kilise Kalesi, about 1 km. east of Akkise, was a settlement of the Gorgoromeis.⁶⁰ There is no evidence that this site was actually called Gorgorome. A suggestion that Kolkurum, northeast of Amblada, preserved the name of the tribe and that there was once a settlement called Gorgorome at Kolkurum was accepted without question by a number of scholars.⁶¹ No remains, however, apart from Roman milestones, have been noted at Kolkurum,⁶² and although it is not impossible that the influence of the Gorgoromeis extended northwestwards from the northeast corner of the lake, and not unlikely that one of their settlements was called Gorgorome, onomastic evidence alone is not sufficient to conclude that such a settlement was located at or near Kolkurum. This would also bring into question the status of the territories of Vasada and Amblada.

The Sedaseis are recorded by an inscription found at Namze, in the mountains about 15 kms north of Akkise,⁶³ which strongly suggests that the site at Namze was a settlement of the Sedaseis. The Sedaseis were probably a people on a par with the Gorgoromeis, the mutual frontier between the two being somewhere in the foothills between Namze and Kilise Kalesi.⁶⁴ The settlement may have been called Sedasa but there is no evidence to confirm it. Sterrett contorts the evidence, probably in

view of the fact that he has already tried to locate Gorgorome at Kolkurum, to assume that Sedasa was at Kilise Kalesi.⁶⁵

It cannot be ascertained whether the Gorgoromeis, Sedaseis and other communities like them took part in the Homonadeian war as members or allies of the Homonadeian tribe, or whether they were peaceable non-participants who came into their own after the disbandment of the Homonadeis.

The authorities of Tacitus and Strabo witness that Sulpicius Quirinius wiped out the Homonadeian threat.⁶⁶ Their central stronghold and an additional 44 castellae were destroyed, the tribe was disbanded and the surviving inhabitants settled in neighbouring cities. They were neither totally annihilated nor totally displaced, but deprived of their centres of operation they no longer possessed the headquarters which gave them the power and the security to carry out their formerly disruptive activities. Strabo estimates that 4,000 male members of the tribe survived,⁶⁷ but even without accurate population figures it is difficult to envisage the inhabitants of 45 fortresses and neighbouring communities being rehabilitated in a mere handful of cities in the vicinity. The emergence of the bishopric Omanada in the 4th century,⁶⁸ moreover, throws doubt on the idea that the Homonadeis ceased to exist as a name after the war. There is no documentary or archaeological record to reveal by what process the name did survive, but it is unlikely that a name which had been totally discarded would return some centuries later merely by retention in the minds of men, passed down through at least ten generations. Ramsay was of the opinion that the bishopric Omonada was a collective bishopric of the villages in the region around Lake Trogitis,⁶⁹ but this theory was probably motivated by the view that the Homonadeis were totally displaced and their settlements never

again inhabited. It seems more credible that a settlement did survive at or near the central Homonadeian stronghold, retaining the old name, but under strict surveillance by the Romans to prevent the possibility of it reverting to a strong centre of brigand activities. A marked military presence from the east of Lake Beyşehir to Trogitis and beyond is attested by epigraphic evidence.⁷⁰

Naturally it is impossible to make definitive divisions of all tribal groups, and difficult to ascertain whether certain communities or peoples were constituent members of a larger tribe and, if so, what part they played within that tribe. Firstly, our knowledge concerning the tribal system and its structural organisation is too limited; secondly, as far as we know, tribal groups were based on a fairly loose and primitive organisation, and this lack of rigid structure would have allowed for different systems of organisation within individual tribes and communities.

Likewise, there was no certain transitional stage when the tribal system broke down and Hellenised or Romanised urban centres took over. This was a very gradual process which varied from settlement to settlement, from district to district, and frequently Hellenisation and urbanisation of the larger settlements occurred within a district which was, on the whole, still basically tribal.

Most of the activities of the dynasts in power during the four centuries before Christ were concentrated in the western regions and the more easily influenced coastal areas of the south. Attempts were made to bring the highlands into line with the rest of Asia Minor but these were unsuccessful, partly because they were half-heartedly carried out and partly because, for fundamentally geographical reasons, the Taurus settlements were a force to be reckoned with, as was proved in later years

when the task was more positively carried out by Amyntas and Augustus.

However, despite the failure of the Seleucids and Attalids to gain firm control in the highlands, contact with Hellenism was inevitable, the highland settlements became acquainted with outside ideas and, out of this consciousness of Hellenism, a number of them adopted certain aspects of what must have seemed to be a more civilised way of life. Influence from their neighbours on the Pamphylian plain doubtless played a part in this development but it is unlikely that Hellenistic forms and ideas were compulsorily accepted by the highland settlements, which were rather in a position, by virtue of their isolated and strategic locations, to choose which elements of Hellenism to adopt. In addition to their natural strength, the settlements of the Taurus had long upheld a tradition of self-sufficiency, a prerequisite for survival, which would render unnecessary a dependency on other settlements, and they would feel no obligation in these early years to ally themselves to a larger scheme of organisation which would take away the pride which stems from independence.

Three of the most prominent settlements of the Pisidian highlands during these early years were Sagalassus, Selge and Termessus. We possess no knowledge of their nature or status before they appear in the historical sources, but no doubt they developed from characteristically Pisidian fortresses, much like other settlements of Pisidia and the adjoining highland districts which retained this form of organisation over the subsequent centuries. The fact that they were originally native tribal centres, and, unlike many of the western cities and even those of Pamphylia, they had not been colonised by settlers who were already indoctrinated in Hellenistic traditions,⁷¹ may have been a contributory factor to their perseverance in preserving an independent status and not

acquiescing in total assimilation with the rest of the Hellenistic world.

The campaigns of Alexander and Antigonus first bring to our notice the existence of Termessus, Selge and Sagalassus. The story of the resistance of Termessus to the Hellenistic invaders reveals that Termessus' civic organisation was at this time of a loosely tribal nature; her municipal decisions were made by a council of elders whose advice, in the instance of war at least, could be deprecated by the young fighting men.⁷² But despite the absence of magistrates and other elements of government associated with a genuine Greek polis, Termessus in the 4th century BC possessed a definite organisational structure, and, despite the obvious tribal aspects of her organisation, she could even at this time be described as a rudimentary city. The power and impregnability of Termessus is shown by her successful resistance of Alexander, and her prosperity and influence is indicated by the fact that she founded a colony, Termessus Minor, near Oenoanda in the 3rd century BC.⁷³

The settlement with the most important and the most advanced civic organisation in the highlands at this time appears to have been Selge. Although the built road which facilitated communication and diffusion of ideas from the Pamphylian plain was not constructed until Imperial times, it seems that some of the Hellenistic characteristics of the coastal cities rubbed off on Selge. Her coinage, apparently modelled on that of Aspendus, begins in the 5th century BC,⁷⁴ and Strabo's remark that she had an exceptionally well developed constitution shows that she retained this lead among the settlements of Pisidia until at least the 1st century BC.⁷⁵ The similar tone of Arrian's comment that the Selgians were Pisidians who inhabited a large city⁷⁶ both confirms that her organisation was far from primitive and indicates that this was an

unusual situation for a highland settlement during the Hellenistic period. Both Arrian and Strabo class the Selgians as barbarians,⁷⁷ but this is more likely to be a comment on their origins rather than their prevailing organisation.

Unlike Termessus and Selge, nothing is known of the development of Sagalassus. Probably not as advanced constitutionally as Selge, her coinage not beginning until the 1st century BC,⁷⁸ Sagalassus yet displays certain characteristics which suggest that her organisation was reasonably well developed during the Hellenistic period, possibly on similar lines to that of Termessus. Termessus did not coin until the beginning of the 1st century BC.⁷⁹ The fact that both Alexander and Manlius deemed Sagalassus worthy of attack⁸⁰ implies a settlement of some distinction during the 4th century BC onwards. The rich and vast territory owned by the Sagalassians in the early 2nd century BC⁸¹ was presumably a possession which dated from an earlier century. Archaeological remains, in particular the regular Greek plan of the city, Hellenistic temples and other monuments, suggest that Sagalassus had an internal organisation sufficiently well advanced and ordered to adopt Hellenistic planning and building techniques at a relatively early date, a development which was possibly motivated by Alexander's contact with the city.

The community of the Etenneis began to issue coins in the mid 4th century BC,⁸² a phenomenon which was doubtless related to her even closer proximity than Selge to the Pamphylian plain and influence from Selge herself. The two spellings, Etenneis and Catenneis, are either variant spellings of the same name⁸³ or the tribe was two-fold. Under the Principate the tribe seems to have split into three cities - Etenna, Cotenna and Erymna. It has been pointed out that the Etenneis are regarded by Polybius and even by Strabo as a tribe rather than a city, and that one should be wary of speaking of such communities in terms of

cities as they are later known.⁸⁴ The acceptance of this observation depends mainly on the definition of the term 'city', which, unfortunately, is a problematic matter since ancient settlements cannot be defined rigidly in modern terms, and seldom does the evidence survive, particularly for the earlier centuries, for the actual status of individual communities in ancient terms. The fact that the Etenneis are denoted by their ethnic is in itself no great proof that they were a tribe rather than a city. Moreover, Strabo was perhaps using an earlier source for his comment on the Etenneis. It is not improbable that the 'city' of Etenna existed in a rudimentary form at this early date, developing in the shadow and under the influence of Selge and the cities of the Pamphylian plain. Certainly, Hellenistic remains at the site of Etenna indicate that at some time in the Hellenistic period a central settlement of the Etenneis existed, at first as a main stronghold of the tribe, later the nucleus of the city territory, and the minting of coins suggests a reasonably well advanced central organisation.

Other settlements known from early Hellenistic times are not so clearly defined. Pednelissus is mentioned for her involvement in Achaeus' campaign,⁸⁵ but nothing is known about her constitutional character, and nothing conclusive can be ascertained from her archaeological remains as the site has not yet been identified with absolute certainty. If the Italian expedition has correctly located Pednelissus at the site near Kōzān,⁸⁶ she must have been a settlement of great physical strength in the Hellenistic period, considering the impressive remains of this date at the site. Possibly she developed along similar lines to, but not necessarily at the same rate as, Selge, Etenna and Termessus, in view of their close, if hostile, relationships. A similar line of development may be proposed cautiously for Cretopolis which is mentioned in the account of Antigonos and Termessus⁸⁷ and in connection with

Achaeus' campaign.⁸⁸ However, one cannot confidently assume that those settlements which merely feature in the history of the 4th and 3rd centuries BC, without any clue to their individual characteristics, had an internal organisation and development akin to those settlements about which we possess more information. It is clear that Selge, Termessus and Etenna, for example, did not share identical characteristics and did not develop at the same rate. There is no authority to confirm that Cremna existed at the time of Alexander or Achaeus, but the implications are that she had early origins; the site is ideal for a native fortress, and her opposition to, and the prestige of her capture by, Amyntas⁸⁹ would suggest that time had been an essential factor in the strengthening of her position and support an argument, albeit hypothetical, for early roots. It is doubtful that Cremna was greatly influenced by Hellenism in view of the fact that she was so anti-establishment in the second half of the 1st century BC. The questions regarding the constitutions, development and loyalties of settlements about which we possess no details must, therefore, remain unanswered.

Possibly in the 2nd century BC, a treaty was made between Termessus and Adada for mutual assistance.⁹⁰ The regular Greek forms used in the recording of the treaty show that both had attained a degree of Hellenism by this time and adopted at least the façade of a Greek polis. The need for such a treaty might suggest a precautionary measure against the Pergamene rulers who remained a threat to the independence of Pisidian communities despite the apparent cordiality between them. The fortifications at Kapıkaya, between Termessus and Attaleia, if they were constructed by the Termessians, confirm that such precautions were necessary, and, if by the Pergamenes, that these precautions were necessary to both sides.⁹¹

A similar constitution to that of 4th century Termessus is found at Amblada in the 2nd century BC. A series of letters from Attalus II to the city and the elders of Amblada⁹² shows that the community had no civic system based on a boule and demos, but the very existence of the letters, and the semblance of organisation revealed therein, indicates that Amblada was yet another settlement influenced to some degree by contact with Hellenism. The content of the letters also provides insight into the kind of pressure exerted upon the settlements of the interior by the Pergamenes. They did not force a central administrative system on Amblada but sustained control by fines and hostages, which, on the one hand, confirms that there was not total harmony between the rulers and the subject communities, and, on the other, suggests that the Pergamenes had a grip of sorts on the Ambladians. Whether it also implies that the whole of this part of Pisidia was under similar obligations is open to doubt, particularly as we know from the later history of the region that the tribe of the Homonadeis were openly hostile to external interference. Nevertheless, Vasada and Mistea, also mentioned in the letters, possibly developed under the same influences, their proximity to Amblada suggesting unavoidable inter-contact.

Little is known about the Seleucid colonies to the north of Pisidia during the two centuries following their foundations. Possibly they developed in a different manner to the more isolated settlements of the highland zone, more on the lines of the minor cities of the west and south coasts, offering no resistance to Hellenism as they had been peopled with colonists familiar with Hellenistic traditions. The locations of Apameia, Apollonia, Antiocheia and Laodiceia Catacecaumene on a main artery of communication ensured that their contact with Hellenism and with any cultural or economic developments was maintained. An inscription attributed to Antiocheia reveals that by the beginning

of the 2nd century BC Antiocheia was a fully developed Greek polis with all the necessary institutions and magistrates;⁹³ yet a strong native element prevailed, but one that was not at variance with Hellenism.

Thus it can be seen that throughout the Hellenistic period certain of the Pisidian communities were adopting an urban way of life, although not strictly on the same lines as the cities of the plains and coastal areas which were more readily exposed to Hellenistic influence. The later claims made by a number of Pisidian settlements to noble founders and a Greek origin show an increasing respect for Hellenism, a desire to emulate a more civilised culture and an embarrassment of primitive and obscure origins. Selge⁹⁴ and Sagalassus⁹⁵ claimed descent from the Lacedaemonians, as did Amblada⁹⁶ and Vasada.⁹⁷ Selge even asserted that Calchas was her founder.⁹⁸ Isinda's claim to Ionian origin was doubtless based on the coincidence of a city in Ionia possessing the same name.⁹⁹ Likewise, Ceraitae used her name to claim descent from a Cretan colony.¹⁰⁰

It is clear, however, that the influence of Hellenism in pre-Roman times extended only to the handful of larger Pisidian communities and that these adopted Hellenistic forms to suit themselves, the degree and implications of which are not absolutely certain. Because they developed gradually and more or less on their own impetus, and had not been artificially introduced into a region which had a basically tribal and self-sufficient organisation, as opposed for example to the cities of the Pamphylian plain, they existed quite congenially alongside more primitive settlements, and not as an alien element with desires to improve and enlighten the tribal communities. Thus with no powerful external and internal pressures to interfere with a rural and tribal way of life, Pisidia remained basically unchanged well into the Roman

period. As Strabo notes, when commenting on Selge's remarkable constitution in the 1st century BC, Pisidia for the most part was divided into tyrannies.¹⁰¹ Moreover, apart from those few cities which had consolidated themselves early, Pisidian communities, whether cities or villages, tended to be small, a pattern which continued throughout Antiquity.¹⁰² This is especially evident in the Milyas region where there was a high concentration of minor cities, and settlements of non-city status. The total number of settlements may, however, partly reflect the fact that the amount of research carried out in this region has been greater than elsewhere.

The most important break-through in the development of Pisidia was effected under Augustus who not only planted the colonies which could aid both in the germination and spreading of ideas and culture and in keeping the region under control, but also instigated the improvement of a road network which facilitated communication within Pisidia and rapid infiltration of ideas from outside. The colonies have been discussed in Chapter II and the road network in Chapter IV.

Those cities which had the most advanced constitutions in Hellenistic times retained this importance throughout the Principate. Termessus proudly boasted on her mid 3rd century coinage the freedom she was granted in 70 BC,¹⁰³ as a result of which she and Rome had a friendly and mutually beneficial relationship. Selge was also considered a free city,¹⁰⁴ and it is unlikely that she had ever relinquished this status even temporarily.¹⁰⁵ The extent of her territory is not accurately definable, but according to Strabo it was vast,¹⁰⁶ and probably remained so throughout Antiquity. No boundary stones have been discovered and no boundary disputes recorded, but no new cities appeared as a threat to her lands. Sagalassus styled herself friend and ally of the Romans

and first city of Pisidia, until the early 4th century.¹⁰⁷ Her vast territory, which had been devastated by Manlius in 189 BC, was still large under the Principate, and she retained her place as a leading Pisidian city throughout Antiquity.

The precise meaning of a 'free' city during the Principate is, however, questionable. Since Imperial procurators are found at both Termessus and Sagalassus,¹⁰⁸ it is obvious that an autonomous status was not without its conditions. Possibly the title was purely nominal and merely a reflection of Imperial tolerance.

Antiocheia, the most important of Augustus' colonies, was also declared free by the Romans, and granted the Ius Italicum,¹⁰⁹ as were Cremna, Olbasa and, possibly, Parlais.¹¹⁰ Antiocheia had a somewhat different constitution to the other Pisidian settlements, based very closely on the Roman system, whereby the population was divided into vici; integrated with this markedly Roman influence was a Greek element, exemplified by the existence of the office of gymnasiarch.¹¹¹ It is unknown whether the other colonies had identical organisations, but no doubt they enjoyed certain rights not granted to many other settlements at this time, if only to provide some incentive for the veterans settled there by Augustus to remain in what must have seemed to them to be a still barbaric and uncivilised region. Copies of the Res Gestae were set up at both Antiocheia and Apollonia, besides at Ancyra.¹¹² The version at Antiocheia was in Latin, showing that the language of the colonists prevailed above that of the natives, and the version at Apollonia was in Greek, suggesting that the colonists were a minority.¹¹³ The implications of the erection of the Res Gestae in these two Pisidian cities are uncertain. Broughton's suggestion that it attests the importance of Antiocheia and Apollonia¹¹⁴ would mean that each city had thus been honoured by the Roman government; if, however, the citizens themselves

had taken the initiative, it implies no more than emulation of the Ancyrans or flattery of Augustus. An alternative explanation is that its erection in three Galatian cities suggests that it was a decision of the Galatian koinon.^{114a}

By the time of the Roman annexation of Asia only a few Pisidian settlements are known to have taken on at least the aspect of a city. Over the following one and a half centuries, we become acquainted with a number of additional settlements, most of which were to remain the leading cities of Pisidia throughout the Principate. However, the degree of 'civilisation' and organisation of some of these, and the process of their development, is not fully known.

A number of settlements which have already been recorded in earlier documentary or epigraphic sources issued coinage in the 1st century BC. These include Termessus, Selge, Sagalassus, Antiocheia, Etenna, Prostenna, Pednelissus, Adada, Amblada, Isinda, and possibly Seleuceia and Apollonia.¹¹⁵ Proof of the earlier existence of the majority of these has been discussed above. Prostenna is recorded in an inscription of the 2nd century BC found at Delos.¹¹⁶

Other coining settlements not formerly heard of are Cremna, Comama, Ceraitae, Parlais, Malus, Conane, Ariassus and Andeda.¹¹⁷ The pre-1st century BC existence of these is confirmed by neither documentary nor epigraphic sources. It is highly unlikely, however, that a settlement which had come into existence in the 1st century BC would begin to coin at once; on this basis alone it would not be too presumptuous to ascribe to all of these settlements roots prior to the advent of Roman intervention in Pisidia. The former status of these settlements, however, is a different matter. The reputation of Cremna during the kingship of Amyntas¹¹⁸ is assuredly indicative that her power and strength had been established and fortified over a number of decades, if not centuries, prior to the

1st century BC. Hellenistic remains at the site of Ariassus confirm that she too was of a much earlier Antiquity, with a fairly high degree of civilisation.¹¹⁹ Prehistoric artefacts found at Barla¹²⁰ might suggest that this was a favoured site from prehistory through to Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine times. Malus has recently been located near Sarıidris, in the mountainous region east of Lake Eğirdir. Very little remains at the site,¹²¹ but it is not unlikely that Malus was of a similar character to other known settlements in this area such as Cremna, Adada, Pednelissus and Selge. The sites and environmental aspects of Comama, Conane and Andeda are very different, and absence of archaeological remains of pre-Imperial date make difficult any assumptions on their origins. Their relatively exposed situations do imply a different nature of settlement, perhaps former villages with neither the fortifications nor the strength of the Pisidian castella.

Of the coining settlements of the 1st century BC Selge, Sagalassus, Termessus, Amblada, Pednelissus, Adada, Cremna and Aarassus (probably Ariassus) are listed by Strabo among the twelve Pisidian cities considered important by Artemidorus in the same century,¹²² which strengthens an argument for early origins and development of Cremna and Ariassus. The other four are Tityassus, Timbriada, Anabura and Tarbassus. The names Tityassus and Tarbassus might suggest an early Pisidian origin for these settlements, and the same might apply to Timbriada.¹²³ Tityassus, however, has not been conclusively identified, therefore nothing definite can be affirmed from the nature or the date of archaeological remains. Inscriptions in what is thought to be a Pisidian language found at Timbriada, and the extent of her territory revealed by the boundary dispute with Apollonia,¹²⁴ imply early origins for and early consolidation of the influence of Timbriada. Tarbassus

is otherwise obscure, and may be a corrupt version of another name.

Other settlements known from documentary sources to have existed before the Principate are Cormasa, Lysinia and Darsa, all three recorded in connection with the march of Manlius in the early 2nd century BC.¹²⁵ and presumably no more than villages at this time. Sandalium is recorded only by Strabo,¹²⁶ but on the analogy of Cremna, was probably a characteristically Pisidian fortress with origins much earlier than the late 1st century BC. Baris is first mentioned by Pliny¹²⁷ much of whose source material, however, dated from the late 1st century BC.¹²⁸ An identification of Baris with Darsa would not be out of the question.¹²⁹ Darsa was certainly in the vicinity of Lake Burdur.

The development of the area roughly corresponding to Strabo's Milyas is interesting, and this particular pattern, both chronologically and topographically, is probably confined to this area of Pisidia alone. Here, there was a high concentration of known cities which appear during the mid Principate, most of which were fairly minor and presumably small in area and population. In addition, many smaller communities are known from this region, but this may merely reflect the amount of fieldwork that has been carried out in the area.

The settlements of the Milyas were organised in a kind of league, that described by Cicero as the commune Milyadum.¹³⁰ This federation as such must have dissolved in time, as individual members began to emerge as cities and became more independent in their own right; yet their geographical proximity would have ensured that close relations were maintained throughout Antiquity. Jones' suggestion that Comama might have been the earlier capital of the league¹³¹ has three points to recommend it; firstly, Comama was in a fairly dominant central location, secondly, she issued coins under the Republic,¹³² and, thirdly, she was

chosen as the site of one of Augustus' colonies. However, there is no definite evidence, either epigraphical or documentary, to confirm this, and nothing to indicate that the league did have a single principal centre. Furthermore, his argument that the members of the league were classed as 'peoples' rather than as cities until the 2nd century AD, when the settlements of this region began to coin,¹³³ is disputable and too simplistic, and rests partially on the definition of 'city' and partially on the connotations of 'people'. An inscription recording a Hellenistic decree of the demos, and Hellenistic built tombs at the site,¹³⁴ suggest that Pogla was not totally immune from external influences during the centuries before she emerged as a fully-fledged 'city', and qualify Pogla as an alternative to Comama as capital of the commune Milyadum.

It is not known how many cities were enrolled in the commune Milyadum. Pogla is the only certainty;¹³⁵ presumably Andeda, Sibidunda, Verbe and Comama, as well as the smaller communities in the vicinity, were members. Just how far into the Principate the commune Milyadum survived as an alliance of the settlements of this district is uncertain. An inscription from Pogla, possibly of the early 2nd century AD, honours a man who had held office in both the koinon and the city.¹³⁶

If the koinon represents the commune Milyadum, this shows that even when the settlements of the Boz Ovası were beginning to develop into individual cities, they maintained their former federation. Hierocles records the χωρία Μιλυαδικα following a list of those settlements which had previously been members of the commune Milyadum.¹³⁷ The precise significance of this entry is unclear, but it at least confirms that the name of the Milyas was retained and possibly that the commune Milyadum existed after a fashion in the 6th century. Even had the alliance as such been discontinued, it is likely that the Milyadic

settlements remained in close contact and relied on each other for political and economic support. Such an arrangement would have been expedient in a district where there existed no great central city on which smaller settlements could depend. In an area where a large and powerful city predominated, moreover, not only would a federation of the smaller communities in the vicinity have been less of a necessity but the development of a number of small cities in such proximity would have been restricted.

In the area roughly west of this cluster of little cities lay the Augustan colony of Olbasa. The similarity of the names Olbasa, Cormasa, Colbasa and Corbasa suggests that these were originally native centres of a former Milyadic or Cibyratic sub-tribe with a similar name. A similar development occurred with the tribe of Etenneis or Catenneis whose major centres adopted derivations of the tribal name for their permanent settlements.¹³⁸ Jones regards Olbasa, Colbasa and Cormasa as components of a non-Milyadic tribal group.¹³⁹ If these settlements were located west of the River Lysis, Jones' opinion would carry weight. However, Olbasa is virtually on the line of the Lysis, Colbasa has recently been identified with the city at Kuşbaba, north of Lake Kestel, and there is strong evidence to suggest that Cormasa was also east of the river, possibly to be identified with the site at Gavur Ören, south of Karacaören.¹⁴⁰ This would seem to suggest that these three settlements were originally members of the Milyadic tribe, and possibly also enrolled in the commune Milyadum. Jones' tentative suggestion that Olbasa and Colbasa might be one and the same¹⁴¹ is impossible. It is, however, possible that Corbasa was a variant spelling or a mis-spelling of Colbasa. Colbasa is not recorded by Ptolemy and Corbasa is attested only by Ptolemy.¹⁴²

In eastern Pisidia, the tribe of the Oroandians had two principal centres, Mistea and Pappa. Mistea is known to have existed from as early as the 2nd century BC as it is mentioned along with Amblada and

Vasada in the letters of Attalus II to the Ambladians.¹⁴³ A similar situation existed with the Moxeani of Phrygia, whose two major settlements, Diocleia and Siocharax, later developed into cities.¹⁴⁴ The case of the Etenneis has already been mentioned. It was a common and not very remarkable pattern that the central strongholds of tribal communities emerged as cities and usually retained this status through Roman and Byzantine times. An inscription from Pappa¹⁴⁵ suggests that even when the principal centres of the Oroandians had developed into regular cities, the koinon of the Oroandians continued to exist, a comparable situation to the survival of the commune Milyadum.

An alliance of settlements perhaps similar to the commune Milyadum and to the Tetrapolis of the Cibyrates¹⁴⁶ existed in the Cillanian plain south of Antiocheia. Epigraphic evidence testifies to a Tetrapolis of four settlements in this region. An inscription found at Şarkıkaraağaç records a citizen of Altada who was a member of the council of the Tetrapolis.¹⁴⁷ That the Tetrapolis was the same as the Civitas Cillanensium mentioned in a dedication to Maximin¹⁴⁸ is more likely than Calder's theory that the Civitas Cillanensium represented a single member of the Tetrapolis,¹⁴⁹ although this is not impossible. It has always been assumed that Neapolis was the chief settlement of the Tetrapolis, and that two other members were Anabura and Altada. The only certainty, in fact, is Altada, recorded in the relevant inscription. However, despite the lack of absolute evidence for Neapolis and Anabura, it is difficult to envisage these two settlements of the Cillanian plain existing alongside a Tetrapolis which included neither of them. The wording of the inscription suggests that all four towns shared a single boule and constituted a single polis whose centre was presumably Neapolis. Neapolis is the only known settlement of the Cillanian plain to appear in Hierocles and receive the status of bishopric during later

centuries. The fourth member of the Tetrapolis has not yet been identified. The only recommendation for the suggestion that it may have been Korduna¹⁵⁰ is that this is the only other ancient name known from the Cillanian Plain. The association is known to have existed during the 3rd century AD, as the dedication to Maximin is datable to AD 235-8 and the Altada inscription can be dated by nomenclature to some time after AD 212, but it is not known when it was instituted or how long it continued.

Ramsay's theory that Anabura was originally the principal city of this district and that the city took the name of Neapolis in the early 1st century AD, possibly involving a change of site,¹⁵¹ is out of the question. If Anabura is to be identified with the ruins at Enevre, early origins for the settlement can be argued as the choice of site is typical of early Pisidian highland settlements and the sanctuary of Men above the site was presumably established prior to the 1st century BC, perhaps modelled on that near Antiocheia.¹⁵² The inclusion of Anabura in the list of Pisidian cities considered important by Artemidorus¹⁵³ adds strength to an argument for early origins as it is hardly likely that a new settlement would have achieved immediate notoriety. Nor is it likely that an insignificant settlement would have merited a place amongst the twelve leading cities of a reasonably extensive district, although inscriptions record Anabura as no more than a demos.¹⁵⁴ If Anabura was indeed a member of the Tetrapolis of the Cillanian Plain, her existence until at least the first half of the 3rd century AD is confirmed. There is no possibility of the name of Neapolis having replaced that of Anabura as Neapolis is first attested by an inscription of the 3rd century BC,¹⁵⁵ a fact of which Ramsay was obviously unaware. Neapolis is mentioned by Pliny,¹⁵⁶ and was probably colonised by Augustan veterans.¹⁵⁷ This confirms her existence in the

1st century BC.

The exact extent of the Cillanian plain is uncertain. The possibility of Neapolis being situated near Kiyakdede rather than near Şarkıkaraağaç, as previously thought,¹⁵⁸ necessitates a reappraisal of the southern limit of the plain. Anabura was almost certainly near Enevre,¹⁵⁹ and were Neapolis near Şarkıkaraağaç, the Cillanian plain would probably comprise that tract of land south of Yalvaç and the territory of Antiocheia, with its southern boundary around the high land defined by Kızıl Dağı and Kara Dağı to the south of Şarkıkaraağaç. The other two members of the Tetrapolis, as yet unlocated, might then be looked for in this region. If, however, Neapolis is to be located near Kiyakdede, the Cillanian plain must consequently have covered a greater area than previously supposed, and the sites of Altada and the fourth member of the Tetrapolis must be searched for in a much less restricted area.

Mistea and Pappa were included in the developments which took place under the aegis of the Emperors of the 1st century AD. Pappa was exalted to Pappa Tiberiopolis, from which it can be assumed that Tiberius granted city status to the settlement, reflected in the boule and demos which appear thenceforth on inscriptions.¹⁶⁰ By Hadrian, or shortly afterwards, the Imperial element of the city name was discarded, and the city was referred to as Pappa, metropolis of the Oroandians.¹⁶¹

Pappa's fellow Oroandian centre, Mistea, was granted a similar honour under the more active urbanisation policy of Claudius, some 25 years later.¹⁶² There appear a number of new titles incorporating Claudius' stamp, most of which refer to settlements of the central highlands - Claudiocaesareia Mistea, Claudiconium, Claudiopolis, Claudiolaodiceia (Catacecaumene), Claudioderbe, Claudioseleuceia (Sidera), Colonia

Archelais, Caesareia.¹⁶³ It would be erroneous, and over-simplifying the situation, to conclude that this represented purely a grant of city status to the settlements in question. Obviously it was an honour to be given an Imperial title, and probably some augmentation of status is implied, but the degree of advancement was not necessarily equal at each of these settlements. In the case of Mistea, the change of name possibly reflected official recognition of city status. This would not have been a complicated transition. Mistea doubtless possessed all the trappings of a city, and the only major change would be in her municipal officials and her constitutional rights. However, the precise status of Mistea before the new title was conferred is not certain. It both brings up the question of how justifiable it is to consider that the reference to Mistea and Vasada in the letter to Amblada, recorded as a polis, implies that they too were poleis,¹⁶⁴ and compels reflection on the possibility of the different meanings of and attitudes to the term 'polis' over these centuries of great change in organisation and control.

Seleuceia had been a Seleucid foundation which possibly issued coinage in the 1st century BC.¹⁶⁵ Her new title, Claudioseleuceia,¹⁶⁶ cannot have represented elevation to city status which she already possessed, unless the Romans had taken away this privilege, to be later reinstated by Claudius, which is highly improbable.¹⁶⁷ In Seleuceia's case it is uncertain what additional honours, if any, accompanied the new title, and it seems most likely that the city was merely an honorary beneficiary of Claudius' policy of making his mark on Asia Minor, the extent and implications of which varied widely.

There are at least three settlements in and around Pisidia which perhaps owe a change in status to Hadrian - Hadriane, Hadrianopolis and, possibly, Sabinae, if, as Ramsay suggests, Sabinae was named after the

Empress Sabina.¹⁶⁸ Sabinae is known only from Hierocles,¹⁶⁹ but is perhaps to be identified with the Dabinae of the Tekmoreian inscriptions.¹⁷⁰ The precise status of Sabinae cannot be determined. The Tekmoreian inscriptions record only ethnics, with no distinction between villages and more important settlements, and Hierocles, even though he professes to do so, does not consistently record settlements of city status. That Sabinae was formerly a village is highly probable, as new foundations during the Empire are few and far between. If Ramsay's theory is correct, Sabinae possibly received city status under Hadrian, but there is no evidence for her existence or her fate after the 6th century. Hadriane was perhaps a refoundation of the 2nd century, the change in name accompanied by elevation to city status. The boule and demos of Hadriane are recorded in inscriptions.¹⁷¹

It is not certain what honour was bestowed on Hadrianopolis by Hadrian. This city, to the east of the Sultan Dağları, began to coin under Antoninus Pius and maintained a bishop throughout later Antiquity.¹⁷²

Under Hadrian, Baris, Tityassus and Timbriada began to coin and Cremna, Conane and Seleuceia resumed their coinage.¹⁷³ Pednelissus and Adada had resumed coining under Trajan.¹⁷⁴

Further developments in settlement status, sanctioned by Imperial authority, are recorded intermittently over the following centuries. An inscription records the official transition of Pogla to city status.¹⁷⁵

The inscription is undated, but if the commencement of Pogla's coinage, under Antoninus Pius,¹⁷⁶ was a direct response to her augmented status, the inscription can be dated to the mid 2nd century AD. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that the other major settlements of the Boz Ovası followed the fates of Pogla, in view of their close associations, but judgement on whether Verbe, Andeda and Sibidunda also

received city status around the same time must be reserved. The coinage of Verbe begins under Commodus,¹⁷⁷ and that of Sibidunda under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus.¹⁷⁸ Andeda also issued under Marcus Aurelius, but coined, probably for a short period, in the late 1st century BC.¹⁷⁹ The significance of this is unclear. It is improbable that Andeda had city status at this time. The issues may represent a brief period of emulation, on the settlement's own initiative, perhaps of nearby Comama which initially coined during the Republic and apparently resumed again under Antoninus Pius.¹⁸⁰ Of the other settlements in the vicinity of the Boz Ovası, Colbasa¹⁸¹ and Olbasa¹⁸² also began to coin under Antoninus Pius, and Isinda resumed her coinage at the same time.¹⁸³

Three cities whose existence is first known from 2nd century coinage are Palaiopolis, Codrula and Panemoteichus. None of these have been located, but Hierocles and the ecclesiastical lists show that all three were in Pamphylia Secunda. The coinage of Palaiopolis¹⁸⁴ and Codrula¹⁸⁵ begins under Antoninus Pius and that of Panemoteichus¹⁸⁶ under Julia Domna. Nothing is known of the origins of Panemoteichus and Codrula but it is unlikely that they were completely new foundations. The name of Palaiopolis implies that the city was founded on the site of an earlier settlement, or merely that the name of a settlement which existed prior to the mid 2nd century AD was changed.

A number of settlements listed by Ptolemy are otherwise unrecorded. Palaion Beudus,¹⁸⁷ grouped with Antiocheia, Baris, Conane, Lysinia and Cormasa, in Phrygian Pisidia, is possibly Palaiopolis. No idea of whether Palaiopolis was in the most northerly part of Pamphylia Secunda or further south is given by the Notitiae, but Hierocles, if his order is any indication of location, places Palaiopolis between Olbasa and

Lysinia,¹⁸⁸ an area which was probably part of Ptolemy's Phrygian Pisidia. Ptolemy records Ouranopolis, Milyas and Corbasa in his region of Cabalia,¹⁸⁹ which covers the area between Pogla and Termessus. Ouranopolis is otherwise unknown; of the known settlements of this district the one with the closest name to Ouranopolis is Verbe, which is not recorded by Ptolemy. There may have been a settlement called Milyas, named after the tribe, and in this district where the settlements were organised into the commune Milyadum, but there is no additional evidence to confirm a settlement of this name. Hierocles records the χωρία Μιλυαδικα .¹⁹⁰

Possibly Ptolemy originally recorded the district, but it has been misinterpreted as the name of a settlement. No settlement of the name Corbasa is recorded elsewhere. The similarity of the names Olbasa, Cormasa and Colbasa might imply that these developed from a tribe or people of a similar name. Olbasa, Colbasa and Cormasa all appear in literary sources and Olbasa and Colbasa are attested by coinage. They were three individual settlements, and if they did indeed develop from a tribe of a similar name it is quite possible that a fourth settlement of the same tribe had the name Corbasa. An alternative possibility is that Corbasa is a variant spelling or a mis-spelling of Colbasa. Colbasa was issuing coins from the early 2nd century¹⁹¹ but is not recorded by Ptolemy. In Ptolemy's district of Pisidia he records Dyrzela, Orbanassa, Talbonda and Vinzela.¹⁹² Talbonda appears in the lists of the Council of AD 451, the Epistola ad Leonem, the Ravenna geographer and the Peutinger Table. Tymandus is recorded by the Greek version of the Council list of AD 448, but the Latin translation records Talbonda, confirming that they were one and the same.¹⁹³ Orbanassa is identifiable as a mis-spelling of no other known name. Dyrzela may be a later form of Livy's Darsa, or an earlier form of Zorzila, which is

first recorded by the Council list of AD 325. If it is a transitional name between the two, the continuation of Darsa into late Antiquity is thus proved. However, although 'D' and 'Z' are easily interchangeable, the termination '-zela', and its various permutations, is not very uncommon. Ptolemy also records Vinzela in the same district. The closest other known name to this is Bindeus which appears only in the later Council lists and the later Notitiae, and is doubtless to be located at or near Findos just west of the southern tip of Lake Eğridir.¹⁹⁴

The only positive identification of the names discussed above is that of Talbonda with Tymandus. The others are no more than suggestions, some more plausible than others, some made with no conviction. Although it is highly improbable that Ptolemy would record a very obscure or insignificant settlement, there is always the possibility that he might have recorded a settlement which was only insignificant in the sense that it never became a bishopric and is therefore recorded in no later documentary sources, and only obscure in the sense that it has not been located and thus no remains or inscriptions belonging to that settlement known. Likewise, certain of the entries in Hierocles' Synecdemus, discussed below, are otherwise unknown, but there is not always a reason to try and correlate the name with another, more well-documented settlement.

A number of innovations were made under Diocletian, the most important of which was the provincial reorganisation. Around the same time, Tymandus was given city status. An inscription records the procedures, such as election of municipal officials, which had to be carried out before the regular rights of a city could be assumed.¹⁹⁵ An earlier inscription, dated by the eponymous strategus of Tymandus to the reign of Antoninus Pius,¹⁹⁶ does not prove in itself that Tymandus was

independent at the beginning of the 3rd century.¹⁹⁷ Many settlements adopted a façade of independent municipal organisation, and it is most likely that Tymandus was still subject to and in the territory of Apollonia until the end of the 3rd century. Otherwise, there would have been little need for Diocletian's granting of city status, unless a former privilege had been taken away, which is unlikely. Even after Tymandus had become independent, her proximity to and her former reliance on Apollonia probably ensured that close relations with and a certain measure of dependence on Apollonia were maintained.

The name of Jovia, which appears in the records of the Council of AD 448 and in Hierocles,¹⁹⁸ suggests a foundation or, more likely, the renaming of an already existing settlement under Diocletian. Jovia, under a different name, was probably initially a village on the territory of Termessus.

Maximianopolis is first recorded in the lists of the Council of Nicaea of AD 325.¹⁹⁹ Hierocles lists both a city of Maximianopolis and an estate of the same name²⁰⁰ which has led Jones to suppose that Maximianopolis owned an estate of sufficient importance to be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the city.²⁰¹ The emphasis, however, should perhaps be shifted. Maximianopolis as the principal settlement of the estate received official recognition and probably city status, accompanied by a new name, at the close of the 3rd century. It is unlikely that the status of the estate would have changed. The site of Maximianopolis is unknown, but if Hierocles' order is anything to go by, a location in western Pisidia, probably somewhere in the region of Lake Kestel, is likely.

Limenae was also a bishopric by the 4th century, as her bishop attended the Council of Nicaea.²⁰² Limenae is probably to be identified with the

Limenia of the Tekmoreian inscriptions.²⁰³ Jones suggests that Limenae and Sabinae received city status at the end of the 3rd century, along with Tymandus, and that at some date between 25 BC and Antoninus Pius the territory belonging to Apollonia around the northern end of Lake Eğridir was divided between Tymandus, Sabinae and Limenae.²⁰⁴ This latter suggestion rests on the belief that the inscription of Antoninus Pius mentioning the eponymous strategus of Tymandus proves that Tymandus was an independent village at this time and owned territory of her own. Although it is almost certain that Limenae would have possessed territory, the case for Sabinae is unclear. Moreover, as Sabinae and Limenae are as yet unlocated, there is no certainty of a connection between them and the reallocation of Apollonia's eastern territory.

Another name first known from the Council lists of AD 325 is Zorzila.²⁰⁵ The name is spelt variously in Council lists and Notitiae, and Zorzela may have been the correct version. If Zorzila is to be identified with Ptolemy's Dyrzela, her existence in the 2nd century AD is confirmed, and if she is to be identified with Livy's Darsa, her origins were much earlier, and the site, as yet undiscovered, is to be located in the region of Lake Burdur.

The name Sinethandus first appears in the Council lists of AD 451.²⁰⁶ It is doubtful that Sinethandus was a new foundation, and this is confirmed by archaeology if the settlement is to be identified with the remains near Kizilören...²⁰⁷ It was perhaps formerly a village, a settlement of the Oroandian tribe, which came into its own during the later Principate.²⁰⁸

Hierocles, although not reliable for the nature or the status of the settlements he records, is a useful authority for the existence of

those settlements during his day. Certain of the entries in his Synecdemus are not recorded elsewhere, which makes it especially difficult to determine their status and location, and impossible to estimate their length of existence. Moreover, Hierocles does not consistently record only settlements, and although he does specify the nature of names which are not of settlements, one might wonder if some of the unqualified obscure names are of settlements, or of regions or estates, for example. Entries in Hierocles for which there is no certain additional documentation include the regio Salamara, Limobrama, the demoi of Sabaion, Sia and Mendeneo, and Myodia.²⁰⁹ The case of Sabinae has already been discussed. Ramsay locates Salamara and Limobrama, on very fanciful evidence, just south of Lake Burdur.²¹⁰ Jones surmises that Salamara was an area of public land probably confiscated by Amyntas or Augustus, and suggests that Limobrama might be a corruption of demos Brama.²¹¹ But apart from these conjectures, there is evidence for neither the exact nature, the location, the origin nor the survival of these names. Jones identifies Sabaion with Stephanus Byzantinus' Isbus,²¹² which is not impossible, but no details are known of either name. Sia has been located near Karaot,²¹³ some kilometres east of Ariassus. The remains of the site show occupation from Hellenistic times into the late Principate. Demos Mendeneo is no doubt to be identified with Ptolemy's Menedemion²¹⁴ and the demos Perminoundeis recorded in inscriptions of the sanctuary site near Kızıkağaç.²¹⁵ Myodia, also listed by Hierocles among the settlements of the Boz Ovası, is obscure.^{215a}

Atenia is first recorded by Hierocles and subsequently by Notitiae VIII and IX.²¹⁶ Her existence prior to the 6th century is not certain, but it is possible that the Tenia recorded by the Tekmoreian inscriptions is a variant spelling of Atenia.²¹⁷ Atenia may have been the principal

settlement of the ager Ateniensis, if the correction from ager Agerensis is not erroneous,²¹⁸ in which case her territory, or part of it, was confiscated by Servilius and possibly turned into an Imperial estate. The implications are that the Ager Agerensis was not far from the ager Oroandicus.²¹⁹ If the Atenia of Hierocles and the Notitiae is to be identified with the ethnic of the Tekmoreian monuments or with the ager Agerensis, or with both, thereby proving that the name was in existence in the 3rd century, if not earlier, Calder and Bean's suggestion that Atenia was the later name of Prostanna²²⁰ cannot be considered.

Two names which appear very briefly, during the 5th and 6th centuries, are Theodosiopolis and Eudoxiopolis.²²¹ The name of Theodosiopolis was instituted either at the end of the 4th century or in the first half of the 5th, and Eudoxiopolis was named during the first half of the 5th century. It is unlikely that either of these were new foundations, but it is uncertain if the names represent the change in status of a former village, for instance, or merely the change of name, from the whim or decree of an Emperor, of an already established and known settlement. They have not, however, been successfully correlated with the names of already known cities which appear either before or after the 5th and 6th centuries and are omitted from the sources in which Theodosiopolis and Eudoxiopolis are recorded.²²² The changing of settlement names during the later Principate was not uncommon, but when the replacement name was dynastic, identification is often difficult as dynastic names were generally temporary. One of the few instances where a dynastic name has been successfully identified with a settlement known by a different name is in the case of Conane which was temporarily called Justinianopolis in the 6th century, recorded as such by Hierocles and Notitiae VII, VIII and IX.²²³ As is usual with dynastic names, some

time later the name reverted to Conane.

A permanent change of name occurred when the city of Apollonia took the name Sozopolis. This happened either in the latter half of the 3rd century or during the first eight decades of the 4th. The name Apollonia is last attested for certain on the coins issued under Gallienus²²⁴ and the name Sozopolis first appears among the bishoprics whose representatives attended the Council of Constantinople in AD 381.²²⁵ The change of name possibly coincided with a relocation of the site, although it is not certain where the original Seleucid colony foundation was situated.²²⁶ Eudocias also owes her name to Theodosius II. Like Jovia, Eudocias was probably a village settlement on the territory of Termessus. It appears that Jovia and Eudocias at first retained their former dependence on Termessus, as they are listed as joint bishoprics in the first half of the 5th century;²²⁷ Eudocias appears alone in subsequent Council lists and Notitiae, and Jovia seems to disappear after Hierocles. The question of their relationship with Termessus is discussed in Chapter IX.

Some names appear only in the ecclesiastical lists. Bindeus is recorded by the later Council lists of AD 692 and 879 and by the later Notitiae. The name is also recorded by the early Notitia IX which might suggest that its omission from Notitiae VII and VIII was an error.²²⁸ The Council lists are notoriously incomplete, and there is no reason to suppose that every bishopric took the trouble to send a representative to every Council meeting. The possibility of Bindeus having replaced Prostanna in some way is discussed later. The Dicenataurus recorded by the Notitiae²²⁹ may possibly be a corrupt spelling of Panemoteichus. Perbaina of the Epistola ad Leonem and the Notitiae is unknown.²³⁰ An identification with the demos Perminoundeis might be stretching the limits of possibility. Three names which appear

in the later Notitiae are Agrai, Alierus and Dadileia. None of these stand as individual bishoprics. Agrai forms a joint bishopric with Seleuceia Sidera in Notitiae X and XIII,²³¹ Alierus appears with Palaiopolis in Notitiae III, X and XIII,²³² and Dadileia with Malus in Notitiae X and XIII.²³³ Agrai has been located at or near Atabey, just northeast of the site of Seleuceia Sidera. Fragments in the village of Atabey, some of which might belong to Seleuceia Sidera, however, imply that Agrai existed during the early Principate.²³⁴ Whether the settlement was always on the territory of Seleuceia, or was an independent village which came into its own at some later date is unknown. Alierus has not been located. An identification with the Alastus of inscriptions found at Akören is questionable.²³⁵ Ramsay's identification of Dadileia with the monastery of Koca Asarı, to the north of Melekler, a former candidate for the location of Malus, can now be discounted as Malus has been conclusively located near Sariidris.²³⁶

Little other than the emergence of settlements has been discussed above. The question of the survival of these settlements, their status and the implications of the disappearance of names from documentary sources are discussed, along with the archaeological evidence for continuity, decline and demographic change, in Chapter IX.

City Territories and Estates

Before the Principate, when the organisation of Pisidia was basically tribal, possession of territory was very much dependent upon tribal power and the outcome of tribal hostilities, subject to such frequent change that territorial boundaries are not clearly definable. However, as the essence of territorial possession is not the boundary itself, but rather which tribe or settlement had the rights to the revenue from tillage of the soil and use of the pastureland, and, later, the

responsibility of jurisdiction and collection of taxes, the actual frontier between two areas of land is not important per se. With the intervention of Rome in Asia Minor, the Romans, with their sense of rules and order, gradually imposed the rigidity of their system on the communities of Asia Minor. The granting of a portion of land formerly owned by Apollonia, to Timbriada,²³⁷ by a king, possibly Amyntas, shows that this could be effected indirectly, Amyntas being a client king of the Romans; from the beginning of the Principate, territorial boundaries were more strictly fixed by order of the Emperors themselves. The increase in the number of independent settlements, especially those of city status, meant that there was more competition for smaller parcels of land, and a more rigid scheme of allocating land would reduce the incidence of territorial disputes and ambiguity of boundaries. No doubt one of the reasons why those settlements which had consolidated themselves at an early date seemed to prosper throughout the Principate is because they had made sure of a relatively large territory before the competition for land became stronger.

According to Strabo,²³⁸ the territory of Selge bordered on the territory of the Homonadeis and the Catenneis. The southern boundary must have extended to the foothills of the Taurus and there met the territory of Aspendus. To the northwest was Adada, and to the west Pednelissus. The estimation of the population of Selge as 20,000 by Strabo²³⁹ suggests that her lands were extensive. Inscriptions from Gağras, south of Lake Suğla, which record the boule and demos of Selge, might imply that Selgian territory stretched at least as far east as Gağras.²⁴⁰ An alternative, and perhaps preferable, interpretation is that the land around Gağras was privately owned by citizens of Selge. On the east side of the Eurymedon, no city is known between the latitude of Selge and that of Timbriada. They may have had a common boundary, but it is also possible that an as yet unlocated city - Tityassus or

Zorzila, for instance - controlled the territory between the two. Ruins and inscriptions around Kesme might be representative of one of these cities,²⁴¹ or of the demos Mulasseis recorded on one of the inscriptions.²⁴² The demos of Tynada, or Gynada, located by a 3rd century inscription found at Yakaafşar,²⁴³ southeast of Timbriada, was probably a village subject to Timbriada.

According to Polybius,²⁴⁴ the Etenneis, probably the same as the Catenneis whose territory was conterminous with that of Selge, could afford to put 8,000 hoplites in the field to assist Garsyeris in his battle against the Selgians, implying a large total population of the tribe and a reasonably extensive territory. This, however, was the late 3rd century BC. Later, it seems that the tribe split up and the former territory of the collective Etenneis was divided and allocated to the settlements of Etenna, Cotenenna and Erymna at least.

Termessus must have ruled a vast territory in the Hellenistic period and into the Principate. Most of her territory was mountainous, restricted to the north by Ariassus, to the west by Isinda and to the south by Trebenna. Heberdey calculated Termessian territory at 265.4 square miles, and showed that at one time it may have extended as far east as the Cattaractes,²⁴⁵ incorporating a fairly large extent of the fertile plain. After the foundation of Attaleia in the mid 2nd century BC, Termessian territory was probably reduced and she lost some of her most farmable land. The walls of Kapıkaya, constructed shortly after the foundation of Attaleia,²⁴⁶ presumably defined the frontier between the respective territories of Termessus and Attaleia from this date. A second fortification wall to the west of Termessus was perhaps built by the Termessians to defer threats from their enemies the Isindians.²⁴⁷ This wall would certainly have initially been within Termessian territory

and possibly defined the western boundary in later centuries. An inscription indicates that the area around Yazır, southeast of Korkuteli, was within Termessian territory at some time.²⁴⁸ Presumably the territory of Termessus underwent few, if any, changes during the first three centuries AD, but it appears that in the late 4th or early 5th century Eudocias and possibly also Jovia, former villages subject to Termessus, received land in their own right, land which must have been carved out of Termessian territory.²⁴⁹

The territory of Ariassus, to the north of Termessus, was mostly mountainous with the occasional arable valley such as that to the south, well below the altitude of the site itself. Since there are possibly a number of cities yet to be located around the confines of Ariassus, the extent of her territory cannot be estimated. It cannot even be ascertained if Ariassus owned the fertile plain around the modern village of Dağ, less than three kilometres to the northeast of the site, as an alternative claimant might have been the unnamed city situated just to the north of the plain.

Sagalassus had a vast territory,²⁵⁰ extending westwards to Lake Burdur and meeting the territories of Conane and Seleuceia Sidera to the north. At the northern end of Lake Burdur was Baris. Between Baris and Conane was an Imperial estate, one of its boundaries marked by an inscription found at Baladız.²⁵¹ The estate probably included much or all of the Keçiborlu Ovası and almost certainly bordered on Sagalassian territory. The Keçiborlu Çayı perhaps defined the boundary between the estate and the territory of Baris. Agrai possibly owned a small piece of land to the northeast of Seleuceia Sidera in later Antiquity, but may, in earlier centuries, have been subject to Seleuceia. To the east of Seleuceia, at the southern tip of Lake Eğridir, was Prostanna whose

territory possibly also bordered on that of Sagalassus. As the early history of Bindeus is unknown it is difficult to ascertain whether the settlement had always owned land between Prostanna and Seleuceia, either as a city or as an independent village, or, during the Principate, gained territory taken from that of Prostanna, Sagalassus or Seleuceia.²⁵²

Boundary stones found at Bedre mark the meeting point of the territories of Prostanna and Parlais.²⁵³ The territory of Parlais was bounded on the west by Barla Dağı, on the east by Lake Eğridir, and possibly extended as far as Akkeçili to the north. Levick estimates the territory of Parlais as approximately 35 square miles, and suggests that the relatively small area of land around the city was supplemented by a detached piece of territory on the opposite shore of the lake.²⁵⁴

The River Lysis was a natural limit to the southwestern extent of Sagalassian territory, and boundary stones found at Düver and Yazıköy prove that here was the boundary between Sagalassian territory and that of Tymbrianassus, a village on the territory of an Imperial estate, from the 1st century AD until at least the end of the 3rd century.²⁵⁵

The inscription which lays down the regulations for the requisition of transport in Sagalassian territory²⁵⁶ implies that Sagalassus had a common boundary with Conane to the north and with Cormasa to the south. Cormasa has not yet been conclusively located, but perhaps is to be identified with the ruins at Gayur Ören between Karacaören and Gölde.²⁵⁷

To the southeast of Sagalassus was Cremna, whose territory may have bordered on that of Sagalassus. Levick estimates Cremna's territory at approximately 170 square miles.²⁵⁸ Possibly there was a common boundary between Sagalassian territory and that of Adada to the east, the most obvious boundary line being either the tributary of the Koca Çayı which begins in Davras Dağı or the tributary further east which runs into Kovada Gölü,

The early disappearance of Ceraitae from the numismatic record might suggest that her territory was absorbed by Cremna.²⁵⁹ Sandalium may have come under the jurisdiction of Cremna or Sagalassus during the Principate.²⁶⁰

The River Lysis must have also defined the eastern boundary of the territory of Hadriane where it met the land belonging to the city at Gavur Ören (?Cormasa), unless the settlement at Kozluca, between the two, was independent. Conterminous with the territory of Hadriane was probably that of Olbasa, which Levick estimates at approximately 200 square miles.²⁶¹ The boundary between the two was possibly the Elmacık Çayı, a tributary of the ancient Lysis. To the south of Olbasa were the Ormelian estates, centred around Tefenni and Karamanlı.²⁶² Olbasa's territory presumably extended eastwards to the Lysis, there meeting either the territory of the city at Gavur Ören or that of an intervening settlement which might have governed its own land.

The territory of Comama has been estimated by Levick at approximately 56 square miles,²⁶³ defined by Gök Dağı and Katrancı Dağı to the west and north, where it possibly bordered on the territory of the city at Gavur Ören, and to the northeast by Lake Kestel. Olbasa presumably governed the territory on the north side of the lake. The southern boundary of Comama's territory was perhaps defined by the Akkitça Çayı, south of which was Pogla. A boundary stone found one kilometre north of Belen, probably in situ, marks the meeting point of the territories of three cities.²⁶⁴ The abbreviations AN and ΠΩ obviously represent Andeda and Pogla; the third settlement, denoted by ΠΛ, is uncertain, but must have been the easterly of the three. Bean suggested that the signs of occupation at Bozburun, between Garipce and Zivint, might be of this settlement.²⁶⁵ The only known name to which the abbreviation could refer is Palaiopolis, but it could just as well represent the name of

an otherwise unrecorded settlement. Mitchell suggests an estate of the Plancii.²⁶⁶ South of Andeda was Verbe, and adjacent to Verbe was Sibidunda. Because of the concentration of the number of cities in the Boz Ovasi, their territory was restricted and they presumably always remained small throughout Antiquity.

The western limit of the territory of Apollonia, where it met that of Apameia, was marked by a boundary stone at modern Çapalı.²⁶⁷ The date given by the stone is AD 135. This was also the boundary between the provinces of Asia and Galatia, and remained so until the province of Pisidia was formed. To the north of Apollonia was the Karakuş Dağı mountain range and to the south Kapı Dağı divided the territory of Apollonia from that of Conane and Seleuceia Sidera. Until Tymandus received city status at the end of the 3rd century,²⁶⁸ Apollonian territory presumably extended as far eastwards as Lake Eğridir, Barla Dağı forming a natural boundary between the territory of Apollonia, later of Tymandus, and Parlais. If Tymandus was an independent village in the mid 2nd century,²⁶⁹ she possibly already administered her own territory. An inscription records the granting of three tracts of land, previously controlled by Timbriada, to Apollonia;²⁷⁰ it seems that the land had belonged to Apollonia originally, but that a king, perhaps Amyntas, had given it to Timbriada. The inscription is mutilated and undated, but doubtless belongs to the early Principate. There is no evidence for Ramsay's suggested date of 25 BC,²⁷¹ but if this is correct Mitchell takes it as indicative of an allotment of colonial land to Apollonia.²⁷² Ramsay suggested that the *Οὐραρμια χώραν* of the inscription is the area around Gelendost, that *Ὀφείως κεφαλῆς* is the narrow promontory which divides Lake Hoyran from Lake Eğridir, and that the *Ἀσλῶνα τὸν κατάγοντα πρὸς Μισύλωι* is the narrow piece of land bordering the lake shore on the northeast and leading into the Hoyran Ovasi.²⁷³ Of

course these identifications are not certain,²⁷⁴ and it does seem surprising that an apparently small settlement such as Timbriada should have controlled territory at the opposite end of the lake from her own situation. However, this is virtually the only possible area that could have been the subject of a territorial dispute between Apollonia and Timbriada, and if one examines the terrain it does not seem so unreasonable that Timbriada's lands might have extended so far from the settlement itself. The total distance from Timbriada to the north-eastern corner of the lake is not short, but in terms of usable land it is not extensive. A slight problem is caused by the location of Malus at Sariidris, to the north of Timbriada. If Malus administered the territory between Timbriada and the tract of land which was the subject of the dispute, one has to conclude that the land in question was once a detached territory of Timbriada. Alternatively, rather than being an independent settlement at this time, c. 39-25 BC, Malus was on the territory of Timbriada. There is no absolute certainty of Malus' status at this time; the few coins issued by Malus in the 1st century BC are quasi-autonomous.²⁷⁵ The situation is unclear. There is, however, no solution in trying to locate these three tracts of land on the west side of Lake Eğridir as at least Prostanna and Parlais stand between Apollonia and Timbriada. To the south, Timbriada's territory was presumably met by that of Adada. The eastern boundary may have been the west shore of Lake Beyşehir. However, it is possible that Tityassus is to be located in this mountainous region between Timbriada and Lake Beyşehir.

Levick estimates the territory of Antiocheia at approximately 540

square miles.²⁷⁶ It was doubtless defined to the north and northeast by the Sultan Dağları. To the west, the most natural boundary would have been the Eleksu, tributaries of which had their sources in the Sultan Dağları and entered Lake Eğridir at its northeastern corner. It is unlikely that the territory included the Hoyran Ovası and extended as

far west as Gençalı,²⁷⁷ but this was possibly the case for a short period. If the three tracts of land which were the subject of the boundary dispute between Apollonia and Timbriada were indeed situated around the northeastern corner of the lake and this land was allotted to Apollonia by Augustus, this would suggest that the territory of Antiocheia, at least at the beginning of the Principate, did not border on the lake at all, but it is possible that this area was included among Antiocheia's territories at a later date. Ramsay noted a coin of Antiocheia, from the reign of Gordian III, which seems to bear a goddess carrying the stern of a ship in her left hand.²⁷⁸ There is no cause to doubt his inference from this that Antiocheia had influence over Lake Eğridir, and not unreasonable to go further and suggest that an explanation of this is that her territory extended to the lake in the first half of the 3rd century. Later, possibly in the second half of the 3rd century, the area around the north and northeastern shores of the lake was perhaps given to Limenae and Sabinae,²⁷⁹ but as these have not been located the possibilities must remain open. Initially, the territory of Antiocheia may have extended southwards to the mountains of Kızıl Dağı and Kara Dağı, just south of Şarkıkaraağaç.²⁸⁰ Assuming Neapolis was situated near Kiyakdede,²⁸¹ her territory would have included that portion of land between Kızıl Dağı and Kara Dağı to the north, and the Imperial estates around Kireli to the south, bounded by Lake Beyşehir on the west and by the Sultan Dağları on the east. The land west of Kızıl Dağı, between the lake and the territory of Antiocheia, may originally have been independent territory of Anabura, but it is possible that much of the Cillanian plain was later administered communally by the Cillanian Tetropolis.

The extent of the territory of the Oroandian tribe has already been discussed.²⁸² Servilius Isauricus confiscated the ager Oroandicus,²⁸³ at least some of which was made ager publicus and turned into Imperial estates. An inscription shows that at least part of the ager

Oroandicus was still Imperial property, under the supervision of an Imperial procurator, during the 4th century.²⁸⁴ Pappa and Mistea, the two principal centres of the Oroandian tribe, remained independent, but perhaps some of their former land was claimed as Imperial property and the potential extent of the territory of each was thus restricted. Presumably the territory of Mistea bordered on that of Amblada to the south. To the north were Imperial estates around Kireli Kasaba.²⁸⁵ Boundary stones found near Sevindik and Sarıköy²⁸⁶ probably form part of a series of similar stones which stretched from the shore of Lake Beyşehir to the foothills of Erenler Dağı, marking the boundary between the estates and the territory of Mistea.²⁸⁷ Mitchell suggests that a portion of the Cillanian plain²⁸⁸ adjacent to the ager Oroandicus was made ager publicus, part of which became an Imperial estate, the rest reserved for the settlement of colonists at Neapolis.²⁸⁹ The ager Agerensis (?Ateniensis) was also confiscated by Servilius²⁹⁰ and possibly shared the same fate as the ager Oroandicus. Another tract of land confiscated by Servilius was the ager Gedusanus.²⁹¹ The name could very easily have been corrupted from Sedusanus, or Sedasanus,²⁹² and, if so, is locatable to the north of Lake Trogitis. A boundary stone found at Üzümlü²⁹³ perhaps marks a point at which the territory of Mistea bordered on that of another city to the southwest. Around Bademli, directly west of Mistea on the southern shore of the lake, was an Imperial estate.²⁹⁴ That Mistea and Vasada had a common frontier in the late 4th century is proved by a letter written by Basil to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium.²⁹⁵ A boundary stone found at Boyalı,²⁹⁶ doubtless marks the southern extent of the territory of Vasada, which probably stretched to the foothills of the mountain range to the east. Presumably the boundary between the territories of Vasada and Amblada was defined by the River Irmak. At the end of the 1st century BC, Amblada and Vasada had possibly acquired

additional land taken from the former territory of the Homonadeis.

Of course, the question of landjurisdiction cannot be solved by simply attributing to a known city the surrounding land and finding a suitable boundary line between that city's territory and the nearest known city in each direction. There is seldom proof that the territories of two settlements were conterminous, and other factors combine to complicate the situation. The future identification of as yet unlocated settlements would restrict the extent of territory which might otherwise be attributed to already located cities. This is particularly true of the highland region of Pisidia south of lakes Burdur and Eğridir where a number of unlocated cities have yet to be placed. In addition, there must have been many smaller settlements on the territory of larger ones, but there is little evidence to indicate their status or their degree of dependency on the larger settlements. The long list of ethnics given by the Tekmoreian inscriptions is proof of just how many villages did exist within a reasonable radius of Antiocheia. Some settlements of non-city status may have controlled their own land, but this is very difficult to ascertain. Without the boundary stones at Düver and Yazıköy, one might easily attribute the territory to the west of the River Lysis to Lysinia. Tymandus possibly administered territory, independent of Apollonia, before she received official city status. The same may be true of Atenia, Limenae and Sabinae, for example, each of which might always have been independent villages. The alternative is that at some time during the mid or late Principate, when such settlements began to emerge as cities, land was carved out of the territories of already established cities, but if this was a common occurrence it is surprising that no complaints from the cities whose territories were reduced have been recorded.

If one examines the question of land-holding chronologically, it is clear that further complications are caused by the frequent changing hands of land. Estates were an integral part of the land-holding system, and these might be owned by the State, by private individuals, including members of the Imperial house, by religious sanctuaries, or by the Church. Identification of estates, and of their nature, is particularly difficult. The problems of identification are discussed in detail by Broughton,²⁹⁷ who concludes that not only was the acquisition of estates a complex process, but also that the evidence must be assessed extremely cautiously before identifying an estate of any nature. Levick more specifically examines the process of acquisition.²⁹⁸

It was not unusual for large estates to consist of a number of plots of land, not necessarily adjacent, and there must have been numerous small-holdings of private individuals within the territory of their native city. A passage in the Theodosian Code refers to senators who owned land in distant and separate provinces.²⁹⁹ Evidence from Antiocheia shows that many citizens owned property within the boundaries of the city territory. That many of these were farms means that little or no archaeological evidence will have survived to show the existence of the property, let alone its ownership. The epigraphic evidence from Antiocheia must represent only a handful of these small-holdings. Private estates in and around Pisidia are also implied at Sagalassus, Olbasa, Ariassus, Termessus, Selge and Laodiceia. Catacecaumene.³⁰⁰ The evidence is from the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Perhaps one of the largest private estates was that owned by Annia Faustina and her family, centred around Karamanli and Tefenni, known as the Ormelian estates.³⁰¹ There is no reason to suppose that the Tekmoreian lists are indicative of the existence of an Imperial estate or even a private estate, around Kumdanlı or Sağır, but the huge

donations recorded by the inscriptions can be taken as evidence that the society included many rich members whose source of wealth might well have been the income from their private estates. The initial acquisition and the changing hands of private estates was probably not a complex procedure. The land was presumably purchased from the State, possibly from the Emperor himself, or from the municipality, naturally for a profit to the previous owner and subject to taxation, and passed down through subsequent generations of the family. It seems reasonable to assume that during the early Principate, with the increasing rise of power and wealth of both immigrant Italian and native families, the total acreage of land under private ownership grew. There are, however, instances where privately owned land became public. A 2nd century inscription from Ariassus records a donation of a piece of land by a certain Diotomus to the city.³⁰² An inscription of a similar date from Termessus records a donation by T. Cl. Agrippa of a piece of land to be used for games.³⁰³ From the mid Principate it was probably a common practice for wealthy individuals to leave property to the Church or to a monastery.

The clearest evidence for land-holding in the Republic is Strabo's statement that Amyntas owned land in Lycaonia capable of supporting 300 flocks.³⁰⁴ Strabo also refers to other private land-holders of the same period.³⁰⁵ Amyntas must have received a fairly significant legacy of land in Galatia from Deiotarus,³⁰⁶ and he perhaps added to his possessions during the course of his wars with the highlanders of Pisidia and Isauria, with or without Rome's consent. Apparently he gained control of the temple lands of Men Ascaenus at Antiocheia.³⁰⁷ Augustus was the heir to Amyntas' estates,³⁰⁸ but it is not certain to what extent he turned this to his personal advantage. He must have kept some of his inheritance as personal property, but presumably it

was also in his own interests, as a diplomatic measure, to turn some of the property over to the State. Parts of the lands formerly owned by Amyntas, plus land confiscated by Servilius, and land personally purchased by Augustus,³⁰⁹ seem to have been used for the settlement of veterans in Augustus' Pisidian colonies.³¹⁰ The immediate fate of the rest of the ager publicus confiscated by Servilius is unknown. Later evidence shows that at least parts of it were turned into Imperial estates at some date.³¹¹ Laodiceia Catacecaumene was the regional centre for a group of Imperial estates in this district, incorporating pasture land and the mines at Sizma which presumably had formerly been the property of the temple of the Zizimmene mother.³¹² There were also a number of private estates in the district around Laodiceia.³¹³ By the mid 3rd century there existed a central office at Antiocheia,³¹⁴ but it is not known which estates' affairs were dealt with here. Levick, showing the same caution as Broughton, has argued that there is certain evidence for the existence of only three Imperial estates in the immediate district of Pisidia, one implied by inscriptions at Kireli Kasaba,³¹⁵ one by an inscription at Bademli³¹⁶ and one to the west of Sagalassian territory, south of Lake Burdur.³¹⁷ In addition there were the estates of the ager Oroandicus,³¹⁸ an estate near Tyriaeum,³¹⁹ and one at the north end of Lake Burdur, defined by a boundary stone found at Baladiz.³²⁰ The possibility of the existence of Imperial estates in the vicinity of Pogla, Sağır, Alastus and Lagbe³²¹ is by no means certain.

It is possible that some of the entries in Hierocles' Synecdemos represent estates. The only certainty is Maximianopolis, the name listed twice, once as a city and once as an estate.³²² The name implies that the estate was Imperial property, and the settlement was perhaps initially the administrative centre. Another possible estate recorded

by Hierocles is the regio Salamara,³²³ The χωριον Μιλυαδικα has been taken as a reference to the Ormelian estates,³²⁴ but this is unlikely.

CHAPTER VI

PRODUCTION AND TRADE

Localised Resources and Land Use

That agriculture was the mainstay of the population, even more so in Antiquity than today, hardly needs proving. It was a natural legacy from the prehistoric communities, and studies have shown that the early communities in Pisidia and its surroundings were among the first to adopt a system of subsistence farming. The same practices have survived in many parts of modern Anatolia. Whereas in the West, and in the cities and larger settlements of modern Turkey, total dependence on the hinterland of a settlement has been succeeded by different methods of survival, brought about by trade, industrial expansion and interdependency on other settlements and countries, much of Turkey, particularly the eastern regions, is still inhabited by village communities which might carry out trade on a small scale but for the most part rely on their own agricultural resources and self-sufficiency.

During Antiquity, complete reliance on the hinterland, on the resources of a settlements' own lands, was a tradition which persisted long in the highlands, even during those years when the cities of the coast had established elaborate trading relations with each other and with cities further afield. On the one hand it was the isolation of highland communities that necessitated their dependence on their own hinterland, and, on the other, it was this practised self-sufficiency that enabled them to maintain their economic independence. Even today, many of the isolated villages are, by necessity, almost totally self-sufficient. The modern village of Zerk which has survived at the site of ancient Selge, relies for the most part on its own produce - eggs, milk, grain and wild fruits such as pear - and until the rough road from Beşkonak to the village and the forests around was constructed less than 20 years ago, it was very difficult for the villagers to

obtain supplementary food such as fresh fruit and vegetables from the markets in the plain. A similar situation exists at Syrtkōy (modern Etenna) where the villagers' prize possession is a communal combine harvester, although they do trade on a small scale, drying and selling the bay leaves which grow in great quantities in the vicinity. One has only to examine the archaeology - for example, depictions of agricultural implements and produce on ancient reliefs and coins¹ (Pl. 9), portrayal of Demeter on architectural decoration and coins² - and to note the attention paid to crop failures, famine and corn doles, to understand that agriculture was the dominant economic activity of Antiquity, and the most important, being fundamental to life and survival.

Production potential is dictated largely by relief, climate and the quality of the soil. In all these respects the coastlands of Asia Minor offer the most favourable conditions for all methods of basic subsistence, and there is no reason to suppose that it was otherwise in Antiquity.³ In comparison, much of the interior, in particular the plateau areas of central and eastern Anatolia, is poor, and the quantity, quality and variety of crops are restricted by both harsh winters and dry summers. Strabo remarks that Galatia, Eastern Phrygia and Lycaonia were cold and bare, with a minimal water supply.⁴ This, however, is too much of a generalisation, and Strabo was probably describing chiefly the open and desolate plains of the plateau, the most notable being large extents of Cappadocia, and the Konya plain which has suffered from the same problem in modern times, only recently alleviated by irrigation schemes. Only a century ago, Sterrett commented on the Konya plain, 'the land would everywhere be productive if only it could be irrigated.'⁵ The topography of Pisidia is very different. Lakes, rivers, springs and a high winter rainfall indicate that there was

sufficient water in most highland districts for most purposes, and it is unlikely that insufficiency of water in Pisidia was much of a problem. Of course there was always the possibility of an excessively dry winter or a long summer drought to create a shortage, and there is the question of climatic change causing more drastic and long-lasting repercussions during later Antiquity. Judging from present day water resources, there was, in general, sufficient water for the needs of the inhabitants of the Pisidian highlands during early Antiquity. Early communities would have neither the expertise nor the inclination to construct elaborate methods of transporting water from afar, and since water is one of the most essential requirements for survival, and thus one of the most important considerations for the location of a settlement, one can assume that settlements would have been established with a serious regard for a nearby source of water. The situation would only change, the local water supply become inadequate, due to population expansion of the individual community, the necessity of cultivating and irrigating more land to feed the population, or the introduction to the more developed of these communities of new trends such as bath-houses and municipal fountains. Such unrelenting pressure on the local source of water could usually be met by the construction of additional water supplies - simple rainwater tanks or aqueducts - but the situation might become so acute as to necessitate the relocation of the settlement elsewhere. Archaeological evidence suggests that in early Imperial times, when these developments were most common, the problem was responded to by the first of these alternatives. In later Antiquity, when climatic change might have been an additional factor, the latter alternative may, in some cases, have been the only solution. It must also be remembered that population figures would have been markedly lower in Antiquity than they are today,⁶ and there would have been less

of a demand on the resources of the interior.

As already noted, the Pisidian highlands are not typical of the exposed plateau areas of much of the interior. Although they might have a wild and unmanageable aspect in comparison with the coastlands, they are in fact composed of a variety of topographical features. It is true that a large part of Pisidia is mountainous and good for little other than the grazing of goats, but most of the mountain ranges are not without their gentler slopes, adaptable for cultivation by tree-felling and terracing, and hidden valleys, much like the yaylas of today which are given over mostly to pasture but are generally equal to fulfilling the agricultural needs of a small community. Strabo's comment on the richness of the territory of Selge⁷ is sufficient indication of the potential fertility of the high valleys of these formidable mountain ranges. Such a city, large by ancient standards, would hardly have survived, let alone prospered, without the resources to be self-sufficient. Selge's territory would have included the fertile valley of the Köprü Irmağı (Pl. 10); cultivation of the land in the immediate vicinity of the city would also have been possible, although terracing of the sloping ground and irrigation of the dry and stony soil would have been necessary, as today.

The lowlands of Pisidia, if not as rich as the littoral plains are not as desolate as the exposed plateau areas, and are sufficiently expansive and fertile to have provided the basic agricultural requirements for the ancient settlements located there. Those districts of Pisidia most conducive to production were presumably the flat plains bordering the lakes, and the valleys of Phrygia Paroreios, both the long valley to the south of the Sultan Dağları containing the cities of Apollonia and Antiocheia (Pl. 11 and 12), and the valleys to the north of the

mountain range around Apameia, Metropolis, Philomelium and Tyriaeum.⁸ Irrigation schemes have improved the fertility of the less well watered land around Uluborlu and Senirkent, increasing the quality of tree crops and the livelihood of the farmer. It is unknown if intensive irrigation of this region would have been necessary in Antiquity. Some of the lakeside lands have in recent history been plagued by marshland, a problem suffered also by the Pamphylian plain before it was drained at the beginning of this century, and have thus been unproductive and hazardous to habitation. This may equally have been a problem in Antiquity, but there is little evidence to ascertain it, nor to indicate how acute such a problem might have become. Philostorgius described the area around Amblada as unpleasant and unhealthy and the soil barren,⁹ although this would have been suitable for growing the vines for which Amblada was renowned in Antiquity (Pl. 13). Sterrett remarks on the unhealthiness of the Beyşehir region,¹⁰ yet the district around Seydişehir, only some 30 kilometres to the south, was noted for an extremely salubrious climate.¹¹ Sterrett also notes the contrast between the unhealthy and malarious region beside the eastern shore of Lake Beyşehir and the prosperousness of the villages on the more fertile and climatically favoured high terrain adjacent to the plain of Kireli Kasaba.¹² On first appearances some of the land bordering the lakes, where mountains directly flank the water's edge, as on the west sides of lakes Burdur and Beyşehir, and the west and east sides of Lake Eğirdir, might seem inadequate for the cultivation of cereal crops, but in reality there are occasional flat tracts of land between the mountains and the water. An example is the flat area between the modern village of Barla and the west shore of Lake Eğirdir (Pl. 14) which, together with other arable land in the city territory, would probably have yielded sufficient crops for the needs of ancient Parlais. Levick,

however, seems to doubt this and suggests that Parlais owned a detached territorium somewhere on the opposite shore of the lake.¹³

The high valleys of western Pisidia and Cabalia are also suitable for cereals and grazing. The fact that Manlius extracted 10,000 medimni of grain from Cibyra,¹⁴ and 20,000 medimni of wheat and the same amount of barley from Sagalassus,¹⁵ in addition to the monetary tributes he demanded, suggests that both cities were capable of supplying these large amounts. Livy gives a glowing description of the fertility of Sagalassian territory - 'uber fertilisque omni genere frugum,'¹⁶ 'agrum Sagalassenum uberum fertilemque omni genere frugum.'¹⁷ Although Bean remarks that the territory is now only moderately fertile,¹⁸ this is disputable. Sagalassian territory was vast, and it is not known whether Livy was referring to a specific part of it, or to its fertility as a whole. As a whole, the district which was once Sagalassian can still be described as fertile, and parts of it, notably the well-watered vale through which the modern road passes by Ağlasun (Pl. 15), are strikingly so. It is almost impossible to draw comparisons between the richness of the soil or the abundance of crops of Antiquity and present day, because an assessment of these would depend largely on the adequacy of the soil or the harvest for fulfilling the needs of the population. In Antiquity, the agricultural potential of the territory of Sagalassus would no doubt have far exceeded those basic requirements and allowed for surplus, unless affected by misfortune, natural or otherwise, whereas today, a possibly larger population and a different economic system have placed more intense pressure on the same land. Likewise, much of the territory of Cremna, to the south-east of Sagalassus, particularly the valley surrounding the city itself, is fertile and favourable to the farmer (Pl. 16).

Sterrett's incredulity that an apparently thriving city, namely Adada, could subsist without outside help in these formidable mountains south of Eğridir¹⁹ has been adopted without question.²⁰ The situation of Adada, however, is not as destitute as Sterrett's description would have one believe. Granted her situation was not commercially strategic, and the wild mountains surrounding the city could not be easily cultivated, yet Sterrett himself praises the fertility of the land around Sütçüler, to the south, territory which Adada would doubtless have owned, and there are also a number of arable areas closer to Adada (Pl. 17).

The picture painted above might seem over optimistic, especially when the interior is compared with the West coast, but the intention is to emphasize that arable land and agricultural resources must have been sufficient, at least during the early Empire, otherwise settlements could not have survived.

Cicero's description of the Pisidians, Phrygians and Cilicians as shepherds who overrun mountain and plain in summer and winter, in comparison with the Carians who have fertile fields,²¹ rather than suggesting that the standard of cultivation in the highlands was inferior to that of the more civilised coastal areas, perhaps indicates that a nomadic or semi-nomadic way of life, as opposed to that of the sedentary farmer, was favoured among the more primitive highland tribes.

As today, the economic activity second to that of agriculture was probably that of animal husbandry. The physical and climatic conditions of much of Asia Minor are ideally suited to the grazing of sheep and goats which are tolerant of the hot dry summers, find nourishment from the poorest vegetation and, goats in particular, maintain a foothold on the most precipitous slopes and crags. Moreover the arid and infertile plains of the Anatolian plateau and the steep slopes of the highlands

can accommodate pastoralism without the animals having to compete with field or tree crops for possession of the more fertile and arable valleys and plains.

There is insufficient evidence to evaluate accurately the importance of animal husbandry in the economy of Asia Minor, but enough from the sources and modern comparisons to create a general impression. The intensity of pastoralism in various regions would have depended on the availability of pasture land, the expenditure necessary for keeping the animals, and the demands for the uses of the animals and their produce. Availability of land would have been less of a concern in Antiquity than it is today, there being less pressure from agriculture and less awareness of the dangers to the natural vegetation; expenditure and profitability would depend on the state of the economy, but sheep and goats can be kept easily, with little more effort than supervision, in a country whose terrain provides a natural habitat; uses of the animals would vary according to community and region, local and commercial demand. Sheep, goats and, occasionally, cattle might be kept to satisfy the needs for meat and milk of the local community, and to provide wool and hides for both local and commercial use. Ancient reliefs show that oxen were used for agricultural purposes, mainly to draw ploughs. Oxen and mules were used for transportation - oxen were probably more common in steppe country such as Lycaonia where the relatively flat land permitted the drawing of wagons with little difficulty, and pack mules would have been more expedient in the highlands where ox-drawn carts are impractical and the sure-footed mule can more easily cope with the narrow mountain passes and steep gradients.²²

It seems that the low-grade pasturelands of today were put to the same use in Antiquity, as Phrygia and Lycaonia in particular supported large

flocks and herds. Herodotus describes the Phrygians as πολυπροβατώτεροι.²³ The flocks of Amyntas in Lycaonia were especially renowned,²⁴ as were the sheep and cattle of the Upper Meander valley, around Apameia, Laodiceia, Hierapolis and Colossae.²⁵ Strabo remarks on the grazing grounds around Selge,²⁶ and no doubt goats were as common in the Lycian and Pisidian Taurus during Antiquity as they are today.

Horsebreeding was not unknown in Asia Minor. Imperial horse ranches are recorded in Phrygia during the late Empire,²⁷ and it is possible that the Persian hunting grounds near Apameia²⁸ imply that horsebreeding was a long-standing tradition in Phrygia. Dionysius Periegetes refers to Phrygia as ἵπποβότος.²⁹ Both Oppian³⁰ and Nemesian,³¹ writing during the late Empire, recommend the horses which were bred in the Taurus regions. The range of uses made of the horse is not certain. As a means of personal transport or as beasts of burden, they would have been restricted to the richer members of society. Possibly they were used to supply the Imperial armies.

It is not known whether transhumance was as common as it was in the Middle Ages and in some parts of Turkey today,³² but in view of the passage from Cicero quoted above, and the fact that semi-nomadism would be at variance with neither the topography of the highlands nor a tribal way of life, it was probably not an uncommon phenomenon in Antiquity, perhaps more so during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, before urbanisation was widespread.

Some of the land which was used for neither cereal growing nor grazing was doubtless given up to the cultivation of tree crops. Unfortunately there is little in the sources to indicate the importance of tree crops in Antiquity, or the extent of their cultivation. Modern comparisons cannot be used confidently because not all agricultural products of

Turkey are indigenous.

Two of the most characteristic tree crops of Asia Minor, both today and in Antiquity, are the olive and the vine. Both are well-suited to the limestone soils of Anatolia, and are able to survive drought and high temperatures. The limits of the olive are fixed by climatic conditions and altitude, its upper limit being 2000 feet.³³ The principal regions of olive culture today are the coastal plains of the west and the lower slopes of the south coast where it thrives in the thin stony soils not capable of sustaining cereal crops.³⁴ The cultivated olive is originally descended from the wild variety and, left unattended, it may revert to the wild type. It is likely that in some areas where today the wild olive grows the tree was once cultivated. This is certainly true of Selge and her surroundings. Strabo praised the olive of the Taurus behind Side and Aspendus, and specifically of the territory of Selge, but today only the wild olive can be found near the modern village of Zerk.³⁵ Wild olive around Termessus and Cremna³⁶ may be indicative of a similar reversion. It is interesting that the villagers of Zerk have recently tried once more to cultivate the olive, but their efforts proved unsuccessful. Possibly Zerk itself is too high, at an altitude of over 2000 feet, and exposed for olive growing and the parts of Selge's territory where the olive grew in Antiquity were of a lower altitude, perhaps in the foothills of the Taurus around Beşkonak and the valley of the Köprü Irmağı. Strabo's description of olives at Synnada³⁷ has been doubted³⁸ as the altitude of Synnada is well above the olive's natural habitat, but his description is so precise that one might prefer to be convinced rather than dismiss it as an erroneous remark.³⁹

The vine is not as restricted by altitude as the olive, and is common

in all parts of Anatolia. It requires little care, no irrigation, and thrives on the lower hill slopes where drainage is good. That viticulture was widespread throughout the Empire is obvious from the frequent depictions of the vine on reliefs, and the sources confirm that grapes and wine were common contributors to the everyday diet. Today, vineyards cover many of the cultivated lower slopes of Pisidia, and it was said that in the Middle Ages 36 varieties could be found on the south shore of Lake Eğirdir alone.⁴⁰ In Antiquity, those districts of Pisidia and its surroundings whose vineyards and wine were especially praised were Apameia, Metropolis, Laodiceia Catacacamene, Amblada, Selge and Termessus.⁴¹

It is less certain how common in Antiquity were the other cultivated tree crops which are found today in Turkey. Certain fruits must have been grown for local use wherever the climate permitted, although not as extensively cultivated as today for want of a wider market, and nuts must have been gathered in wooded areas where they grew in their natural habitat.

Although Turkey is one of the chief lemon- and orange-growing countries today, neither of these fruits was introduced to this part of the Mediterranean until about a thousand years ago. The plum, pomegranate and fig were probably indigenous, and so one may assume that they contributed in part to the ancient diet. Presumably the pomegranate was grown in Pamphylia as it was depicted on coins of Side as a symbol of the city.⁴² The apple was possibly the most common fruit tree as it can be grown fairly easily in most climates. Athenaeus recommends a variety grown at Apollonia which must have been excellent enough to take the early name of the city, Mordiaeum.⁴³ There is little evidence for vegetables and garden produce. Philostratus mentions vetch at

Aspendus⁴⁴ and Termessus boasted of her gardens on coinage.⁴⁵ No doubt vegetables were commonplace and rated little praise. Another product of the warmer coastlands - Cyprus, Cilicia, Lycia and Pamphlia - was the palm, which had many uses such as for building, thatching, fuel and rope-making.⁴⁶

One of the most characteristic features of the agricultural landscape of Turkey, in particular the Aegean and Mediterranean regions and the Meander valley, are the cotton fields whose produce makes an important contribution to the country's economy. The cotton plant, however, is not indigenous to Asia Minor, but there are indications that it was not completely unknown during early Antiquity. Philostratus alludes to a wool which springs from the ground, white like that of the Pamphylians.⁴⁷ There is no further evidence for cotton in Asia Minor at this time, and it might be assumed that it was introduced through the early Ptolemaic connections between Egypt and Pamphylia and cultivated on a small scale in Pamphylia.⁴⁸

One of the natural riches of Asia Minor is the forests. High and regular precipitation ensures that the forests of the Black Sea mountains are denser, with a more varied distribution of species, than those of the rest of Asia Minor. The central plateau alone is deficient in tree cover, and although there is evidence to suggest that this was not always so, it appears that during the Empire much of the plateau was as bare as it is today.⁴⁹ The southern highlands, however, were well covered with forest, no doubt more so than today; deforestation over the past two thousand years has interfered with the natural extent of the forest, although more recent tree-felling has been controlled and reafforestation programmes carried out from an awareness of the dangers of deforestation. Lycian and Cilician timber was highly rated,⁵⁰ and

the forests of the Pisidian Taurus were doubtless equally excellent and abundant. Strabo remarks on the variety of the timber which grew above Pamphylia.⁵¹ Timber was an important facility to everyday life. Essentials such as construction of buildings, furniture and fuel are fulfillable by other materials, but an accessible supply of timber is both less restrictive and more economical. Vast quantities were consumed by smelting and ship-building, the latter being an important industry in the ports and ship-yards of the south coast. Subsidiary forest produce such as resin and pitch were equally valuable to the ship-building industry in particular.

The sources record other products of the forest, notably styrax gum, iris root oil and scarlet cocchus dye. The gum extracted from the styrax bush was used in the making of javelins and frankincense; it was an important product of Cyprus, Cilicia and Pamphylia, in particular grown in the territory of Selge.⁵² The root of the iris was used in the manufacture of perfume and ointment, and was also common in the forests of Cilicia, Pamphylia and the territory of Selge.⁵³ Cocchus dye was produced by a parasite of the kermes oak which is found in most of the forests of western Asia Minor. Pliny and Dioscorides recommend that produced in Galatia, but also mention Pisidian, Asian, Cilician and Armenian.⁵⁴

Basic building stone was probably quarried locally in Antiquity, most cities having some kind of local supply. Much of the Taurus is composed of limestone which provided a ready source of inexpensive building material. Large limestone quarries have been found in the vicinity of the sites of Cremna and Sagalassus, and near the sanctuary site at Antiocheia; all discoveries were the result of recent research. Similar quarries must have existed close by most cities, although these

have not been discovered. Evidence from the sites of Etenna, Aspendus and Side, for instance, shows that local use was made of the conglomerate rock which is common in the southern Taurus (Pl. 6). Despite the crumbly texture, sandstone was also used where there was a local, and inexpensive, supply. All of the buildings at the site at Çaycı, near Etenna, were constructed of sandstone.⁵⁵ Luxury building stone, notably marble and granite, was obviously more expensive, as local supplies were few and far between. There is very little evidence for marble quarries in Pisidia and its surroundings. The quarries of Docimium near Iscehisar, north of Afyon, yielded a variety of marbles which were famous throughout the Mediterranean world.⁵⁶ It is not surprising to find samples of Docimian marble at Pisidian sites as the Docimian quarries would have been the closest source of luxury marble, and the least expensive in respect of transportation costs.

An inscription⁵⁷ records that the local marble of Sagalassus rivalled Phrygian, ie. Docimian, marble. Whether or not this is true is uncertain as the stone has not been identified. The texture of the limestone of the Pisidian highlands is very fine and, with a high polish, very hard unmetamorphosed limestone closely resembles marble.⁵⁸ Possibly local sources of marble or high quality limestone existed in the vicinity of other cities, but unknown to us because their fame did not reach the international market and the quarries have not been located. A thorough investigation into local quarries would be beneficial to a more complete understanding of this aspect of the economy of Asia Minor.

Turkey as a whole is rich in minerals, but it is almost certain that the sources were not as extensively exploited as they are today, either because of ignorance of their existence or because lack of local need

or a wider market made their exploitation unprofitable. One of the most well known mines in Asia Minor was that at Sizma in the territory of the Zizimmene Mother, near Laodiceia Catacecaumene, which yielded rich quantities of cinnabar.⁵⁹ Mines in the neighbourhood of Cibyra were probably the reason for the reputation of the iron workers in the city.⁶⁰

A supplementary source of food was fish, but its contribution to the ancient diet is unknown. Presumably fish constituted a fairly large part of the diet in regions where supplies were plentiful, but, unlike today, it was probably uneconomical and impractical to transport fish to regions where it was not local. The coastal settlements obviously had a ready supply of fresh sea food in the Mediterranean, Aegean, Marmara and Black Sea; the sturgeon of Pamphylia were particularly recommended.⁶¹ Inland, the availability of fish depended on the location of fresh-water lakes and rivers, in which respect Pisidia was favoured. Fishing is a popular occupation in the lakes of Eğridir and Beyşehir, the former renowned for a delicious crayfish, and fishing for trout is popular in the upper reaches of the Köprü Irmağı. Pococke noted that a plentiful supply of crayfish and enormous carp caught in the Meander near Dinar were considered an inexpensive source of food by the locals.⁶² Presumably the same resources were available to the settlements of the lake district during Antiquity.

Not all of the lakes supported life, and those which did not were exploitable in another way. The interior of Asia Minor was rich in salt lakes, the largest and most famous being Lake Tatta (modern Tuz Gölü) in Cappadocia.⁶³ To the west of Pisidia is Acı Gölü, ancient Lake Anava, smaller in size than Tuz Gölü, but with plentiful deposits of salt, and Arrian remarks that salt was collected from Lake Ascania (Burdur Gölü) in Antiquity.⁶⁴ Salt pans were also noted near Aspendus

by Pliny,⁶⁵ doubtless the Lake Capria recorded along with the salt lakes Tatta and Anava by Strabo.⁶⁶

Commercial Activities - Trade and Industry

It is far easier to assess the availability of raw materials during Antiquity than it is to evaluate the intensity of their exploitation and their profitability as marketable commodities.

On the whole, agriculture and animal husbandry can be considered as local enterprises, their edible produce important for local consumption, but contributing little to trade. Marketing of basic foodstuffs may have extended beyond the immediate locality if, for example, the requirements of a settlement exceeded production and surplus, due to a bad harvest or bad planning, and it was necessary to arrange for provision of additional supplies; perhaps a more stable and long-term arrangement might exist, one which was not spurred by misfortune but based instead on a mutual need, whereby, for example, settlements A and B, one rich in olives, the other in vines, made a trade agreement profitable to both sides. Such interchanges would generally have remained at a regional level. Grain, however, must have always been an important contributor to the market. Rome and Constantinople were almost completely dependent on imported grain, and references to corn doles and riots due to bread shortages show that supplies were not always adequate or consistent. An inscription from Pogla⁶⁷ illustrates that grain produced in the vicinity of this small inland settlement was exported as far as Alexandria, which is curious as Alexandria was one of the major markets of supply of grain for Rome and Constantinople.

Trading on a large scale was in the province of luxury items. It was by no means a new idea, familiar to Anatolian civilisations from very

early times. However, trade is founded to a certain extent on trust and friendship and a willingness to participate in much wider relationships. It is obvious that the character of most of the highland communities of Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period was not conducive to friendly relations with outside, and the scale of their trading was probably restricted to the basic interchanges described above. But with the infiltration of Hellenistic and, later, Roman culture came both an awareness of more civilised ideas and a desire for the luxurious trappings of this 'civilisation'; the improvement of communication systems facilitated the means to carry out commercial exchanges with settlements and regions further afield.

Those larger settlements which adopted the aspect of a city during the Hellenistic period, having become acquainted with Hellenistic culture and traditions, would certainly have developed more expansive commercial relationships than the majority of the highland communities. Even before adequate communication and trade routes through Pisidia had been established, there would have been relatively little difficulty for the richer inhabitants of Termessus and Selge to import luxury goods via the cities and ports of the Pamphylian plain, and the more northerly Pisidian citizens of Sagalassus, Antiocheia and Apollonia had similar opportunities via Apameia and the East-West highway. To what extent this was taken advantage of during the Hellenistic period is uncertain, but it is unlikely that the inhabitants of those settlements which had knowledge of and contact with the luxuries of the civilised centres of the Hellenistic world would relinquish opportunities for requiring luxury items, either fabrics, ornaments and perfumes for household or personal use, or decorative marbles and stone to enhance the beauty of their homes and cities.

The location of trade routes and markets is an important consideration in assessing the commercial situation of Asia Minor and its various provinces. Transportation of goods by sea was the quickest and the most economical method,⁶⁸ despite the adversities posed by winter weather conditions and marauding pirates. Land transportation was equally fraught with hazards, and, without the modern advantage of motorised vehicles, transportation by road was relatively time-consuming and costly. So the coastal ports remained at the forefront of commercial activity, and opportunities for increased prosperity were greater for the coastal cities than for the cities of the interior.

Land routes might have been less economical and speedy than sea routes, but they were just as essential, and probably preferable in the winter. The development of the road system of Asia Minor was a major contribution to the ease and speed of both ordinary travel and commercial traffic. By the 1st century BC the great East-West highway between the Aegean coast and the East, via the Meander valley, Apameia and Iconium, was established, and this remained the most direct and important commercial highway across Asia Minor until the 4th century. There were two possible roads between Apameia and Iconium, the first following the contours of the northern side of the Sultan Dağları, and the second passing through the cities of Phrygia Paroreios, Apollonia and Antiocheia, to the south of the mountain range, and thence via Philomelium to Iconium. Naturally, those cities situated on the major highways were of great commercial importance. The crucial location of Apameia ensured that this city long remained second to Ephesus as a market for merchandise from Anatolia and for imported goods from Italy and Greece.⁶⁹

An alternative means of transportation in the interior may have been

via the easily-navigable rivers, of which the Meander would have been the most commonly used for the moving of large and unwieldy consignments of goods, from central Anatolia to the Aegean coast. Again, Apameia's location near the source of the Meander confirmed her importance as a commercial centre for merchandise which had to be transported from the interior to the coast.

The improvement of the road system was beneficial to the settlements of the interior themselves and to those of the coast and further afield. The economic advantages to the inland settlements are obvious. The consequent more intensive exploitation of what valuable resources existed in the interior created profitable opportunities for marketing and export, luxury goods from outside became more accessible, and the expense of their importation lessened as land transportation became easier. Although the coastal cities might have relinquished their absolute monopoly on commercial activity, this loss was probably balanced by the gains which were made through their crucial positions as entrepôts for merchandise transported from central Asia Minor to outside, and vice versa, and, again, the riches of the interior, relatively few though they may have been, were more readily available.

There were two major openings for trade into and out of Pisidia. One was via the roads and rivers of north-south orientation which linked the highlands with the Pamphylian plain, and thus to the rest of the Mediterranean world via the busy harbours of Attaleia and Side, ports of call for vessels travelling to both east and west Mediterranean.⁷⁰ The second outlet was by the East-West highway, a section of which directly served Apollonia and Antiocheia. The internal road system of Pisidia, established under Augustus, together with the proximity of the commercial centre of Apameia, ensured that the participation of Pisidia

in the overall commercial network of the ancient world was not as restricted by geographical drawbacks as it had been prior to the 1st century.

Despite this increased involvement of the inland settlements in the commercial world, however, there remained a marked regional contrast between the Pamphylian plain, with its large cities constantly receiving foreign trade, and the highlands, whose economy was still founded on production of basic foodstuffs rather than luxury articles. For fundamentally geographical reasons, this economic contrast must have always persisted, and it seems logical that, in comparison with the settlements of the coastal regions, the prosperity of the settlements of the highlands must have been restricted in this respect. On the other hand, commercial ventures are not always favourable, and a community or region whose economic enterprises are confined to the immediate locality, with the emphasis on self-sufficiency and relatively little dependence on wider commercial activities, would run less risk of suffering drastically during a commercial crisis than the community or region which relies heavily on commerce and trade.

That commerce was important to the cities of Pisidia hardly needs proving, but might be illustrated by the portrayal of Mercury, as patron of commerce, on coins of Antiocheia and Cremna.⁷¹ Alliance coins between cities of the interior and harbour cities of the coast might be suggestive of special economic ties. Instances are Apameia and Ephesus, Apollonia and Perge, Apollonia and the Lycians, and Sagalassus and Side.⁷² If coinage were a purely economic phenomenon one might consider those settlements which issued during the Republic to have already established stable commercial links. However, even if it might be assumed, which is highly dubious, that those cities at which a large number of coins have been

found were deeply involved in commerce and trade, one cannot make economic comparisons on purely numismatic evidence as there is no certainty that the quantity of coins found at cities is an accurate reflection of the number issued or used.

Naturally, those products and materials which were exported from Pisidia and her neighbourhood were the ones whose rarity made them valuable or whose abundance made them profitable. These factors were essential to compensate for high transportation costs to markets further afield. The most marketable commodity in this first category was the marble which was quarried near Docimium. The most precious of the three white marbles found here had an individual quality which rivalled white marbles from elsewhere in the Mediterranean and was quarried in huge quantities for use mainly as sarcophagi and sculpture.⁷³ The most distinctive marble from the Docimian quarries was that known as pavana-zetto whose principal use was decorative.⁷⁴ These two types of Docimian marble in particular ensured that the quarries remained of great commercial importance throughout Antiquity. The popularity of the Docimian marble is confirmed by the many examples found at sites not only in central Asia Minor and the west and south coasts, but as far afield as Italy,⁷⁵ and by the numerous references to Docimian marble in the sources, celebrated in the verses of the poets as a symbol of richness and luxury.⁷⁶ Although its early use in only private buildings was deplored by some authors as extravagant ostentation,⁷⁷ by the mid 1st century AD, however, it was commonly used in public buildings also. The quarries were situated near Docimium, but the marble was described variously as Docimian, Phrygian and Synnadac.⁷⁸ The reason for the term 'Synnadac' marble was on account of the main depot and marketing base being located at Synnada, whence it was distributed to other markets, the most common direction of transportation being via Apameia and

the Meander valley to Ephesus. Quarry marks show that exploitation of the quarries was most industrious during the early Empire,⁷⁹ but there is testimony that quarrying continued into the Byzantine period.⁸⁰ Whether it had been resumed after an unproductive period is uncertain, but it is not unlikely that demand slackened at some time during the late Empire and was never revived to the vigorous rate of the 1st and 2nd centuries, for reasons of shortage of purchasing funds and the economical practice of robbing valuable marble from earlier structures for reuse in new buildings.

As noted above, Docimian marble is commonly found at Pisidian sites, the quarries being a convenient source of supply. White Docimian and pavane-zetto, and sometimes grey, can be recognised at Antiocheia, Cremna and Apollonia-Sozopolis.⁸¹ Capitals of Proconessian marble have been found at Cremna.⁸² A few fragments of verde antico have been noted at Antiocheia, and cippollino columns and fragments of both cippollino and purple porphyry have been found reused at Cremna. An interesting point is that very little marble and few decorated architectural fragments have been found at the sites of Adada and Ariassus; these two sites have yet to be fully investigated.

One of the raw materials of Asia Minor which was constantly in demand was timber, of which large quantities of excellent quality were found especially in the Taurus mountains. The multitude of uses for timber made it a valuable commodity in Antiquity. Forests were first exploited for local use, but felling of trees was often indiscriminate due to a lack of understanding of the ecological problems this can cause. The consequent reduction of local supplies in regions where timber was not prolific in any case, together with the increase of large-scale industry which required larger quantities of timber for smelting and ship-building in particular, and an awareness of the virtues of different kinds of wood for different purposes, some of which were not available locally, resulted in the

expansion of the timber trade.⁸³

The Pisidian Taurus would have been the closest source of material for construction in the ship-yards at Side,⁸⁴ which suggests that exploitation of the forests above the Pamphylian plain was vigorous. Presumably the rivers Eurymedon and Melas were used as the means of transportation. There were doubtless adequate supplies of timber on the more southerly Taurus slopes to avoid the difficulties of transporting logs from the more inaccessible northern slopes. One has only to think of the fleets of the Persians, the Cilician pirates and Pompey to understand that ship-building was an important enterprise from early times; the increase of trade across the seas, necessitating more and more vessels for transportation, meant that construction of ships remained an essential and profitable activity. The dock-yards at Side and those at Hamaxia, to the east,⁸⁵ presumably retained their monopoly of ship-building on this part of the coast throughout Antiquity, and ensured that the forests above Pamphylia made an important contribution to the ship-building economy. The existence of a municipal forest at Trebenna in Lycia⁸⁶ implies that local awareness of the values of the forests did exist, but there is no direct evidence to indicate just how profitable the ship-building industry was to the settlements in whose territory the timber was felled. It would not be out of character for the Imperial government to take advantage of the revenue obtainable from the forests.

It was presumably only the timber of the southern slopes of the Taurus which was exploited for exportation to industrial centres outside the immediate neighbourhood. The timber of the more northerly highland regions was probably confined to local use and thereby protected from the dangers of deforestation by over-exploitation. Practically every

settlement in Pisidia had a ready supply of timber close by, and it would never have been a commodity which the Pisidians had to import. Despite the possibilities of surviving without fuel or building materials in the form of wood, using dung, mud-brick and stone as substitutes, it is likely that those parts of the central plateau which were deficient in tree cover did import some quantities of timber from nearby, probably using both the northern forests and those of the Sultan Dağları as sources of supply.

Certain of the products of the interior which would generally be classed as basic did possess exceptional qualities which place them in the category of export items. Among these were forest produce such as the styrax gum and iris root oil, common products of the forests around Selge, and the scarlet cocchus dye. The praise of each of these items by ancient authors⁸⁷ suggests that their fame was reasonably widespread and that they were numbered among the export articles of the Pisidian highlands.

Despite the ubiquity of the vine, there were many varieties, some of which were localised and thus relatively rare and desirable. The excellence of Apameian wine as an aperitif,⁸⁸ and that of Ambladian wine as an aid to medicinal diets,⁸⁹ gave them an individuality and value through which they were doubtless common contributors to the export market. The same probably applies to Selgian wine,⁹⁰ the table wine of Termessus⁹¹ and the Skybelites grapes of Pamphylia from which were produced both wine and raisins.⁹²

The olive, as part of the diet, was probably restricted to more local markets. It did not possess varieties of excellence to the same extent as did the vine, was common to all the Mediterranean lands, but not to all regions, with the result that it was presumably imported by

settlements in those districts where it could not be grown, from the closest and most economical source of supply. Olive oil, on the other hand, was in great demand. Gymnasia in particular consumed huge quantities at great expense. Discoveries of containers for oil far from their place of manufacture and in shipwrecks testifies that oil was transported long distances and on a regular basis. The cities of the interior would hardly have profited from olive oil production and probably had to import oil for both public and private consumption.

Another product of the highlands and inland plateau areas of Asia Minor was the sheep's wool and goat's hair whose many uses, abundance and high quality made it a viable export commodity. The sheep of Apameia produced a fine wool and the long-haired goats of Phrygia and Cilicia provided a coarser wool which was in demand, by armies in particular, for the manufacture of cloaks, socks and leggings, sacks, rope and horse blankets.⁹³ In this case there is ample evidence from the sources to prove that it was exported to Rome under Augustus, an arrangement which probably continued throughout Antiquity, depending on demand and economic stability. It can be inferred from Strabo⁹⁴ that sheep farming could be an extremely profitable business.

The fame of the horses of Phrygia might suggest that they were raised for wider distribution than to satisfy merely local demand, and the fact that the horse ranches of the later Empire were Imperially owned is further indication of this. As the horse was not a commonly bred animal and was constantly required by armies and, to a lesser extent, by citizens of wealth and rank, it might be assumed that all places where horses were bred contributed in some capacity to a wider market. The mules of Galatia were renowned,⁹⁵ as were the wild asses of Lycaonia which were exported to Rome.⁹⁶ Wild swine were not uncommon

in forested districts and pork was eaten in Asia Minor before the advent of Islam. The hams of Lycia and Cibyra compared with those of Gaul and were presumably exported.⁹⁷ Pliny mentions wild pig in Pamphylia.⁹⁸

The almost essential use of salt in the diet, for taste, mineral supply and preservation, presumably made all sources of salt important means of income, but exactly how great a contribution the salt from the lakes of central Anatolia made to the commercial market is uncertain. The largest contributor to the salt market would have been Lake Tatta, by virtue of both its size and its proximity to the major highway and trade route across Asia Minor. From here a 'salt road' led to Pessinus.⁹⁹ Lakes Anava and Ascania, although smaller in size, were also close to the same highway, and these, together with Lake Capria in Pamphylia, would certainly have supplied a regional, if not wider, market, considering that sources of salt were few and far between. It is not certain, however, whether or not the cities in the vicinity benefited much from the salt trade. Broughton suggests that the rights to the revenue from salt pans were owned by the State.¹⁰⁰ This was certainly true of coastal fishing rights,¹⁰¹ but it is not known if it was also the case with the income from fishing in lakes and rivers.

Obviously, it is difficult to evaluate the extent of the contribution of various products to the economy, as this would have depended not only on availability, but also on demand and the feasibility of exporting certain commodities, about which the sources provide little enlightenment.

With the advancement of technical knowledge and the interchange of ideas came the development of crafts and industries. Ship-building has already been discussed briefly, but it must be emphasised that this was one of the most active and expanding industries of the coastal settlements,

particularly those with busy harbours and ready supplies of timber, Even given that it might be a gross exaggeration, Strabo's numbering of the ship-yards at Cyzicus as over two hundred¹⁰² is clear indication of just how important was the ship-building industry. Where the early users of sailing vessels might have constructed or commissioned their ships on a rather haphazard basis, ship-building eventually developed into a better organised business with more fully trained craftsmen and regular commissions. New vessels and repairs were in constant demand. The Cilician pirates required ships for their frequent raids, and many vessels were needed for the battles conducted against them during the 1st century BC. The figures given for the navy of Pompey at the culmination of this series of battles perhaps gives an idea of just how many ships might be required for the purpose of warring alone. According to Appian,¹⁰³ Pompey's fleet was composed of 600 vessels, 270 of which he used against the pirates, a proportion of which must have come from the dock-yards of Asia Minor. Destruction of ships during the civil wars maintained the demand. In addition to those vessels commissioned by the navies, there were the trading ships, either Imperial or privately owned, which kept up a steady traffic in the seas. As long-distance trade increased, so the number of vessels required for transportation multiplied. Naturally, ship-building was an industry confined to the coastal cities, and the inland settlements, apart from those whose territories might provide the basic materials, were denied such a form of income and employment, thus providing an aspect of economic contrast between the coast and the interior.

Smelting was another industry which consumed vast quantities of timber. There is little evidence for the industry, but the number of products which would have required smelting suggest that it was an essential and universal business. The renown of the iron workers at Cibyra implies

that smelting was a large scale industry in the area.¹⁰⁴ The epithet 'Combusta' or 'Catacecaumene' of Laodiceia has never been satisfactorily explained, and an interesting possibility is that it might refer to the presence of smelting furnaces in or near the city.¹⁰⁵

The mines at Sizma were probably initially part of the estate belonging to the temple of the Zizimmene Mother, but it seems that they were taken over by the State and the revenue diverted to the Imperial treasury.¹⁰⁶ The name of Cinnaborium, located on the East-West highway, suggests that here was a distribution centre for the export of the cinnabar.¹⁰⁷

Most of our information for industries other than ship-building refers to stone-cutting and the manufacture of textiles and pottery. This is not surprising as not only did each of these crafts furnish products more or less essential to everyday life, but a demand for the finer and more luxurious articles created a need for superior craftsmanship in these fields.

Local stonecutters were probably employed for basic work, and the more skilled of these might have carried out more elaborate work on the decorative stone-cutting and engraving required for both public and private buildings, the cutting of inscriptions and grave reliefs. There is evidence for, besides the local stone workers who provided services for the local communities, the existence of schools of skilled stone-cutters and sculptors which sent out trained artisans to wherever they were needed.¹⁰⁸ To enlist the services of an itinerant stone-worker was perhaps more popular than to commission articles from a fixed and probably distant workshop.

Itinerant workers were not uncommon,¹⁰⁹ and the salary of a skilled stone-cutter relatively high.¹¹⁰ Examples of these itinerant workers show that two of the most famous schools of stone-cutters were connected with the marble quarries of Docimium and Aphrodisias; it is hardly surprising that the vicinity of two of the famous marble quarries of Antiquity should foster the training of workers in marble. By inference, it might be assumed that the majority of inscriptions recording citizens of Docimium found in other localities have the significance of referring to such workers. Instances are known from Vasada, Apollonia, Tymandus and Iconium, among other places.¹¹¹

The pottery industry was probably the most universal of all. Basic wares for domestic use were presumably produced by the potters of the individual community, and constant local demand would ensure that business on this level continued. More elaborate wares might also be fashioned locally, but as the perfection of these relied not on the skill of the potter alone but also on the quality of the medium, it is likely that luxury table ware was supplied from famous centres of pottery production. It has certainly been proved that pottery was an important aspect of the import-export business in areas where studies have been carried out. Unfortunately, practically no research has been done on the pottery of the interior of Asia Minor, and although it is safe to assume that imports were fairly common, to what extent is uncertain. Even though fine wares might have been imported, there would always be business for the local potter to fulfil continual demands for inexpensive basic domestic wares, and as such it was a reliable industry and means of employment.

The manufacture of certain textiles and associated businesses is an industry which, due to the abundance and the excellence of animals and their pastures, made many districts of central Anatolia important centres of production. Development of trade and improvement of communication routes extended the range of commercial enterprise with the result that, in the case of textile manufacture, production rate and centres multiplied, and the monopoly passed from the west coast of Asia Minor to the interior.¹¹² Production of inexpensive coarse woollens was probably localised in areas where grazing was possible. More specialised manufacture of goods for both local use and export purposes made use of the finer wools of sheep and the coarse goat hair which was highly praised for the making of hardwearing garments and other articles. Tertullian remarks on the vestments of Selge,¹¹³ a confirmation of Strabo's comment on the quality of the flocks in this city's territory.¹¹⁴ Praise of the flocks and herds of Lycaonia and Apameia¹¹⁵ implies that manufacture of woollen articles might be a flourishing industry in these regions where the raw products were close at hand. Leather goods were manufactured from the hides of sheep, and references to associations of leather workers from Apameia, Cibyra and Termessus¹¹⁶ confirm that leather working was an important industry. The only evidence for a dyeing industry in Pisidia comes from Sagalassus,¹¹⁷ but one might suppose that dyers were not uncommon in a region where production of the articles which require dyeing was prolific. One of the chief occupations of the inhabitants of Burdur during the last two centuries was the tanning and dyeing of leather.¹¹⁸

Finer textiles such as linen, cotton and silk were probably imported to central Asia Minor from the main centres of production where the raw materials were more common. Although cotton is grown today in many parts

of modern Turkey, it appears that it was virtually unknown in Antiquity. It might be inferred from Philostratus¹¹⁹ that cotton was grown in Pamphylia, and presumably probably woven into cloth on a small scale, but this is a rare instance of the existence of the raw material in Asia Minor. It is not certain what types of materials were used for clothes. Probably the inhabitants of central Asia Minor usually wore woollen garments, both coarse and fine, as the material was readily available and relatively inexpensive.

Agriculture continued to be the major economic activity, but the development of industry gave not only opportunities for the merchants and the owners of the various businesses but also an alternative means of employment to the working man. This might have been an attractive alternative to those agricultural workers who were suffering because of the problems caused by increased taxation of the land and the growing rift in status among the members of the agricultural hierarchy.

One reflection of the growing importance of industries and commercial crafts and of the increasing participation of commercial workers in the economy, is the formation of guilds and trade associations to protect the rights of the workers. Much of the evidence for guilds dates from the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, suggesting that this was the period when industrial activity in the towns and cities was well established and the workers felt both the need for protection and the power to bring about the formation of such associations. The handful of inscriptions which point to the existence of guilds in and around Pisidia are sufficient to indicate that this had become a common enough practice in this region by the 3rd century AD. Among the inscriptions from Apameia referring to trade associations is one from the 2nd century specifically recording a guild of leather workers.¹²⁰ There also existed a guild of leather

workers at Termessus in the early 3rd century,¹²¹ and an association of leather tanners is recorded at Cibyra.¹²² An association of dyers existed at Sagalassus in the late 2nd century.¹²³ Other trades protected by guilds include quarrymen, recorded at Termessus,¹²⁴ builders of Docimium, recorded at Iconium,¹²⁵ and gardeners, recorded at Cibyra.¹²⁶

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCHES OF PISIDIA

The most valuable archaeological evidence for occupation of a settlement after the 4th century tends to be of an ecclesiastical or a defensive nature. Closer examination of a site might reveal a replugging of earlier fortifications, repair of domestic structures or remodelling of public buildings, but these are seldom datable. Unless a site has been excavated, datable small finds are not abundant. Obvious Byzantine fortifications are few and far between in the Pisidian highlands and so it is the churches which provide the best, often the only, source of information about late Antiquity.

There has been no systematic survey of the Pisidian churches. This is an attempt both to describe what does survive and to correlate the evidence as far as possible. There are two major drawbacks. Firstly, there has been no excavation of the churches in the region, apart from those at the main site of Antiocheia, the reports of neither of which are entirely satisfactory. Excavation of the basilica was primarily concerned with the mosaic floor of the first phase of construction, and there exist only brief comments on the other church at the site. Secondly, one has to rely, sometimes completely, on the accounts of earlier travellers for structures which have since deteriorated or to which access is very difficult. Some of these descriptions are, fortunately, very thorough; others leave a lot to be desired.

What follows is an account of the ecclesiastical remains of the Pisidian settlements, inevitably in catalogue form. Firstly, the churches of the bishoprics of Pisidia, Pamphylia and Lycaonia are described in the order given by the Notitiae, excluding those which lie outside the geographical boundaries outlined in the Introduction. This is followed by a description of the churches of sites which are not known to have been bishoprics.

PISIDIA

ANTIOCHEIA

At the main city site there survive a basilica and a church which may have had a Latin cross plan, and at the sanctuary site is a further church of basilican plan. The standing remains of the basilica overlies an earlier basilica which epigraphic evidence shows to have been built by AD 381 at the latest, and there is reason to favour a 4th century date for the other two churches also.

The basilica is located inside the city wall on the low-lying west part of the site. Much of the building was excavated during the first quarter of this century, the main object of interest being a mosaic floor which belonged to the earliest known phase of construction (Fig. 3).¹ The standing remains are of a later basilica built on the site of the early structure (Fig. 2). A plan drawn by the excavation architect, F. J. Woodbridge, incorporates details of both the mosaic and the ground plan of the later building (Fig. 1). There is no scale to the plan but, if the proportions are correct, using our knowledge of the dimensions of the later basilica, it seems that the longitudinal axis of the early building was approximately one metre to the south of that of the later basilica and that the east and west extremities of the early nave were about 6-7 metres west of the corresponding ends of the later nave. These observations are implied by the extent of the mosaic whose east end is somewhat short of the later apse and whose west end is incomplete, interrupted by the west wall of the later nave. It is, however, unknown if the apse itself represented the sanctuary area of the early basilica or if there was a chancel between the apse and the solea in the eastern section of the mosaic; if the latter was the case, the nave of the early basilica was probably slightly longer. If the mosaic covered the full width of the early nave, this nave was about $1\frac{1}{2}$ metres narrower than the

later nave.

Structural details of the early building are unknown, but it does appear that the later basilica was constructed consciously along the lines of the early basilica, with almost identical dimensions. The date of the later basilica is unknown. It is unlikely that the first basilica would have been left to fall into disrepair; it might be considered unlikely that the first basilica would have been purposely dismantled, only to be replaced by a structure of almost equal proportions; however, we have knowledge only of the mosaic floor, and a few ideas on the ground plan, of the first basilica, and it may be that this building was dismantled to make way for a basilica of grander appearance. Alternatively, the demise of the first basilica was unplanned and unforeseen; there are no signs or records of a damaging influence, natural or otherwise, before the early 8th century when the city was attacked by the Arabs, and it might be considered that the instrument of destruction was the Arab attack in AD 712/3, and that, at a date when Antiocheia had regained some of her former strength and prestige, a replacement basilica was constructed as closely as possible to the plan of and on the same lines as the former building. This, however; must remain a very tentative suggestion. There is, in fact, no certainty that the main site was reoccupied after the 8th century. If the destruction of the first basilica was not planned, it is more plausible that the agent of destruction was an earthquake. In any case, a pre-8th century date is much more credible than a post-8th century date.

The eastern section of the mosaic is an arrangement of two squared panels on either side of a narrow band laid along the longitudinal axis of the basilica. There are indications that this central band was separated from the panels by a parapet, thereby giving the earliest

dated example of a solea ever found.² Two of the four inscriptions worked into the mosaic, both in the central band, are extracts from the Psalms, and the texts provide a unique early Christian example of the wording of the inscription on the floor reflecting the very action of approaching the altar. The other two inscriptions record the name of bishop Optimus who represented Antiocheia at the Council of Constantinople in AD 381,³ thus giving a terminus antequem for the building which the mosaic adorned. Directly to the west is a succession of four larger squared panels, each separated from the next by a frame which also encloses the whole of this section. The similarities in the abstract design of both parts of the mosaic suggest that, despite different donors, the whole floor was laid around the same time.

At present, there is no way of knowing if the mosaic was contemporary with the first known basilica or if it was laid some years after the building's construction. None of the early Byzantine fragments in the museum can be attributed exclusively to this basilica, and are, in any case, not datable closely enough to imply that the basilica itself was of an early rather than a late 4th century date. One would expect that, if a fitting place of worship did not already exist, an ecclesiastical building worthy of Antiocheia's status as metropolitan archbishopric of Pisidia would have been erected as an immediate consequence of her promotion. If this basilica had not been standing for three quarters of a century before the laying of the mosaic, it is conceivable that an even earlier, simpler church once stood on the site, a building which was demolished in the latter half of the 4th century in favour of a grander structure. Without meticulous excavation this question will remain unanswered.

Some of the masonry of the earlier basilica may have been used in the later basilica but, because of the different alignments of the two

buildings, there is little cause to suspect that any of the extant walls have stood since the 4th century. The best preserved part of the basilica is the north outer wall (Pl. 19). The lowest visible course is of very large rectangular blocks laid flat. Above is a double course of similar blocks laid on end of which only the outer row remains. Arundell noted two doors in this wall.⁴ The only suggestion that one of the gaps in the wall might have been a doorway rather than a consequence of disrepair is the fact that the end block of the section of wall to the east of the opening is laid across the full width of the wall rather than along its length. Only two blocks of the south wall remain in situ, and a further two mark the southeast corner of the basilica. The measurement from the apse to the west wall of the nave is just over 50 metres. The total width is c. 25 metres. The apse is semi-circular on the inside and polygonal, with six edges, on the outside. A single incomplete course survives to show that the thickness of the apse wall was formed by two stones.

Two fairly tall blocks define the doorway at the west end of the north aisle. In between is half of the threshold stone, marked with a squared depression for a door post. Arundell recorded a door at the end of both aisles, each with a width of 10 feet, and a third doorway, 15 feet wide, in the centre of the wall, at the west end of the nave.⁵ The width of the actual door at the end of the north aisle can be calculated at a little over 2 metres. Nothing further survives of this division between the narthex and the main body of the basilica, unless two fairly shapeless blocks at the west end of the nave are in situ, in which case the west wall of the basilica was c. 2 metres thick.

West of the nave is uncertain territory as nothing remains in situ. The narthex was only partially excavated and the colonnade marking the western extreme of the narthex on Woodbridge's plan is conjectural.

According to Arundell, the north and south sides of the basilica extended

55 feet beyond the west wall to form a 'portico',⁶ from which it can be assumed that there was a walled forecourt attached to the narthex.

A stylobate surmounted by a colonnade divided the nave from each of the aisles. The stylobate was formed by reused white limestone blocks of a uniform cross-section, some with a length of over $2\frac{1}{2}$ metres, others shorter and squared. In situ in the north stylobate are three long blocks, two of which are adjoining and bear the mason's marks for the positioning of the column bases. Using the distance between the mason's marks and the known total length of the stylobate, a perfect calculation of 13 full columns plus a half column or pilaster at each end can be made for each stylobate. In situ in the south stylobate is another long block, also bearing the same mason's marks. One squared block remains in situ in the south stylobate, a toppled squared block in each of the stylobates, and a further squared block was found in the north aisle. Nothing survives of the colonnade itself, but in one of the excavation photographs can be seen a large octagonal column base lying in the north aisle. The foundation of the stylobates was a bed of white mortared rubble, patches of which are visible along the length of each stylobate. Between this layer of mortared rubble and a similar layer visible at a lower level in the south division, are grey limestone blocks laid flat. These may have been a feature of the early basilica and might be found by excavation beneath the north division also, or, alternatively, they represent additional foundation to compensate for the slightly downward sloping ground on the south side of the basilica.

During the excavation, a concrete floor was found at the west end of the north aisle at a level of c. 60 cms. above the mosaic. This was no doubt a feature of the later basilica but it is unclear whether or not it also covered the floor of the nave. Several skeletons in graves were found underneath the mosaic, but as neither their positions nor

other details were recorded it is unknown if they pre-dated the mosaic or if they had been let into the floor at a later date.

The church is located towards the centre of the site, overlooking the theatre and the basilica. Very little of the building survives (Fig. 4). Structural details which are not apparent today were uncovered during the excavation but the only useful recorded information is a photograph of the eastern section of the church only (Fig. 5). The best preserved part is the apse which stands practically as it was in 1924 (Pl. 20). The lower course of fifteen blocks is complete, and of the second course four blocks survive. Both the outer and the inner faces are smoothed and the grey limestone blocks neatly fitted. The lower course rests on a foundation of rubble, white mortar and small cut stones. The depth of the apse to the inner face is 5.96 metres and the internal width is 8.275 metres. The apse was enclosed by a bounding wall of which a single block remains in situ, giving a measurement of $1\frac{1}{2}$ metres between the apse itself and the wall.

Of the rest of the church very little masonry survives and it is not clear whether some of this is in situ or not. The total length of the church can be calculated at 43 metres and the width at 25.50 metres. The excavators presumed that the church was of Latin cross plan, the horizontal arms of the cross forming a transept. The sketch plan of the church produced on the plan of the site published in the Art Bulletin⁷ shows a Latin cross plan with free-standing arms. Whether or not the outer walls of the church were excavated or observed is uncertain, but the line of the north outer wall which extends westwards from the end of the north arm of the 'transept', parallel to the nave, can in fact be traced. It is perhaps more plausible, then, that the church was actually of simple basilican plan with side chambers at the east end of the aisles. It might be inferred from the excavation photograph

that the nave was divided from the central part of the 'transept', i.e. the chancel, by a parapet or screen, unless the grooves discernable in some of the blocks defining this division are merely a vestige of their former use. It also appears from the photograph that a division marked the north and south sides of the chancel, which was narrower than the width of the apse. These divisions were possibly in the form of arcades supported on small rectangular piers, two of which can be seen in the photograph. In turn, the width of the nave was yet narrower again and can be roughly estimated at just over 5 metres.

Further internal details are unclear. Three or four blocks on the line of the nave-aisle divisions might be in situ, but the form of these divisions is uncertain. Of the extreme west wall, seven adjoining blocks remain on the north side of the place where a central entrance might be conjectured, and a further three blocks define the northwest corner. A line of accumulated earth c. 5 metres to the east of this wall is perhaps excavation spoil. A single block some distance further east might represent the west end of the nave. The plan of the west end of the church is, however, unclear. If the single block does indeed represent the west end of the nave, either there was a very deep regular narthex or there was a narrow narthex with perhaps an outer porch or some other feature at the extreme west end of the church.

Ramsay reported a second, smaller apse between the main apse and the bounding wall, its north wall joining the main apse and its south wall merging into the south wall of the church.⁸ Within the small apse were supposedly the remains of the stone foundation for a bench and desk. Unfortunately, there is no available excavation report to give confirmation to Ramsay's remarks, nor is it possible to judge from the remains as they now stand to what extent Ramsay's observation might have been the result of his imagination. The details of the area between the 'main' apse and the bounding wall are now obscured by an accumulation

of earth. There is, however, an irregularity, a slight protrusion, on the otherwise regular and smooth outer face of the apse, less than a metre from its south end, and the outer corner of the end of the apse has been cut away (Pl. 21). This is perhaps an indication that Ramsay's observation should not be completely dismissed. Unfortunately, the protrusion is only barely visible, jutting out c. 15 cms. to the south, itself covered by the accumulated earth. If there was indeed a small apse, the protrusion must represent the point at which the small apse joined the main apse. A minor excavation would no doubt clarify the problem. Ramsay also noted a communicating door, but its reported position varies. In 1928, the door was described as being between the small apse and the space between the main apse and the bounding wall; in an article of 1930, the door was positioned between the small apse and the main apse.⁹ There is no possibility of there having been a door in the wall of the main apse, and so this remark at least must be regarded as erroneous. A door between the small apse and the space behind suggests a kind of eastern passage.

Ramsay's theory that the small apse marked the sanctity of the spot where Paul preached and that the church was built on the site of the synagogue, perhaps even using the same foundations,¹⁰ is highly improbable. There are no parallels to support such a theory. The Jewish race did not become obsolete with official recognition of Christianity in the early 4th century and the Jewish community of Antiocheia would still have required a synagogue in which to worship. It is much more credible that the small apse was a baptistry, perhaps, approached from the side room at the east end of the south aisle. If there was an eastern passage there was probably also a doorway at the opposite side of the apse. It is also worth considering that the small apse might have been a martyrium, although neither of these alternatives can be seriously entertained without first verifying the existence of

the second apse and the nature of the church.

Ramsay suggested that the church was dedicated to the martyrs Neon, Nikon and Heliodorus, and that the name of the first bishop of Antiocheia was Basus.¹¹ These suppositions were made on the strength of an iron seal found during the excavations; on one side were the names and the representations of the three martyrs, on the other the name Basus, or Bassus, in monogram. On account of its large size and the fact that it was not fashioned from a precious material, Ramsay argued that the seal must have belonged to the church rather than to an individual; however, the genitive of the name Basus might suggest private ownership. Moreover, the seal was first said to have been found whilst tracing the streets of the city;¹² Ramsay's later assertion that the find spot was the church,¹³ then, seems dubious. Neon, Nikon and Heliodorus were martyred at Antiocheia, under Diocletian, but the seal alone is not convincing proof that the church was dedicated to the three martyrs. Only if it could be shown that this was a martyrial church does Ramsay's theory merit consideration.

Ramsay dated the church to the 4th century, but his reasons are unconvincing. A 4th, or 5th, century date is acceptable, however, if two frieze blocks found on the church site were designed specifically to adorn the church. One of these blocks appears on the excavation photograph. Its decoration consists of a simple palmette design and Latin cross. The block is positioned squarely in the northeast corner of the south aisle, at floor level. As one would expect open floor here, it seems that the block was placed thus for photographic purposes rather than being in situ and reused. A second block of the same frieze remains on the site, in the south aisle and definitely not in situ. The most convincing interpretation at present is that the frieze was contemporary with the church. On stylistic grounds the frieze can be

dated to the 4/5th century. In the museum is a capital for which no comparisons can be found, but the similarity of its unusual palmette design to the open palmette motif of the frieze might suggest a similar date. Possibly the provenance of the capital was the church. The only other evidence for decoration comprises several tesserae of green glass and a broken piece of a pavanazetto column with an oval cross-section. A quantity of tile fragments implies a tiled roof.

The church at the sanctuary site has a regular basilican plan with nave, two aisles, apse at the east end and narthex at the west (Fig. 6). Two unusual features are the main entrance in the short north wall of the narthex and a room at the east end of the south aisle, wider than the aisle itself. The total length of the building, from the apse to the outer wall of the narthex is c. 22 metres and the width c. 13 metres. Of the apse two complete courses survive; the third course is incomplete at its north end, and three blocks of the fourth course remain. Both inner and outer faces are rounded and the grey limestone masonry seems to have been fixed with white mortar which has now crumbled away. Before the apse was the chancel, c. 4 metres long, which was separated from the nave proper by screening. Five long narrow stones remain at floor level, laid end to end along the line of the division. Cuttings in these stones show that there were two chancel screens with a narrow gap in the middle.

A row of blocks, mostly of a fine white limestone, marks the division between the nave and each of the aisles. A reused marble block placed on top of the north division, 1.45 metres from its west end, has six holes in its upper face, the arrangement of which suggests that it was surmounted by a round base. There are several column fragments on the site but none of these can be attributed for certain to the nave-aisle divisions. At the east end of the south aisle, on line with the screening

between the nave and the chancel, is the threshold stone for a door which opened into the small room. The room is squarish, about a metre wider than the aisle itself. It was perhaps separated from the chancel by a colonnaded or arcaded division. This is suggested by blocks at floor level which are of the same dimensions and on the same line as the nave-aisle division. The function of this room is not absolutely certain, but the existence of a large stone font which now lies to the east of the apse strongly implies that this room was used as a baptistry. The font was fashioned out of a large block which had originated from an angular building on the slope above and to the south of the church. In the upper face of the block is a deep quadrafoil-shaped depression which presumably held the baptismal water (Pl. 22).

The north side of the church is the least well preserved and it is not clear if the north aisle was likewise widened at its east end, although if the room at the end of the south aisle was indeed a baptistry one would not expect it to be so. The north outer wall of the church is partially missing or partially buried but, apart from at its east end, its line can be traced. The south wall, on the other hand, survives up to 2 metres in height. The masonry varies in size, creating a rather untidy appearance, but as the inner face would have been covered and the outer face, at least to the surviving height of the wall, was built against the sloping hillside to the south and thereby obscured, this would have been of little importance.

The wall between the nave and the narthex (Pl. 23) is represented by a double row of large rectangular blocks laid on end, resting on a foundation course apparently of single blocks laid flat. Set into the wall at each end is a large rectangular pillar which also marks the west extreme of each nave-aisle division. As the pillars protrude into the nave-aisle divisions, they must have been of structural importance at this end of

the proposed colonnade. The wall itself is incomplete at its south end but extends just over half a metre across the end of the north aisle, beyond the pillar. The form of the entrances into the aisles is uncertain, as is the nature of the entrance into the nave. There is an opening of 1.95 m. in the centre of the wall and a single floor slab in the doorway. Of the outer wall of the narthex two courses remain. The lower of these is a double row of blocks and the upper course is of large rectangular blocks which cover the full thickness of the wall. In the north end of the wall is a depression, perhaps for a door fixture. Paving stones remain both across and just inside the doorway in the short north wall of the narthex. A further paving stone in situ against the outer wall of the narthex suggests that the narthex was completely paved with simple limestone flags. A row of stones at floor level against the east side of the wall between the narthex and the nave implies that there was at least one row of paving at this end of the nave. Part or the whole of the rest of the nave may have been covered with a mosaic of which numerous tesserae of different coloured marble and stone can be found, particularly at the east end of the nave. The same tesserae are also abundant in the vicinity of the apse. Fragments of white and grey marble revetment are particularly numerous in the eastern part of the church.

As the walls of the church incorporate many blocks and votive reliefs from the sanctuary buildings, obviously the church was constructed following the demise of the sanctuary itself. The major indication of the date of construction is a frieze which can be dated from the style of the decoration and the moulding of the blocks to the 5th century at the latest, quite possibly the 4th (Pl. 24). At least 22 of the frieze blocks remain on the site, and there is an additional one in the museum. The frieze must have been a major decorative feature of the church, perhaps surmounting a colonnade down both sides of the nave. Curved

blocks indicate that the frieze continued around the apse. Two of a total of three blocks with the design on two sides with a mutual corner can be attributed to the ends of the apse. The only logical position for the third corner block is the east end of the south nave-aisle division, which implies that the frieze was carried around the room at the end of the south aisle. The frieze blocks are of grey limestone and bear a raised decoration which includes stylized vegetation, fruit, trees, tendrils, ducks, partridges, a single-handled cup or jug, a chalice and a Latin cross. Two large blocks bearing simple Latin crosses are in keeping with the style of the frieze. One of these lies in front of the apse; the other has fallen, along with a large amount of masonry, down the slope on the north side of the church.

Fortunately, the church has survived well enough to be able to form a reasonable impression of its structural details and layout. It escaped excavation and detailed description when the sanctuary of Men was examined in the early part of the century, meriting only a few words on the anticipated profitability of future excavation.¹⁴ The only other published reference to the church is a brief note by Ramsay who was of the opinion that it was part of a monastery complex.¹⁵ Unfortunately, very little remains of the associated construction which Ramsay regarded as the monastic buildings. A collapsed wall leads up the slope to the south of the church on the same line as the east wall of the baptistry. The slope is dotted with heaps of field stones but it cannot be certain that these once served some constructive purpose. Building activity to the west of the narthex was perhaps, but not necessarily, a later addition. Delapidated walls suggest that a long room was built against the southern third of the narthex. Collapsed heaps of rubble and earth may represent two further walls built at right angles to the narthex, thereby indicating a second room against the northern third of the narthex. There is an opening in the outer narthex wall, 1.20 m. wide,

which might imply that a doorway was set into the wall, possibly at a later date. If the signs of construction to the south and west of the church do indeed represent a monastery, it is tempting to suggest that this was a private entrance to the church to be used by the monastic community. The fact that the opening is a few centimetres west of centre and the two courses of the wall are not flush with each other on either side may indicate that the opening is a consequence of disrepair, but these irregularities would not be so incongruous if the doorway was small, and a later modification.

Although the site would have been ideal for a monastery, this is not, however, the only possible interpretation of the associated buildings. At some time during late Antiquity, some of the sanctuary buildings were converted. A plausible explanation is that this activity was a result of unsettled conditions in the region, and it might be suggested more specifically that the sanctuary site was populated in the early 8th century in anticipation or as a consequence of the Arab attack. This possibility is explored in greater detail in Chapter IX.¹⁶ The same explanation might apply to the construction in the vicinity of the church. A convincing case can be made out for occupation of the sanctuary site on more than a temporary basis in the 8th century, in which case it might be proposed that the church was modified to suit its new function as a civic basilica. This explanation would best explain the presence of the font and the indications that the chambers built onto the narthex were a later addition.

Ecclesiastical fragments in Yalvaç - There are many ecclesiastical fragments in the museum but, apart from one of the 'partridge' frieze blocks from the church at the sanctuary site, the provenance of none of these is known to have been any one of the three churches. Most of the fragments had long ago found a secondary use in the buildings of the Turkish town. In particular, there are a large number of

epistyle blocks of various designs and cross-sections, of a c. 11/12th century date. Both the number and the variety of these indicate that they formed the decoration of more than one building but, unless the second phase of the basilica is of a post-8th century date, which is dubious, there is no evidence to show the existence of a church of late Byzantine date at Antiocheia. Several of the fragments were found in villages some distance away from Yalvaç and one might wonder if these belonged to outlying churches rather than that the building materials had been carried such distances from the site of Antiocheia. Besides the epistyle blocks, some of which are very handsome and well preserved (Pl. 25), there are ceiling pieces, a part of an ambo, a small octagonal column (Pl. 25) and a number of capitals (Pl. 26) in the museum. These mostly date from the 11/12th century. There are also pieces of an early date, mostly of a 4th or 5th, possibly also 6th, century date, including several epistyle blocks. Also notable are ecclesiastical fragments which were found near Çamormanı, some 40 kms. west of Yalvaç; one of these fragments is the arch of a ciborium which bears an inscription alluding to a church of the village of Pidron. These fragments are described in further detail below. A further interesting piece, now in the museum, is a large baptismal font, recut from the upper part of an altar (Pl. 27).¹⁷ On each of its four sides is an incised motif or an inscription. One of the inscriptions is taken from the Psalms; another records the names of Paul and Gregory. The date of the font is perhaps 4th or 5th century. Although texts from the Psalms would not be uncommon in ecclesiastical buildings, one might wonder if the provenance of the font was the early basilica.

SAGALASSUS

Three churches have been recorded at Sagalassus. Concerning one of these there is little information. To distinguish the other two, the

first, which is constructed from the materials of an Ionic temple, is here referred to as the 'Ionic' basilica and the second, which has a prominent cross-transept, is referred to as the 'transept' basilica.

The 'Ionic' basilica stands overlooking the lower agora (Fig. 7 and Pl. 29).

Reused inscriptions show that the basilica was built from the materials of a temple of Apollo Clarius which was probably erected in the 2nd century AD;¹⁸ there is evidence to suggest that the site of the temple was retained. Although much of the masonry still remains on the site, the structure is, nevertheless, quite delapidated. The best preserved part of the building is the north arm of the transept, which stands seven courses high. The courses alternate in height; many of the blocks bear the clamp holes which indicate reuse. The transept protrudes very slightly, less than a metre, from the rest of the wall. The rest of the north wall stands over a metre in height; the upper part has collapsed outwards, as if disturbed by an earthquake, but the blocks, all bearing clamp holes, lie side by side in their original order. The masonry, despite weathering, is well fashioned. The south wall is less well preserved, but its line is traceable. Of the rounded apse, slightly horseshoe in plan, five partially buried stones remain to enable an estimation of the dimensions. The width was 6.90 m. and the depth c. 4.20 m. Coloured tesserae of glass, marble and stone, presumably of a wall mosaic, can be found in the vicinity of the apse.

The nave was divided from the aisles by two rows of Ionic columns. The columns seem to have been little disturbed since their collapse and lie at fairly regular intervals. The north stylobate and the Attic bases were unearthed by the Lanckoroński expedition,¹⁹ but the stylobate itself is no longer visible. The colonnades were calculated to have been 5.83 m. high.²⁰ Five of the columns were recorded as still in situ a century ago, one at the west end of each stylobate, one at the east

end of the north stylobate, a fourth part way along the north stylobate, and a fifth at the east end of the north aisle. These columns, plus an additional two which are still in situ in the south stylobate, are circled on the plan. Niemann calculated that there were 11 columns to each

colonnade.²¹ The distance between column centres is 2.21 m.; the reused architrave blocks which surmounted the colonnade are 2.20 m. long. The column at the east end of each aisle emphasized the transversal width of the transept which is less than 2 metres wider than the nave and aisles.

The Lanckoroński expedition recorded a single central door, 1.91 m. wide, in the west wall of the basilica. Both the jambs and the lintel were still in place at the beginning of the century.²² There was a cross incised on the left jamb; today, this cross is not discernable, perhaps obscured by the thorny vegetation. An incised Latin cross with splayed arms is, however, visible on the now fallen lintel. All four jambs of the narrower doors into the aisles are in situ; these doorways were not noted by the Lanckoroński expedition. At a distance of 3.96 m. to the west of the door to the nave was another door which is represented by two tall jambs (Pl.28). The narthex was walled on all sides.

The forecourt was roughly twice as deep as the narthex. Its north wall was constructed of reused masonry, including huge architrave blocks. At the extreme west end of this wall was a doorway, each jamb flanked by a rectangular pillar with an incorporated fluted pilaster column. The pillar at the right side of the doorway has fallen over, revealing a large round base. The door was apparently approached by about ten steps.²³ There may have been a similar arrangement on the south side of the forecourt, although the evidence no longer survives. Directly to the west of the forecourt is a vertical drop, reinforced by a buttressed wall. Immediately inside the wall are three stones of what was either an inner wall or a high stylobate surmounted by a colonnade. Along with masonry from the buttressed wall, several columns do lie at the foot of the drop,

implying the latter.

On the north side and at the southeast corner of the basilica are what must be the remains of the temenos which was a legacy of the temple. Fallen capitals, architrave blocks and columns, mostly plain but some fluted, lie outside the north wall of the basilica. These were no doubt from the colonnade which was conjectured parallel to the outer walls of the basilica.²⁴ Outside the north wall, near the northwest corner of this arm of the transept, are two door jambs in situ. How this door relates to the overall ground plan and the chronology is uncertain.

Among the debris in the body of the basilica are fragments of white marble and pink stone. There are tiles, but their small quantity suggests that the roof was predominantly wooden. The material from the temple was used very conscientiously in the construction of the basilica. This is clear from the well-fitting masonry of the north wall, especially this arm of the transept, and from the architrave blocks, which were used in their correct series. There is no evidence for mortar, which confirms the carefulness of the construction.

The transept basilica stands outside the main group of ruins, at the western extreme of the site (Fig. 8). The best preserved and most remarkable feature is the apse, which was built as three sides of an octagon. A tall section of the north side and the lower course of the other two sides remain. The ashlar courses are of alternating heights, surmounted by an entablature which, on the outside face, bears a frieze of masks (Pl. 30) and, on the inside, a frieze of dancing satyrs (Pl. 31). Above the frieze is a course of simply moulded blocks. The frieze led Arundell, on his first visit to the site, to comment, "If some sculptures of masks had not attested the contrary, I could have almost fancied this a Christian temple".²⁵ The masonry was, in fact, reused.

This is indicated by clamp holes, and the frieze almost certainly belonged originally to a building of non-Christian character. Despite reuse, the masonry was extremely carefully fitted. The outer face of the apse is perfectly smooth and regular; small chipped stones and white mortar were used between courses only where necessary. The inner face, however, is rough and irregular. That the frieze and two of the blocks further down the wall are smooth on this side indicates, rather than weathering, that the apse was faced on the inside. Around the inside of the apse, at a low level, is a curving course of blocks of pink stone and fine white limestone (Pl. 32). In the vicinity lie several other blocks of pale pink stone and fine white limestone (or marble), which are smoothed on one face. Either the apse was faced with these blocks up to, or even above, the level of the frieze and its inner face was completely curved, or the curving course of blocks represents a synthronon and the upper part of the apse was faced with some other material and the angles retained. Three holes in a vertical line at the north end of the apse suggest that, if there was indeed a synthronon, its upper part was wooden. The junctures of the blocks of the apse alternate course by course with the result that the remaining portion is stepped where the masonry has collapsed. The upper four remaining courses, i.e. the two entablature blocks and the two ashlar below, however, form a straight vertical edge, with six bar holes down the side, indicating a window (Pl. 31). A block lying outside the south side of the apse has four bar holes in one face; this must have been a windowsill or a lintel. The implication is that in two, or perhaps all three, sides of the apse there was a rectangular window with a grille of six horizontal and four vertical bars.

The arms of the transept can still be traced. The north arm, and the north wall as a whole, is fairly well preserved, surviving in places up to three or four courses of alternating heights. Some of the masonry is

smoothed, some is 'cushioned' ashlar with a margin around the outside. The massive blocks of the wall leading north from the apse, forming the east side of the north arm of the transept, are annotated with Greek letters to assist in correct positioning, neatly arranged in alphabetical order. The right jamb of the door in the west wall of this arm of the transept is still in situ - the left jamb has fallen - as are both jambs of the door in the east wall of the opposite arm of the transept.

Of the three doors in the west wall, both of the tall moulded jambs of the central door remain standing (Pl. 33); on the ground in front of the door is the fallen lintel. The right jamb of the north door is in situ; the other jamb has fallen, leaving no evidence to show whether the doors were of equal size, as indicated on Hartel's plan,²⁶ or whether the central door was wider, as stated by Arundell.²⁷ On the grounds that Hartel's plan is very basic and it is unlikely that Arundell would point this out were it not obvious, it is more credible that the central door was in fact wider, as is usually the case. Of the south door, the lower portion of the left jamb remains in situ. This door was conceivably narrower than the north door; the wall between the central and south doors is longer than that between the central and north doors, but accurate measuring would be necessary to confirm whether or not this difference in length was significant.

Internal details are unclear. The west end of the south stylobate is visible, and a number of fallen fluted columns and bases lie in the body of the basilica. Also among the debris are huge ashlar, and entablature and architrave blocks decorated with dentils, palmettes, egg and dart, floral designs, and other decorative devices of the Corinthian order. One fallen block bears an incorporated pilaster capital with acanthus leaves. All indicate reuse of material from a pagan building. Lanckoróski suggested a temple of Dionysus,²⁸ but Niemann expressed doubt that the original building was a temple.²⁹ Niemann remarked on architrave blocks which he took as indicative

that the building was surrounded by colonnades,³⁰ and Arundell's plan features colonnades leading westwards from the arms of the transept, parallel to the outer walls. There are no columns, either standing or fallen, on either the north or the south side of the basilica, but there is a large in situ base on the appropriate line, its position confirming that the colonnades extended beyond the west wall of the basilica, as shown on Arundell's plan. It is conceivable that the basilica was built on the site of the pagan building and the colonnades were an original feature incorporated into the plan of the basilica.

Arundell recorded a 'portico' 27 feet long with walls extending beyond it on either side.³¹ This seems to indicate both a narthex and a forecourt. The north wall of the basilica does continue slightly past the west wall, suggesting that the narthex was walled on north and south sides. Traces of a wall parallel to the west wall and another wall at right angles to this seem to imply a narthex walled on all sides, presumably with a central doorway, and a forecourt divided into three. Fluted and plain columns lying in the vicinity suggest that part was colonnaded. The plan of the west end of the basilica is, however, unclear; it is possible that the features at this end were retained from the original pagan building.

Fragments of pink and white mortar may represent repair since, apart from the white mortar used sparingly in the apse, more so in the lower part, there is no sign that mortar was used as a matter of course in any of the extant sections of walls. Broken tiles give an indication of the roofing material, but as these are relatively few the roof may have been predominantly of timber. In the vicinity of the apse and at the west end of the nave are small coloured tesserae of yellow, black, rose, white, green and shades of blue. Arundell noted a large cross deeply incised into the outer wall near the main entrance,³² presumably by the central door in the west wall.

A third basilica was recorded at Sagalassus, situated on a broad flat

hill lower in the valley to the southwest of the 'Ionic' basilica.³³

The plan appears to have been regular with rounded apse at the east end, nave and two aisles, although no trace of the form of the nave-aisle divisions was found. Excluding the apse, the total length was 21.55 m. and the width 12 m. The construction material was a combination of rubble and reused masonry, the latter employed particularly for reinforcement at the corners. The walls were 0.85 m. thick on average. The threshold stone of the entrance door was wider than the opening itself, intruding into the wall on either side. The general delapidation of the building was apparently caused by wild pigs. No further details were recorded. This basilica can no longer be identified, unless it is represented by ruins on a promontory directly south of and below the transept basilica, southwest of the 'Ionic' basilica. This building was of an east-west orientation. Both jambs and the lintel of a door in the west wall stand in situ. The northeast corner of the building is represented by ashlar masonry. The rest is a mass of fallen rubble. There are stone steps leading up to the area in front of the entrance door.

In the upper agora lie fragments of three or four chancel screen posts, fashioned out of a distinctive pale pink stone, the same as that noted in the transept basilica and, in smaller quantities, in the 'Ionic' basilica. The stone was in fact used elsewhere on the site, but it is conceivable that the original provenance of these posts was one of the two basilicas. Nevertheless, their presence in the upper agora is puzzling. A single post may have turned up here by chance, implying no specific purpose, but the existence of more than one suggests that there was some functional reason for their presence. They may be the only surviving evidence that a church was constructed here at a time when the agora had outlived its regular purpose. They may represent a monument of non-Christian character. If their provenance was indeed

one of the basilicas, this would suggest disuse or a remodelling of this basilica. However, as there is no sign of further construction of which the posts may have been a part, no more than the possibilities can be presented.

SOZOPOLIS

According to tradition, the church of Apollonia was founded by Mark, cousin of Barnabas, in the 1st century AD,³⁴ but the veracity of this is questionable. When Arundell visited the site whilst it was still occupied by Greeks in the 19th century, he observed that the Greek church was built on the foundations of a Byzantine basilica.³⁵ Rott, who was much more knowledgeable about things Christian and Byzantine, however, seems to doubt Arundell's awareness of dating and chronology.³⁶ Today, the remains of a basilica can be seen, but it is uncertain if this is the same as that observed by Arundell. Recent bulldozing may have obscured evidence that survived even after the site was abandoned by the Greeks over half a century ago and may also have turned up evidence that was not previously exposed. Arundell provides no clue to the extent to which the Byzantine basilica had supposedly been retained in the plan of the Greek church, nor any information on the size or the plan, but as the scale of Greek churches tended to be smaller than the plan indicated by the present day remains, it is unlikely that this is the same building as that noted by Arundell.

The remains of the basilica are situated in a prominent position on raised ground to the west of the main acropolis hill. Little survives apart from traces of the basic ground plan (Fig. 9) which show that it was a building of large proportions and was adjoined by a second structure which was possibly a spacious forecourt. The curve of the rounded apse can be traced from occasional blocks which lie partly buried. The north outer wall is traceable along much of its length, and the south wall is partially visible. The north wall extends beyond the end of the apse which suggests that there

were pastophories flanking the apse, and that the apse was contained within, or incorporated into, a bounding wall. A large exposed block possibly marks the west end of the north wall and a second block, directly south of this and on line with the north end of the apse, perhaps marks the west end of the division between the nave and the north aisle.

Unfortunately, further details are unclear and there are no surviving architectural fragments at the site to give an indication of date. Fragments of Docimian marble lie about the site of the basilica. The quarries would have been a convenient source of supply. Two rounded pits in the ground, one at either side of the west end of the building, lined with coursed stone and mortar, were perhaps cisterns. The nature of a curved apse-like feature close to the southwest corner of the basilica is uncertain.

An inscription dated by Foss to AD 585 records the dedication of a church or palace to the Archangel Michael.³⁷ It is unknown to which building the inscription refers. There would no doubt have been more than one place of Christian worship in the city. Sozopolis was a popular place of pilgrimage on account of an icon of the Virgin which secreted myrrh.³⁸ Among its pilgrims was Theodore of Sykeon. The myrrh, famous for its effectiveness against disease and miscarriage, was bottled and exported. Rott was told that the foundations of a Greek building, no longer visible, which was constructed against the fortification wall on the east side of the site were of a basilica dedicated to Constantine and Helena, and that, according to Greek tradition, the site of this basilica was a spot sacred from early Christian times.³⁹

Several Christian inscriptions and fragments attributed to Sozopolis have been found in the nearby villages.⁴⁰ One of the inscriptions gives proof of pre-Constantinian Christianity at Apollonia.⁴¹ A piece of decorated marble from an ecclesiastical building, found in Uluborlu, was perhaps the floor of an elaborate ambo of 5th century date, but its provenance

is unknown.⁴² Arundell noted that the altar of the Greek church was supported on a large stone font⁴³ which, as it was not being used in its original capacity, was presumably a relic of one of the Byzantine churches of Sozopolis.

APAMEIA

The legend of Noah's Ark associated with one of the hills around Dinar⁴⁴ must have contributed to the popularity of Monotheism within Apameia. Coins of the first half of the 3rd century featuring the name of Noah and a representation of the legend⁴⁵ show that this was a tradition which even the municipal government was proud to uphold. A number of Christian inscriptions have been found in the vicinity of Dinar,⁴⁶ most of which are of an early date and three of a pre-Constantinian date.⁴⁷

The only remains at Dinar of an ecclesiastical nature, apart from the inscriptions, are those of a church which stood on the hill where the Ark was presumed to have rested. Different measurements and plans have been published by Arundell, Ramsay, Weber and Ballance.⁴⁸ Of these, Ballance's plan is presumably the most accurate and is reproduced here (Fig. 10). In the late 19th century the walls were standing one course high all round and two courses in places.⁴⁹ Between then and Ballance's visit there seems to have been little deterioration. Ballance recorded the walls as a little over 2 metres high in places.⁵⁰ The thickness was formed by two limestone blocks with some rubble in between. The blocks were carefully squared and fitted, with no need for mortar. Many of them had been annotated with Greek letters to assist in correct positioning.⁵¹ This suggests reuse. Some of the blocks were incised with crosses; a large Latin cross was noted on the south wall of the narthex and there were small Maltese crosses in roundels on some of the springings of the arcade.⁵²

The apse was of a stilted horseshoe plan with a string course around the

outside at a low level.⁵³ Its internal width was 5.80 m. The nave was divided from the aisles by a series of rectangular piers. Ballance noted three of these, from which he calculated a total of seven bays to each arcade, with an average span of c. 2 metres between the centres.⁵⁴ The mouldings of the piers were unelaborate, with a single fillet at top and bottom and a simple base. The width of the nave, 6.35 m., was almost twice that of the aisles, the total internal width of nave and aisles being 14.25 m. The internal dimensions of the body of the church, i.e. nave plus aisles, just about created a perfect square. Towards the west end of the south outer wall was a small door.

Three doors connected the narthex to the nave and the two aisles. The narthex was divided into three sections by small pilasters which probably supported arches.⁵⁵ In the outer wall of the narthex was a central door, and there was a second door in the outer wall of the north section, but no direct communication from the outside of the church through the south section. Instead, there was a small niche in the outer face of the wall.⁵⁶ The central door of both inner and outer narthex walls had simply moulded jambs and lintels.⁵⁷

An interesting feature are the two rooms, c. 4 metres square, which flank the narthex on either side, giving the total width of the façade as 27.70 m. The rooms could be entered through the north and south sides of the narthex only. Their function is not absolutely certain but they probably incorporated staircases to a gallery above.⁵⁸ Whether the proposed gallery was over the narthex only is unknown as there is no evidence for the form of the upper part of the church. The comparatively small amount of debris in the nave might indicate a wooden roof. If the chambers on either side of the narthex did house stairs, these stairs were probably also of wood.

Arundell noted a 'portico' west of the narthex, 15 feet deep and connected to the narthex by walls on north and south sides.⁵⁹ He conjectured

a colonnade across the western extreme of the forecourt. The only trace of this feature seen by Ballance was a single stone projecting from the south end of the outer wall of the narthex which presumably belonged to the south wall of the forecourt.⁶⁰ Because of the downward slope of the ground on the west side of the church, Arundell suggested an approach by steps.⁶¹ It is, however, equally plausible that the conjectured open colonnaded front was purely decorative and that the entrance to the forecourt was in one or both of the side walls.

The date is uncertain. One inscription was found in the church, in the north wall, which Ramsay dated from the lettering to not later than the 4th century,⁶² but the inscription is too brief to be much use as an indicator of date; as far as we know, the inscription may have been reused. Ramsay proposed an early date for the church because he believed that it must have stood on the site of the famous temple of Zeus Celaenae which he surmised was destroyed by Christian fervour under Constantine.⁶³ Weber thought that the plan indicated a Constantinian date.⁶⁴ Neither of these arguments are satisfactory. Ballance preferred a 5th century date, 6th at the latest.⁶⁵ The masonry and construction techniques do suggest an early date and, in the absence of further evidence, it is perhaps best to give a tentative date of c. 5th century. Strykowski classed this church among his 'Isaurian type' and pointed out the similarity of the ground plan, especially at the west end, to that of Church II (34) at Binbirkilise.⁶⁶

SELEUCEIA SIDERA and AGRAI.

Artemon, the first bishop of Seleuceia, was supposedly converted by Paul in the 1st century.⁶⁷ There is no evidence for Christianity at Selef, the actual site of Seleuceia, near Bayat, but the remains are poor in any case. A small mosque just outside Bayat itself, however, was built on the foundations of a Byzantine church, according to Rott.⁶⁸ Built

into the south wall were many fragments of Roman date and a slab bearing a Christian inscription. One of the jambs of the west door was a dedication to Claudius. Other fragments, both Roman and Christian, in nearby villages might have belonged to Seleuceia.⁶⁹

In Islamköy in particular are a number of ecclesiastical fragments.⁷⁰ One fragment noted by Rott was a door lintel with a decoration on its front face comprising a colonnade with palmettes and crosses between the columns.⁷¹ In a band above the decoration was part of an inscription which included the name of Gabriel. The design sounds typical of 11/12th century ecclesiastical decoration. The mosque in the middle of the village was converted from a Byzantine church (Fig. 11) with east-west orientation, a nave and two aisles, and an apse jutting out from each of the north, east and south sides.⁷² The construction was mortared brick with the occasional course of smallish reused limestone blocks. The upper part was built entirely of mortared blocks. At a low level around outer face of the walls and the apses were double-recessed, arched false windows. Above the level of the apses were small round windows defined by neatly fitting wedge-shaped bricks. The internal length of the church was 12.50 m. and the width 8.20 m. Column drums, of a 0.60 m. diameter, with capitals decorated with crosses, were found lying inside the church. A pilaster 0.90 m. wide was found still in position at the end of the arcade. In front of the entrance were noted the columns of a porch or narthex. Apart from the broken protruding sills below the round windows, the whole structure was almost completely preserved at the time of Rott's visit.

The date of the church is uncertain. The neatness of the mortared brick coursing and the recessed arches can be paralleled in churches which are securely dated to the 6th or 7th centuries, but the general impression suggests a later Byzantine date. There is no real indication of the internal structural details or the form of the roof, but the three apses might

imply that the plan of the church was in effect cruciform, perhaps with a domed roof. The small round windows are unusual. The different materials used in the upper part of the church might, however, indicate that the upper part was rebuilt at a later date.

The church may have belonged to Agrai, thus pinpointing more definitely the site, equidistant between Bayat and Atabey, or it might have been an outlying church of Seleuceia, constructed at a site 5 kms. distant from the city. It might, conceivably, be an indication that the site of Seleuceia was relocated at some time during late Antiquity. It might have been a pilgrimage or martyrial church, in which case there is no reason to attempt to relate it directly to either Seleuceia or Agrai.

ADADA

The only signs of Christianity at Adada are a church located some distance from the main Hellenistic and Roman city area, and a church boundary stone of unknown provenance which was found in the agora.⁷³

The church (Fig. 12) is fairly small in size, constructed of reused material and mortared field stones. The north and south walls stand to a considerable height, about 4 metres, and the apse survives to almost half this height. The apse (Pl. 34), at the east end of the building, is semi-circular, rounded inside and out. The lower portion is constructed mainly of small cut blocks and roughly shaped stones which are vaguely coursed. These are topped by a course of large slabs, laid on edge, which form the outer curve of the apse. The inner curve has mostly collapsed at this point but was clearly the same. Above this, nothing remains. The fallen masonry consists of stones of varying sizes. The space between the inner and outer row of slabs seems to have been filled with rubble. The slabs perhaps served partly as a reinforcing layer but their main purpose was probably decorative.

The length of the church, including the apse, was roughly 6-7 metres.

The south wall was pierced by windows at two levels. (Pl. 35). The lower two windows are complete but the wall has collapsed just below the arches of the upper two windows. Up to the level of the lower windowsills, the thickness of the wall is formed by two layers of squared blocks of varying sizes. The larger blocks, which are mostly on the outer face, are obviously reused and include one which bears a rounded boss. The remaining height of the wall is composed of small stones held by mortar. Again, there are two definite layers forming the thickness. That the construction was sturdy is shown by the fact that the walls have survived to such a height. The west end of this wall is built of large ashlar blocks, well cut and neatly fitting. This part of the wall, and perhaps also the lowest couple of courses along the length, which are exposed only on the exterior, appear to have been retained from an earlier building.

The lower part of the north wall, up to a level above the sills of the lower windows, is buried. In fact, only the arched opening of one window, corresponding to the westerly of the two lower windows in the south wall, is visible. There were no windows at a higher level. The lower part of the north wall may also have been retained from an earlier building, but this is not verifiable without excavation. The visible part of the west end of the wall was a later addition, presumably contemporary with the rest of the church. Its construction is of large blocks of varying sizes, mostly rectangular, with some smaller stones, and with pieces of brick closing the joints in the upper half. Some of this masonry was definitely reused. The visible part of the length of this wall is built in the same way as the upper part of the south wall, of mortared stones, some of which are roughly shaped, others field stones. In the upper part of this wall, however, are pieces of broken brick.

There are no short walls between the apse and the north and south walls.

The thickness of the apse is twice that of the outer walls, the extra

thickness being on the inside, with the result that there was an angle between the apse and the outer walls inside the church but, on the outside, the north and south walls merge into the curve of the apse without any corners.

Internal details are obscured by fallen debris, bushes, tall trees and earth which has accumulated especially in the northern half of the building. Between the west ends of the outer walls, a central doorway is marked by two jambs. The west end of each of the outer walls juts out almost half a metre towards the doorway. In the south wall, the north face of this protrusion is neatly finished off apart from two stones at the level of the arches of the lower windows which are narrower in height than the rest of the masonry and protrude even further towards the central doorway. The same is true of the end of the north wall, although this face is less neatly finished off. Obviously this was a feature of the earlier building which was retained in the church, as it was copied at the end of the north wall. The implication is that each of the walls was adjoined by a side door, with the result that there were three doors in the west wall of the church, and probably also by a window above the lintels.

A column in situ a couple of metres west of the central doorway and at least four columns which lie on the ground in the vicinity, together with the smooth finish of the west ends of the outer walls, suggest that there was an open porch, perhaps colonnaded on three sides, although there is no sign that anything had been attached to the west end of either of the outer walls of the church.

Built against the outer face of the north wall, about a third of the way from its west end, a wall extends at right angles. The wall is about 2 metres long and ends neatly. Its construction is of large blocks which are definitely reused. It was clearly a later addition as it partially obscures the arched window in the north wall of the church. The extant

height of the added wall is slightly greater than the surviving height of the north wall. . Towards the top of the wall is a rectangular window of which the upper part is missing, but a neat narrow margin is clearly visible down the two sides. The window obviously implies a room of some sort. There is no sign that the chamber was on the west side of the wall, and the details of the window suggest that the west side was the outer face of the wall. Unfortunately, access to the east side of the wall is restricted to all but a mountaineer. There may have been a doorway beneath the window, but debris has accumulated almost to the height of the windowsill. The purpose of the added room is obscure. It might be suggested that it held a staircase, but for what purpose is uncertain; there is no possibility of direct access to the church at any level through the exposed part of the north wall. However, at least $1\frac{1}{2}$ metres of the lower part of the north wall is buried, and it is conceivable that clearance of the debris and accumulated earth would reveal a door at ground level in the central part of the north wall.

No more than 5 metres to the west of the church is a deep rectangular hollow in the ground, c. $1\frac{1}{2}$ by 3 metres, lined with small irregularly-shaped stones. That it was once vaulted is shown by the inward curve of the stones along the two long sides. It is centralised on the same axis as the church which implies that it was associated either with the church or with the building from which the church was converted. It might have been a cistern, although there is no sign that it was ever watertight.

It might have held the relics of some martyr. If the church was a martyrial church, this might partly explain its small size and somewhat unusual plan.

Parallel to the church, less than a metre to the south of the narthex, or porch, is a series of steps, six in all and several metres in length. The steps face north, towards the church; the south side is perpendicular, c. 3 metres high. The steps themselves are neatly fitted limestone blocks; the south face is smooth and the masonry at this side, although irregularly-

cut, is also well-fitted. The steps appear to be of an earlier date than the church and were perhaps associated with the building on whose foundations the church appears to have been built. A few metres to the south of the church and the steps, at a lower level, are several sarcophagi and small built tombs.

The date of the church is uncertain. There are no parallels to assist in dating, and no architectural fragments can be seen on the site. The windows and the construction, for the most part, suggest an early date. The small size and the single chamber do not contradict an early date if the church was a funerary church, implied by the cemetery to the south, and, possibly, also a martyrium. The different materials used in the lower and the upper parts of the south wall are perhaps a reflection of the availability of building materials rather than of major reconstruction. The use of brick fragments and the absence of upper windows in the north wall, however, seem to suggest that at least the upper part of this wall was rebuilt at a later date. If this was the case, the addition of the chamber onto the outside of the north wall may have been contemporary with the reconstruction of the wall. It might be suggested, tentatively, that the reconstruction and the added chamber signify that the function of the church was changed at a later date. The location of the church is some distance away from the early nucleus of the site, which would accord well with its proposed initial function as an extra-mural cemetery church. There is evidence for some activity in this area at an early date, i.e. the steps and the building from which the church seems to have been converted, but there is no reason to suppose that this area was anything more than a kind of suburb of the city until some date during late Antiquity when the nucleus of the site seems to have been relocated here. The evidence and the reasons for this are discussed in Chapter IX.⁷⁴ It might be suggested that, when the nucleus of the settlement was relocated, the church was in a delapidated state - this would best explain the need for the apparent reconstruction of the north wall - but it was restored from necessity, and

transformed both in plan and in function, by the addition of the outer chamber.

It is perhaps too objectionable to propose that this chamber may have been a baptistry and that, despite its otherwise inappropriate plan, the church was used as a civic church. If one has to search for a civic church in this area, a building which was reported by Ramsay and Hogarth

is a more fitting candidate.⁷⁵ This church was apparently small in size, with a narthex separated from the body of the church by a dividing wall, and a triple apsidal termination, implying a three-aisled basilica. The description of the location, a mile south of the city, by the road to Perge, shows that this church was in the same area as that described above, but the brief account of the character of the church indicates that it was a different building. Sterrett reported a ruined temple which had been converted into a house or a church using lime mortar in the rebuilding.⁷⁶ The structure was situated $\frac{3}{4}$ hour south of Karadiken and was apparently surrounded on all sides by dense forest; with large pine stands, oak and brushwood inside. Despite the possibility that Sterrett's building may be one and the same as the church described above, there is so much still to be examined in this highly wooded area to the south of the main city, and a number of structures of unidentifiable purpose but of a relatively late date, that there is an equal possibility that these were three distinct buildings.

The date of Ramsay and Hogarth's church is uncertain but if they are correct in proposing an early date - according to Ramsay's dating code, an 'early' date is usually 4th century - either this church was also an extra-mural church at its date of construction, the ecclesiastical centre of Adada was always outside the main city area, or the nucleus of the site was moved at an earlier date than might otherwise be supposed. No ecclesiastical building, let alone a civic basilica, has been identified in the early city centre, but this is not to say that one did not exist.

This is, in effect, a catch-22 situation. There are too many unknown factors involved. The strength of any argument on the dates, the functions and the possibility of changed function of the churches depends very much upon the date at which the site was relocated, and the date of the relocation of the site depends partly upon the dates and the functions of the churches. If a civic basilica were to be identified in the early city centre and if Ramsay and Hogarth's church were to be located, with the purpose of getting a better idea of its size, date and function, the number of possible interpretations of the situation as a whole could be narrowed down. It is all too obvious that Adada is a site which would benefit greatly from a systematic survey.

SINETHANDUS

Although no epigraphic confirmation has been found, there is little reason to doubt the identification of Sinethandus with the site about 2 miles west of Kızılören, at the eastern end of the Barsakdere. The main settlement was on a hill. The remains include masonry of Hellenistic and Roman workmanship and a building which is thought to have been a church.⁷⁷ On the site of the church was found a double column (Fig. 44). There must have been more surviving than suggested by the brief remarks made by early 20th century travellers, as Strykowski compares the church to those of Eski Anamur and Dikilitaş and cites it as an excellent example of the use of Roman pillars.

Near the settlement are a number of rock-cut chambers and tombs of Christian date.⁷⁸ One of the chambers was a cruciform chapel dedicated to the Virgin (Fig. 40). Strykowski was of the opinion that the place was a cemetery, but three of the chambers appear to have been habitation cells which might suggest that a religious community lived here. As the plan shows, the chapel was of cruciform shape, with a central rock-cut dome. The total length was 5.20 m. and the total width 3.50 m. The north, south and east

arms of the cross had rounded ends, the east end cut so that the small apse was within the curve. There were three basically rectangular niches, slightly curved to follow the curve of the wall, set into the wall at a higher level above the apse. Further niches, one rectangular, the others rounded, were set into the walls around the north and south arms of the cross and along the shaft. At the west end of the church proper the walls and the roof were narrowed in steps, opening out into a small rectangular chamber which must have served as a kind of narthex. On the walls of the narthex were two inscriptions, one of which shows that the chapel was dedicated to the Virgin.⁷⁹ On the wall of the nave was a Maltese cross in a medallion, and a second over the central of the three niches around the apse. The date of the chapel is uncertain. Considering the dome, the 5th century date suggested by Strykowski⁸⁰ is probably too early.

At the nearby fortress of Asar Kalesi, which was possibly the Byzantine stronghold of the settlement, was perhaps also a church or a chapel. This was suggested by Swoboda et al. on the evidence of fragments which included a double column (Fig. 45).⁸¹

PAPPA

Ramsay noted the remains of a "large and fine church" at Yunisler.⁸²

Neither he nor later travellers gave details of the structure. The explanation for this silence might be that there was virtually nothing standing at the time of Ramsay's visit; he was perhaps partly judging the grandeur of the structure from inscriptions and fragments found in the town. This interpretation is confirmed by Crowfoot, who visited the site about a decade after Ramsay's visit and saw hardly one stone standing on another.⁸³ Jüthner noted the ruins of a church which he judged from

the architectural fragments to have been monumental, well built and perhaps the most important church of the ancient city.⁸⁴ According to Jüthner's brief description, this church seems to have been situated just outside the

modern town. Hall noted a Byzantine church site called Açlık Pazarı, about 15 minutes walk to the north of the town, by the banks of the river.⁸⁵

It seems that these various brief descriptions must all refer to the same church, Jüthner noted a cemetery 150 paces to the east of the church. The gravestones were Christian in character. If Jüthner is correct in surmising that the nucleus of the site was on the opposite bank of the river, where he noted an extensive ruinfield including buildings constructed of large blocks of ashlar masonry and the remains of a Christian sanctuary, the church at Açlık Pazarı was probably a cemetery church outside the city limits. Ramsay suggested that the church was dedicated to St. John, from which he surmised that the modern name Yunisler (old spelling, Yonislar) is derived.⁸⁶ This is not such a fanciful idea if a Greek community survived at Yunisler, but as there would have been more than one church at Pappa the theory cannot be restricted to this particular church. Many of the fragments and inscriptions in Yunisler are Christian in character.⁸⁷

PARLAIS

On a steep hillside above the village of Barla stands a church (Fig. 39) whose present character is in keeping with the fact that it was used by the Greeks who lived in the village until the early part of this century. Signs of restoration and repair indicate a long period of use. The body of the church is rectangular, longer from east to west than from north to south, but the effect would have been of a square area dominated by a central dome, with the screened apse at the east end unobtrusively extending the church into an oblong. The apse is represented by three shallow semi-domed niches; the central niche was wider and taller than those on either side. At a higher level are three windows, arched on the inside and squared off on the outside. In the opposite wall are three deep vaulted niches of equal size. In the north wall are three arches which were originally open to the outside of the church. These were later blocked in with a rubble fill and the wall

itself was reinforced on the exterior. In the south wall there is yet again a triple-arched effect. The central and the eastern of these arches are doorways, 'double-arched' in that the arched opening itself is narrow and recessed c. 20 cms. into the wall and framed by a taller, wider arch which is flush with the wall itself. At the west end of the wall is a doorway which is squared off at the top by a large rectangular limestone block, with a purely decorative arch effect worked in brick into the wall immediately above. At the very east end of this wall is a small square opening almost at floor level.

Parallel to this inner south wall is a second wall which incorporated the main entrance to the church. Between them was the narthex, the most appropriate term to describe the broad passageway along the south side of the church. The fact that the narthex and the entrance door were at the south side of the church was dictated by the terrain, the steep hillside immediately to the west of the church precluding an entrance in the usual position. The entrance door (Pl. 36) was arched on the outside, by alternating brick and stone, and squared off on the inside by a large limestone block placed below the level of the arch. This has a layer of mortared rubble on its south side, which was perhaps faced with the rounded cornice, now missing, which was noted by Pace.⁸⁸ To the east of the doorway are three windows which are bordered by a rectangular limestone block on each of the four sides. As with the three windows above the apse, these were arched on the inside. Five small holes down each side, and four along the top and the bottom, indicate that the windows were barred.

The materials used in the construction of the church are a combination of mortared field stones, brick and limestone blocks of varying sizes. All four of the walls which surround the body of the church are built mainly of mortared field stones with the occasional attempt at coursing. Large and medium-sized limestone blocks are used for stress and decorative points such as the curve of arches and the piers in between. In the south outer

wall the field stones are not as heavily mortared and are used only below the level of the windowsills. Limestone blocks of different sizes, interspersed with patches of brick, form a coursed decorative effect over the rest of this wall. In the niches of the east, west and north walls are extensive traces of plaster.

In the upper part of the walls are two series of holes at two different levels, some of which were plugged with hollow earthenware pipes. These were presumably to support the scaffolding for the construction of the roof. Above the three vaulted niches in the west wall is a roof which is about 2 metres lower than the walls around all four sides of the church, approximately at the level of the upper line of scaffolding holes. This roof is covered with grass, but appears to have been flat. The narthex was roofed by a barrel vault. This is evident from the underside and by the suggestion of a curve beneath the grassy covering. The roof above the narthex is at the height of the walls surrounding the body of the church. At the top of all of these walls can be seen the suggestion of the springing of a vault. The vaults must have converged on a central dome, giving added strength by a buttressing effect. Two stumps of the limestone columns which must have formed the square base for the dome are still in situ. Two further columns of the same diameter lie in the centre of the church.

Pace recorded evidence of an iconostasis just before the apse; he noted a column set not more than a metre west of each of the two divides between the three apsed niches.⁸⁹ The northerly of these two columns, of marble, lies fallen in an appropriate position. There are several broken pieces of marble in the vicinity of the apse, and a suggestion of the base for the iconostasis against the south wall. High above this is a shallow niche with a sill. Two similar niches are discernable at the same level above the divides between the three apsed niches of the east wall. These were perhaps fixtures for the typical high Greek iconostasis.

The floor of the church is covered with earth and vegetation and there is no sign of how it was paved. The narthex floor was paved with limestone flags and its level is somewhat higher than the floor of the body of the church. Below the southernmost of the three vaulted niches in the west wall is a stone vaulted passageway, descending westwards. This is partially filled with debris, giving no indication without excavation of whether it was a crypt, perhaps, or the entrance to a spring, well or cistern.

Whether or not there are any remnants of a Byzantine church of Parlais in the Greek church is uncertain. The construction materials of the walls, particularly evident on the exterior, change as the height of the walls progresses, but it is unclear if this definitely shows major reconstruction rather than that the lower sections were built from more solid materials to give a firmer foundation to the doors and the windows. Pace believed that he had found evidence that the building in its present form was built from the ruins of a Byzantine church.⁹⁰ He observed that a lower level of the pavement of the narthex was visible in places, that the domed roof would have been of a type peculiar to Byzantine churches of Asia Minor, and cited Byzantine parallels for the rounded cornice of the entrance door. These observations are not all together sufficient to prove the antiquity of the church. There is no longer any indication that the narthex floor, although obviously higher than the floor of the body of the church, had been laid upon an earlier floor. As the domed roof does not survive, its type can only be conjectured and there is no reason why a form of domed roof which had been developed in the Byzantine period should not have been imitated later. The comparisons which Pace gives are in any case earlier than the walls of this church which are mostly, if not completely, post-Byzantine, the point being that it is highly implausible that a Byzantine dome would have survived intact in the nucleus of the church and the walls and vaults of the roof rebuilt around it at a later date. The rounded cornice of the entrance door no longer remains and may in any case have been reused.

Nevertheless, although Pace's arguments do not stand up to examination, there is a strong possibility that the Greek church was built on the site of the Byzantine church and that the materials from the Byzantine church were reused. There is less certainty that the Byzantine foundations and ground plan were retained or that parts of the surviving walls have remained standing since Byzantine times.

Above the central window of the outer narthex wall is an inscription surrounded by a brick arch which records a certain Clemens as founder of the church.⁹¹ On the one hand, although the inscription is post-Byzantine, it does not prove that the original structure was erected under Clemens' patronage. He may merely have provided the means for extensive renovation of a badly delapidated or abandoned church already standing on the site. On the other hand, although it is possible that the inscription was inserted into the wall at a later date, this does not prove that the rest of the wall was Byzantine, as Pace seems to surmise. The original antiquity of the church remains uncertain.

A large number of Christian inscriptions have been found in Barla, many of which almost certainly relate to the more recent occupation by the Greek community. Others, executed in a rather barbarous Greek, are of uncertain date but are most probably to be associated with the Christians of the Byzantine era.⁹² One inscription mentions the bishop Alexander whom Pace identifies with Alexander, bishop of Seleuceia Sidera in the mid 5th century.⁹³ The name, however, was not uncommon. Even were this identification correct, it may indicate no more than a non-hierarchical relationship between the two cities, not surprising because of their proximity, but one cannot go so far as to accept that Parlais was dependent on Seleuceia, as suggested by Pace.

PAMPHYLIA (under the metropolis of Perge)

CREMNA

The greatest obstacle to an understanding of the churches of Cremna is the condition of the site. A clearing of the profuse vegetation and a tidying up of the fallen debris would do much to help to clarify the internal details of the buildings. The site was visited by Lanckoroński and Hausner in 1885, but they had no accompanying architect and the resulting account of Cremna is less thorough than the descriptions of the other sites visited by the expedition. Four churches were noted by Lanckoroński, two of these very briefly described, and a further four have been discovered during the recent survey under the directorship of Stephen Mitchell. For easy reference, the churches are marked on the plan (Fig. 13) as 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F', 'G' and 'H'.

Basilica 'A' (Fig. 14).- In the nucleus of the site, where most of the public buildings are situated, is the complex comprising the 'forum of Longus' and an attached basilica. As a result of the recent survey, it is now believed that the complex was originally built at some date between the reigns of Augustus and Vespasian, and that the incomplete inscription⁹⁴ from which it was previously understood that the complex was initially erected under Hadrian actually refers to restoration and minor remodelling. At a later date, the basilica was converted into a Christian church.

The apse was presumably a modification to suit the Christian building. The secular basilica may have had an internal apse or tribunal,⁹⁵ but it is doubtful that it would have had a protruding apse. The apse is incomplete, but it is clear that it was semi-circular. Three courses are visible around the north side, the lower two of limestone blocks laid horizontally, the upper course a double row of narrow slabs laid on end (Pl. 37). Three holes in a horizontal line suggest that there was a

wooden synthronon. The south side of the original basilica was an open colonnade which defined at the same time the north side of the forum and permitted access between the two. This was later blocked off with reused material to form a solid south wall for the Christian basilica (Pl. 38). The inner wall of the narthex was a later addition, probably contemporary with the conversion of the function of the building. This wall was well constructed and the jambs of the three doors neatly moulded.⁹⁶ The forecourt, of which little is visible beneath the huge blocks of fallen masonry, was perhaps an addition post-dating the Hadrianic renovations, but pre-dating the Christian basilica. The chronology, however, has yet to be sorted out.

The width of the basilica was c. 19 metres and the length c. 55 metres. The most impressive part of the building is the outer wall of the narthex, an original feature, which was pierced by three arched doorways (Pl. 39). The wall still survives almost as it was drawn in Lanckoroński's Fig. 140 (Fig. 15). The north doorway, measuring 3 metres in width, is still intact. The south doorway, of which little remains, was doubtless the same. The central doorway was a wider and higher version, c. 6 metres wide. The curve of the arch was formed by simply moulded blocks, 0.50 metres high. The same mouldings are evident on an entablature running horizontally immediately above the arch. The west side of the wall is much more weathered than the east side. Barely discernable is the same moulding on the arch of the doorway and the entablature above. Lanckoroński noted moulded and decorated architrave blocks among the debris in the body of the basilica which suggest that the entablature was carried around the nave and the aisles.⁹⁷ It would be interesting to know if the effect of the entablature was imitated in the added inner wall to give unity to the converted building.

When the basilica was first constructed as a secular building the arches in this wall were open entrances, but it seems that doors were provided

at a later date. The fittings for door fixtures are discernable in the south doorway; there were doubtless doors in the central and north entrances also, but the evidence for these is buried. Presumably this was a modification contemporary with the conversion into a Christian basilica.

Set against the east side of this wall are two piers, one between the north and central doorways, the other between the central and south doorways.

These are of the same height and have the same moulded tops as the supports from which the archivault springs on either side of the north and south doorways. A roughening of the wall above the piers and a protruding block at the level of the entablature proves that the arcade abutted against this wall. In Lanckoroński's drawing several stones protrude at the level of the entablature. The arcades were supported on two rows of piers, 1.16 m. wide. The two bays of the arcade of the secular basilica which now fell within the narthex of the Christian basilica were retained, with the result that the narthex was compartmented into three sections. In the original basilica there would have been twelve free-standing piers down each side, with a further pier standing up against the wall at each end of each arcade. Another modification which was presumably contemporary with the conversion of the function of the basilica is the walling up of the most easterly bay of the south arcade. It is possible that the east end of the north arcade was likewise walled up, as proposed on Ballance's plan, both giving privacy to the sanctuary area and creating a chamber at the end of each aisle. It is conceivable that the eastern section of the former colonnade between the forum and the basilica was left open, thereby providing a subsidiary entrance into the basilica. There is no evidence for Ballance's suggestion of a second, internal, apse.⁹⁸

Unfortunately, the upper part of the basilica above the level of the arcades cannot be reconstructed and it is therefore unknown if this was at all remodelled. Apart from the arcade, there are few indications of the decorative devices used in the building. A single glass tessera found

in the vicinity of the apse cannot alone be used as evidence for a mosaic. Neither can a fragment of a grey granite column be taken as proof that such columns were used in the basilica. Heavy tiles lying among the debris suggest that much of the roof was tiled. There is no epigraphic or architectural evidence to confirm the date of the conversion of the building into a Christian basilica. However, a 4th century date can be proposed with reasonable confidence, and it is highly likely that this building functioned as a civic basilica.

Basilica 'B' (Fig. 16) is situated outside the west city wall. The semi-circular apse at the east end is now barely traceable. According to Lanckoroński, it was 3.15 m. deep.⁹⁹ At each corner of the apse stood a tall rectangular pillar, the north one of which is still in situ. Five free-standing pillars, 0.60-0.70 by 0.52 m., divided the nave from each aisle. Two of these still stand in the north division. The internal length of the basilica, excluding the apse, was 21.40 m. The width of the nave was 6.54 m. and the aisles were each 2 metres wide. Lanckoroński measured the outer walls as 0.60-0.70 m. thick, but they were actually over a metre thick. The north outer wall is quite substantial, especially at its east end where three courses of large reused blocks, including an altar stone, show that the apse was enclosed. At the east end of the north aisle a doorway, c. 1 metre wide, leads into a chamber at this side of the apse. Details of the east end of the south aisle are unclear, but there was probably a chamber at this side also. As the apse did not abut against the bounding wall, there must have been an eastern passage connecting the two chambers. The conjectured distance between the apse and the bounding wall is a little less than a metre.

There were three doors in the west wall. The central doorway was 1.34 m. wide. A fallen door jamb, 1.25 m. high, lies before the opening. Details of the doorways into the aisles are no longer clear. It might be inferred

from Lanckoroński's general description that at least the inner jamb of each doorway was in place a century ago - unless this was conjecture - and that the actual width of each door was 2 metres minus the thickness of the jamb on either side. The length of the lintel block of the south door was given as 2.14 m. As the width of the aisle itself was less than this, the lintel must have intruded into the wall on either side, thus giving extra structural cohesion.

The west side of the narthex was defined by a row of double columns, perhaps five in all, the central one of which (Pl. 40) stands to its full height, at least 1.80 m. (the lower part is buried). The lower part of the column to the south of this, roughly on the line of the south nave-aisle division, is also in situ. The narthex seems to have been closed at its north side, but open at its south side.

This outer side of the narthex defined at the same time the west side of a colonnaded forecourt. Only one broken column remains in situ along the north side of the forecourt, but there are at least six column fragments scattered about the vicinity. These, again, are double columns. The exact form of the forecourt is uncertain. According to Lanckoroński, the north and south sides were each formed by four columns, the distance between the centres being 3.67 m. This distance accords with the positions of the extant columns. The west side was defined by three columns, the distance between centres being 3.20 m. The central one of these was neatly on the line of the longitudinal axis of the basilica. The column on either side was supposedly on line with the inner jamb of the doorway into the appropriate aisle, although if the given measurements (the 3.20 m. distance between the column centres and the 6.54 m. width of the nave) are correct, each of these columns must have been slightly on the nave side of a line drawn from the nave-aisle divisions, i.e. roughly on line with the columns at the opposite side of the forecourt. Rott cautiously did

not commit himself to accepting Lanckoroński's description of the forecourt, admitting only that it must have been associated with the basilica.¹⁰⁰

Lanckoroński's tentative suggestion that the basilica was built on the site of a twin temple to that implied by remains to the south is dubious. A few traces of the parallel building survive today but there is no certainty of its nature, nor that it is to be associated with the basilica, or with a structure on whose foundations the basilica may have been constructed.

Large rectangular tesserae of white marble and grey, mauve, cream, dull pink and greyish-brown stone were found, particularly at the west end of the nave and in the narthex, which indicates that at least part of the floor was laid with a mosaic. There are some pieces of white marble but these are too fragmentary to show their original form and possible use. A weathered fragment of a fluted column was noted in the nave. Part of a red granite column lies some metres outside the south wall but it might be doubted that its provenance was the basilica. Several fallen capitals and architrave blocks lie in the vicinity of the forecourt. These are mostly too weathered to show whether or not they were reused. One fragment is clearly decorated with a palmette, egg-and-dart and bead-and-reel design. Pieces of coarse pink mortar lie in the vicinity of the apse but there is no sign of mortar in the outer walls. There is a great quantity of both coarse and fine large tiles which were presumably used for the roof. Fragments of heavy wheel-turned cups or steep-sided bowls were also noted among the debris.

Some metres to the west of the basilica are three low natural caverns within a rocky outcrop. At the back of the largest of these, the southernmost one, had been installed two miniature columns with incorporated capitals of a simple design, probably of an early Byzantine date. Within the past four years, these have disappeared. The south side of the cavern

was built up with field stones. The low roof between this cavern and the smaller adjacent cavern to the north was supported by a fluted column drum. In front of this second cavern, below ground level, is what must have been a rectangular vaulted chamber. Its lower part is buried but part of the wall and the vaulting of its north side, constructed of large limestone blocks, are still visible. A third cavern to the north is supported by another large fluted column drum. The back wall of a fourth cavern on the north side of the forecourt was also built up by an artificial wall, and there is a rectangular pillar of small dimensions at the west end of this cavern. The whole, particularly the vaulted chamber, seems to suggest a martyrrium. Fragments of thick, coarse water pipes in the vicinity of the caverns might be thought to imply that there was a fountain, perhaps, in the forecourt and that the vaulted chamber was a cistern, but there is no sign that this chamber was watertight and the pipes are probably to be associated with the aqueduct which led past the basilica from the west. The basilica may have been constructed at the site of a martyrdom, but its main function seems to have been funerary. This is suggested by the fact that it was an extra-mural church, it seems to have had an eastern passage, and, most significantly, there are a number of sarcophagi, both rock-cut and free-standing, on all sides of the basilica.

Basilica 'C' (Fig. 17) was perhaps the grandest ecclesiastical building at Cremna. The most impressive standing part is the west wall (Pl. 41). The two jambs of the central door were reused decorated architrave blocks which stand over 2 metres high. The rest of the wall, including the jambs of the door into the north aisle, was constructed of reused masonry,

The south end of the apse, built of huge limestone blocks, is visible, but the rest of the apse is buried. The north and south outer walls of the basilica continue beyond the apse and meet a wall running behind it.

The conjectured distance between the apse and the bounding wall is 2 metres. This, together with the existence of two tall door jambs at the east end of the north aisle, implies that there was an eastern passage. The number of column fragments in the body of the basilica suggests that the nave was divided from the aisles by colonnades. The columns were fashioned out of a variety of coloured marbles, including grey cippollino. Over five pieces of grey granite columns were also noted, in addition to several capitals with acanthus decoration.

In the vicinity of the apse are fragments of white marble, both grey and green cippollino, Docimian pavanazetto and purple porphyry; some of these fragments were pieces of revetment polished on one side and with white mortar adhering to the other side. A large quantity of small tesserae of a variety of colours were also found in the vicinity of the apse. The colours include brick red, black, bright green, pale green, turquoise, dark mauve and pale mauve, all opaque glass, and silvery, dark purple and various shades of blue translucent glass. Fragments of white mortar were noted in the vicinity of the apse, and a large quantity of tile fragments lie scattered over the whole basilica.

The narthex was walled at its north and south ends. The line of the west wall of the narthex is represented by a low wall, also built of reused masonry. There was a door at the south end of this wall, leading into what seems to have been a southern passageway, but it is likely that the major part of the outer wall of the narthex was colonnaded and approached by steps. About three metres to the west of the narthex are the remains of a stylobate, one of the slabs bearing an incised circle 44 cms. in diameter. Presumably there was a colonnaded porch outside the narthex. The level of this stylobate is half to one metre lower than the top of the outer wall of the narthex. A number of complete columns and fragments of columns lie in the vicinity, including some of limestone, one of grey granite, one fluted and two double columns.

Because of the inscribed circle on the stylobate, unless this was a reused stone, the outer colonnade was probably formed by rounded columns, and the outer wall of the narthex was perhaps surmounted by double columns. There are also a number of dentillated fragments lying in the vicinity.

This is presumably the basilica which was briefly described by Lanckoroński,¹⁰¹ but not marked on the site plan. Lanckoroński considered, tentatively, that the basilica might have been built on or nearby the site of a temple. He measured the length, excluding the apse, as 24.50 m. and the width as 11.80 m. He observed that the basilica was built of a greater amount of reused material than any of the others; notable were epistyle blocks of precise workmanship, doubtless the reused door jambs, and the door cornices, which no longer survive.

A few metres to the west of the basilica are the remains of a rectangular building which may have been associated with the basilica. The walls are well constructed of reused masonry. There was an entrance in the west wall, and a deep doorway with two lintels leading into a room at the north side of the building. (Pl. 42). The outer north and south walls are incomplete at their east ends and the east wall has completely collapsed. The interior of the building is full of fallen masonry and fragments, including a number of pieces of white marble, a large fragment of grey granite, an architrave block ornamented on its underside with opium pods, a round drum decorated with an acanthus design, a white marble rounded column base, and a moulded fragment of white limestone bearing the impression of what must have been a metal cross. There are also numerous tile fragments among the debris.

If this building is to be associated with the basilica, its purpose depends very much on the function of the basilica itself. The eastern passage suggests that the basilica may have been martyrial. If it was

also a pilgrimage church, the building to the west may have been a hostelry. Eastern passages were not exclusive to martyrial or funerary churches, however, and it might be considered that this basilica had a civic function, and that the building to the west was the bishop's residence, or a complex which included a baptistry. The remains of the basilica suggest that it was rather a splendid building, and the debris in the building to the west show that this was not such a simply decorated structure. The date of the basilica is uncertain; any date between the 5th and the 7th century would be plausible.

Basilica 'D' (Fig. 18) stands on the elevated eastern part of the site, above the theatre and the other major public buildings of the city. The rounded apse is barely traceable. The south wall stands to over a metre in height and is constructed of roughly-shaped blocks and field stones, uncoursed. The north wall is mostly obscured by vegetation, as are the internal details of the basilica. The form of the nave-aisle divisions is unknown; there are no signs of columns. At the east end of the south aisle, beside the apse, was a narrow doorway. The west wall of the basilica was pierced by three doors; all six jambs, reused epistyle blocks with simple mouldings, are still in situ. The main entrance to the basilica seems to have been in the short north wall of the narthex. The huge moulded jambs and the undecorated lintel are still in place and are visible from the site below (Pl. 43). The west wall of the narthex is very delapidated, but it is unlikely that there were additional doorways in this wall. The south wall of the narthex is solid. Tile fragments lie scattered about the site of the basilica, but there is no trace of decoration. The date and the function of this basilica are uncertain.

Basilica 'E' (Fig. 19) lies immediately to the west of the forum basilica ('A') in a domestic area. Directly across the narrow street

which runs past the narthex was a house. There seems to have been a house on either side of the basilica also, which suggests that at least one house was demolished to make way for the basilica. The basilica was built almost entirely of reused material, with some field stones. The construction of the apse is slightly puzzling. Its semi-circular curve was built of reused blocks of varying sizes and field stones, very vaguely coursed (Pl. 44). The end of the curve at each side is defined by a tall reused block. From each end of the apse, a straight wall leads westwards to join the wall running across the end of each aisle. These walls are narrower than the wall of the apse itself, and they are recessed away from the longitudinal axis of the basilica, so that the distance between them is greater, by about a metre, than the width of the apse. These straight walls use a greater proportion of field stones to reused blocks in their construction than does the curved wall of the apse, and also a small amount of brick. They appear to be a later addition, abutting against the apse proper, rather than merging into it. However, as there is no sign that the apse was enclosed, and the solid wall at the east end of each aisle is c. 2 metres west of the ends of the apse proper, openings, instead of walls, leading from the outside into the sanctuary area would not make sense. Moreover, if this were the case, the apse would have been free-standing, unconnected to the body of the basilica. It must be concluded, then, that these walls were contemporary with the initial construction of the basilica and in fact defined the sanctuary area. The less substantial construction might be explained by the probability that only the rounded part of the apse was covered by a semi-dome. The brick may represent repairs. The tall block at the south corner of the apse proper is set about a metre to the east of the block at the opposite side, with the result that the apse was not perfectly symmetrical.

All six of the reused door jambs of the west wall are in situ.

The narthex was walled on all sides. There was a door in the short north wall, indicated by the in situ east door jamb and the fallen lintel. The south and west walls of the narthex are incomplete and it is uncertain if there were further entrances into the church.

The ground is very much built up with earth, fallen masonry and bushes, and the internal details of the basilica are unclear. A fallen column fashioned out of a conglomerate stone lies in the nave. A fragment of a column of fine limestone or inferior marble, of small diameter, lies in the narthex. Outside the south wall lies a simple Byzantine capital of white limestone, bearing a cross in relief. There are white marble fragments in the vicinity of the apse, and small stone and marble tesserae of white, black and beige in the same area. The roof would have been at least partially tiled.

Basilica 'F' (Fig. 20) was built up against the south side of a wall which stretches some distance across the site. The apse was constructed mostly of field stones. It is in a fairly collapsed state, but it was clearly horseshoe in plan and apparently not inscribed. The construction of the south wall was virtually the same. The long wall which runs east-west across the site was used as the north wall of the basilica. There were three doors in the west wall, complete with reused jambs. Roughly halfway down the north aisle are the remains of a small apse, also built of field stones, and it appears as if this aisle was walled off from the nave at its west end (Pl. 45). The narthex was defined by a colonnade. Further details are unknown. Structures in the vicinity appear to have been mostly of a domestic purpose. The function of the church is unknown; it was possibly a commemorative building.

Basilica 'G' (Fig. 21) was built entirely of field stones. There

are suggestions on the south side of the apse that the apse was enclosed, but this appears to be a later modification; on the north side, the east end of the outer wall seems to form a definite corner with the solid wall which runs across the east end of the north aisle. The apse appears to have been semi-circular in plan, the ends protruding slightly to the west. The details of the interior and the west end of the church are obscure. Parallel to the south wall, on the outside, was a colonnade. The bases and weathered limestone and granite columns lie in their original fallen positions. This colonnade might conceivably have been a feature retained from an earlier building on the site, possibly a temple. It is certain that there was no similar colonnade on the north side of the basilica as the lower part of the north wall is built up against a fairly high plateau of bedrock not far from the extreme northwest corner of the site.

Basilica 'H' (Fig. 22) is situated towards the north of the site, not far from the city centre, on a low hillock. It was of a squat squarish plan. Lanckoroński noted two sets of four piers separating a central nave from a aisle on either side.¹⁰² The sketch of this church on Lanckoroński's site plan shows a smaller apsed structure adjoining the northern half of the west side of the church. Lanckoroński interpreted the building as a former temple of Mithras or the Magna Mater, later converted into a church. The remains are too sparse to enable a comment on this theory.

Today, too little survives to be able to confirm Lanckoroński's observation of an adjoining apsed structure. The main apse, built of large reused blocks, can still be traced. The outer walls, of the same construction as the apse, are also partially visible. In the west wall, there seem to have been doorways into the nave and the south aisle, but it is unclear if there was also a doorway into the

north aisle. However, if there was indeed an adjoining apsed structure, one would not expect a door in this position. One short pier of the north nave-aisle division remains in situ. Most of the debris in the body of the church is extremely weathered, reused masonry, with some rubble. Among the debris, several weathered column fragments are discernable. Unless the columns surmounted the piers, this might imply galleries. Pieces of grey marble lie about the site, and there are a number of revetment fragments of white and grey marble. A smattering of tile fragments indicates that the roof was at least partially tiled.

PEDNELISSUS

At the site near Kozan, which is probably to be identified with Pednelissus, three churches have been recorded. One of these is a regular three-aisled basilica which had been converted from a rectangular building bordering the agora near the city centre. A second church was situated by the road which leads from the valley below to the south gate of the city. A third church was converted from a heroon which is one of the few vestiges of the Hellenistic necropolis below the acropolis on the south side of the city.

The basilica (Fig. 23) abuts against the south half of the east side of the agora and was converted from a rectangular building to which the Italian expedition assigned a total of four phases.¹⁰³ The original structure, contemporary with the agora itself, was possibly a temple; this was rebuilt during the Principate, on the same plan; a third phase, probably a renovation of the temple, is indicated by an inscribed architrave block; the final phase involved the conversion of the building into a Christian basilica. A apse was added to the short east side of the building, and colonnades were erected to divide the basilica into three aisles. The semi-circular apse was constructed

of badly mortared, irregularly-shaped blocks of a small size. The depth of the apse was c. 5 metres and the width c. 7 metres. This is the same as the width of the nave, but the apse was not aligned on the longitudinal axis of the basilica. The reason for this is uncertain; it was perhaps to avoid the demolishing of some other structure, or of part of the rocky hill behind, which would have been necessary in order to achieve perfect symmetry. Seven of the bases of the colonnades were found in situ, two in the north division and five in the south division. The bases were 0.60 m. square and c. 0.80 m. high. The description of their crude form and unequal proportions suggests that they originated from a structure of late Roman date. Small fragments of fluted columns found among the debris show that the columns themselves were out of proportion with the bases.

The length of the basilica was c. 28 metres and the width c. 16. The north wall of the original rectangular building, and the part of the east wall which was not demolished to make way for the apse, were retained. The south wall is very delapidated, but this was probably also a feature of the building from which the basilica was converted. The line of the south wall is indented 1.80 m. from the line of the south wall of the agora itself. The agora stands on a kind of platform, and it is plausible that the south wall of the rectangular building was set back from the line of the south wall of the agora to make way for a staircase which led from below and entered the agora at the point marked p-q on the plan. The form of the narthex is uncertain, but this was presumably a modification of the original building to suit the new function as a Christian basilica. The north wall of the narthex was walled and pierced by a small doorway. It might be proposed that the south side was also walled and that there were three doorways leading into the body of the basilica, as is usual, but there is no evidence to show whether the west side

of the narthex was walled or colonnaded. The architrave block which is used as evidence for a third phase of the building appears to have been reused in the narthex of the Christian basilica. The provision of the colonnades to divide the body of the basilica into three aisles indicates that there must have been major reconstruction of the upper part of the building. The description is too limited to be able to propose a date confidently. However, a 4th century date would not be implausible, and it is not unlikely that this was the civic basilica of the city.

The lower church which is situated outside the city walls (Fig. 24) is on a small hillock about half an hour distant from the main south gate of the city, by the road.¹⁰⁴ The church was constructed of reused materials. The walls were hardly standing when the Italian expedition visited the site, but there was sufficient evidence to signify the basic ground plan. The body of the church was 19.10 m. long and the width 12.90 m. In relation to the dimensions of the rest of the church, the semi-circular apse was large, 5.90 m. deep, and narrower than the nave in width by the length of two very short walls which connected the ends of the apse to the outer walls. The walls were 0.80 m. thick.

The positions of two piers in the body of the church seem to indicate that the roof was dominated by a dome on a square base. The Italian expedition, with quite logical reasoning, decided that the church must have been of basilican plan, but this decision was influenced by the conviction that the ground plan of this church was not suitable for features which are usually to be associated with a church of cruciform plan. Traces of four other small pillars were observed, apparently with the help of a certain amount of imagination, by some members of the expedition, but the positions of these did not quite suit the proposed basilican plan. In actual fact, if one envisages two further piers to the west of the two in situ piers, in such positions that the

result would have been a perfect square, the measurement between the two in situ piers and the east wall of the church would be exactly the same as the measurement between the two conjectured piers and the west wall of the church. The cross-section of the in situ piers are of a form characteristic of a church with a domed roof.

The outer walls of the church continue to enclose a forecourt which, if the extant limits of the walls represent the actual western limit of the forecourt, was 12 metres long. From the forecourt, the body of the church was entered by two side doors. The apsidal niche in the east wall of the forecourt seems to have been a later modification.

The date of this church cannot be established. If the roof was indeed domed, it was presumably of a post 6th century date, Its function is equally uncertain.

The third church at Pednelissus was too delapidated for any significant details to be recorded.¹⁰⁵ This church was converted from a Hellenistic heroon in the necropolis just outside the city walls. Its construction was, again, of reused materials, and its size, conditioned by the dimensions of the heroon, was apparently somewhat smaller than that of the lower church. The entrances into the church were comparable to those in the west wall of the lower church.

ARIASSUS

The remains of Ariassus suggest that the site was occupied during late Antiquity. However, no ecclesiastical architecture or Christian inscriptions have been found at the site. This said, it has yet to be investigated thoroughly.

Near the centre of the narrow defile in which stood the major public monuments of the city is an apsed structure.(Pl. 46), but there is

no certain indication that this was an ecclesiastical building. The composition of the apse, of which only the core survives, is mortared rubble with pieces of broken brick, on a foundation course of large blocks. On either side stands a tall squared pier composed of reused ashlar, which could conceivably be the support for the springing of an arcade between nave and aisles. There are no signs of other in situ piers, but the area is obscured by accumulated earth and rubble, possibly caused partly by subsidence. Among the debris are several ashlar blocks, similar to those used to built the responds by the apse. Even if these did originally constitute piers, such features would suit a secular as well as an ecclesiastical basilica, and if the building were of an ecclesiastical nature there are a number of peculiarities. The apse would have been at the south end of the building and it is approached by at least two broad steps; there were presumably more than two steps as the base of the apse is at a higher level than that of the uppermost of the two visible steps. These peculiarities might be explained by the fact that building space in the city centre was restricted by the hills on either side and by the steep drop at the southern extreme of the site, and the city planners had to make do with whatever building space was available. The ground slopes downwards from the apse to the bath-house to the north, and would have needed levelling in order to accommodate a building. The high south wall of the bath-house would have supported a built-up floor. Difficulties caused by levelling might explain the steps leading up to the apse, and a raised bema would not have been entirely unusual. The location of the bath-house may not have allowed for an entrance in the usual position, but it is not unknown for the main entrance door to a church to be in the short wall of the narthex, which, in this case, would have given directly onto the main street of the city.

The proximity of the bath-house and the steps leading up to the apse might be used as arguments for identification as a nymphaeum. However, it appears that the apse did not stand alone. A wall, which is possibly to be associated with the apse, can be traced along the line of where the outer west wall of the conjectured basilica would have been. Its length is approximately 20 paces, roughly twice the conjectured width. If this is the same as the building identified by Rott as a market-basilica,¹⁰⁶ it is certain that the apse did not stand alone at the beginning of the century. However, with his knowledge of and interest in Christian remains, Rott did not identify the building as a church. This does not completely rule out the possibility. It is conceivable that the structure was originally a market-basilica which, for reasons dictated by lack of space and economy, was transformed into a church at a later date, retaining the unusual orientation. The composition of the apse does seem to suggest a date at which secular basilicas were no longer fashionable. It would, however, be unwise to identify the structure as a Christian basilica without further evidence. It seems that excavation is the only way to prove beyond doubt that the proposed outer west wall was associated with the apse; if it is found not to be so, the most logical interpretation is that the apse represents a nymphaeum of late Roman date, and that Rott's market-basilica is to be found elsewhere on the site. It is also possible that the civic basilica of Ariassus is to be found on one of the hilltops which define the defile. A brief search revealed nothing, but excavation might prove otherwise.

PAMPHYLIA (under the metropolis of Side).

SELGE

As a result of the recent survey of Selge, published by Machatschek and Schwarz, a total of 7 basilicas are known from the site. In addition, a small chapel was noted near İkiz Yaylası, some distance from the city. The basilicas are here referred to as 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F' and 'G'. Of these, the first four lie within the confines of the city walls; the other three lie just outside the walls, and each seems to have been a cemetery church. Basilica 'A' appears to have been built on the site of an earlier structure, possibly a temple complex. Basilica 'B' was converted from an odeon which flanked the upper agora, basilica 'C' was converted from the temple of Zeus on the Kesbedion hill, and basilica 'D' incorporated an earlier podium temple. Apparently, basilicas 'C', 'D' and 'G' were rebuilt on a smaller scale at a later date.

Basilica 'A' (Fig. 25) stands on the summit of the hill above the upper agora, at the southern extreme of the site. The basilica has been described, briefly, by Lanckoroński¹⁰⁷ and, in greater detail, by Machatschek and Schwarz.¹⁰⁸ The length of the building was 35.90 m. and the width 18.80 m. Although the ground plan is traceable, some of the walls stand up to 2 metres in height and the apse stands to a greater height, the state of delapidation is only too obvious.

The apse was semi-circular, built of limestone blocks of considerably varying sizes (Pl. 47). The south side survives to a height of c. 3 metres, and the north side, rather more collapsed, is almost as high towards the centre, where there is a wide gap. The straight sides of both portions of the apse wall on either side of the gap suggest a broad, high central window, at a fairly low level, perhaps arched and compartmented. One of the blocks of the sill still protrudes from the south portion of the apse. Although the lower part of the apse is

buried by earth and debris, Machatschek and Schwarz recorded a synthronon with three steps.¹⁰⁹ The lowest visible part of the apse was constructed of a rather haphazard arrangement of reused masonry, with well cut blocks used for the ends. Very small stones were used in the interstices and are apparent in abundance in the exposed core of the delapidated north portion. The surviving upper part was built of large well shaped blocks which are coursed. The apse was enclosed and flanked by two side chambers. The north chamber appears to have communicated with the outside by a small door in its north wall; there may have been a door in the east wall of the south chamber. The forms of the various doors in the basilica vary quite considerably.

The nave was divided from the aisles by two rows of rectangular pillars, 0.55 by 0.70 m. in cross section. There was a total of 6 free-standing pillars in each division. Five of these still remain in situ in the south division, and one survives in the north division. The south wall is in a sorry state, but stands up to 2 metres in height in places. Its construction is of varying sizes of reused limestone blocks, with a vague attempt at coursing. The north wall is little more than a mass of collapsed masonry. Three windows were observed in the south wall, at irregular intervals, and a single window was noted in the north wall.¹¹⁰ Two long narrow stones with a gap in the centre are fixed across the nave, about 4 metres from the chord of the apse. These were presumably for a chancel screen.

In the centre of the west wall is a doorway; there were narrower doorways leading from the narthex into the aisles. All of these doorways are blocked with collapsed masonry. Two tall rectangular pillars still in place mark the entrance in the outer wall of the narthex. A double row of blocks at a low level extends to north and south. Machatschek and Schwarz observed a side door in the short north wall of the narthex

which they surmised was used to provide communication with the outer building on the north side of the basilica.¹¹¹

On the north, south and west sides of the basilica are traces of further walls, but it is difficult to sort out the chronology. Some of these walls may be vestiges of the earlier complex which appears to have been dismantled to make way for the erection of the basilica. Other walls may have been later additions, and quite conceivably represent a monastery complex. The cistern and water channels in the vicinity of the basilica might support this theory. Still visible against the south outer wall are foundations built of small stones, which seem to represent a series of chambers. The addition to the west of the narthex resembles a large forecourt. Its western limit is marked by two upright squared blocks in situ and other fallen blocks, both short and pillar-like, which either represent the piers of an open arcade, perhaps, or are all that remains of a wall. Two tall rectangular pillars roughly on the line of the south nave-aisle division and a weathered pillar on the line of the north nave-aisle division might imply that there was an internal division within the forecourt on either side. Machatschek and Schwarz seemed to believe that there was a forecourt, but they interpreted the masonry around the southwest corner of the forecourt as representing a quadrangular room, possibly a chapel, associated with the proposed monastery. The alignment of the walls which Machatschek and Schwarz planned in this vicinity are offset from the axis of the basilica, which might indicate that they were indeed a later addition. The alignment of the chambers on the south side of the basilica are even more offset from the lines of the basilica, and it is not certain if these are to be associated with the proposed monastery complex or if they are all that remains of the earlier complex on whose site the basilica was constructed.

There is little evidence for decoration. The fallen masonry is too

weathered to show the form or design of arcades. Some of the masonry is of a fine white limestone, but there is no obvious trace of marble, apart from a small column base which lies outside the south wall and which may have been fashioned out of low grade marble. No columns can be seen among the debris. Numerous pieces of small glass and stone tesserae of a variety of colours imply a wall mosaic, and larger rectangular tesserae of black, pink and cream-coloured stone were no doubt used for some parts of the floor. There are indications that the nave was at least partially paved with limestone slabs. Many tile fragments imply a tiled roof. Comparisons suggest a c. 5th century date.

Basilica 'B' (Fig. 26) was converted from an odeon which flanked the southeast side of the upper agora.¹¹² Little more than the apse survives (Pl. 48). Its lowest visible part was constructed of small stones and two reused moulded blocks, one of which is inscribed. Above is a facing of upright slabs with an average height of 1.10 m.¹¹³ The holes for the bronze letters of a single-line inscription remain. Above the slabs rest horizontally laid blocks of varying sizes. The apse was semi-circular; it was enclosed by the northeast wall of the former odeon, and the space between seems to have been filled with rubble. Machatschek and Schwarz noted traces of a 3-stepped synthronon, and pieces of marble revetment.¹¹⁴

There are few surviving traces of the rest of this building, although it appears that the four outer walls of the odeon were retained as the outer walls of the basilica. The basilica was divided into nave and two aisles by colonnades, apparently each with six bays. Two types of Ionic capitals seem to have been used in the basilica. The first type suggests a 2nd century date - these were perhaps features of the odeon which were repositioned when the basilica was built - and the second type appear to be copies, presumably fashioned for specific use in the basilica because an insufficient number of originals could be found.¹¹⁵

There was no narthex at the usual end of the building, presumably because of the sloping ground. Instead, the narthex flanked the long northwest side of the basilica and seems to have been a feature of the earlier building. The northernmost of the three doors in the northwest wall was apparently blocked up.¹¹⁶ An inscription and cross were noted on one door jamb.¹¹⁷ Flanking the apse, on its right side, was a small squared chamber which communicated with the aisle by a small door. On the opposite side of the apse was no chamber, but there was an apsidal niche in the wall of the main apse. On the ground in the body and the vicinity of the basilica can be seen large squared tesserae of white marble, and small glass and stone tesserae of pink, blue and dark grey. The date of the basilica was perhaps 4/5th century.

Basilica 'C' (Fig. 27) was converted from the temple of Zeus on the summit of the Kesbedion hill at the western extreme of the site. The details of the basilica and the conversion are given by Machatschek and Schwarz.¹¹⁸ The columns which surrounded the temple on north, south and west sides were reshaped and the spaces filled in with limestone slabs to form the outer walls of the basilica. The stones were well fitted and fixed with clamps. The east wall and the semi-circular apse were completely new additions, as was the inner wall of the narthex. The narthex was 3.30 m. deep. In both inner and outer walls was a single central door, 2.60 m. high and 1.50 m. wide. The internal divisions of the basilica were formed by 5 free-standing piers, 54.5 cms. square, with simply moulded, squared tops. The floor was apparently cemented. The remains of a semi-circular bema were noted within the apse.

Machatschek and Schwarz surmised that this basilica was later transformed into a smaller church; the outer wall of the narthex fell into disrepair, the length of the earlier basilica was shortened by the fixing of a division, 0.65 m. thick, with a central door, across the width, with the

result that the western part of the early basilica became a kind of forecourt, or deep narthex.

Basilica 'D' (Fig.28) lies within the city walls at the northern extreme of the site.¹¹⁹ This was the largest basilica at Selge, 55.80 m. in length and 32.30 m. in width. Very little of the building survives. The semi-circular apse was inscribed and flanked by a side chamber on either side. There was apparently a synthronon with 4 steps. The nave was divided from the aisles by 6 free-standing pillars down each side. Machatschek and Schwarz were of the opinion that the basilica originally had no narthex and that when this was added at a later date, it was planned at the same width as the podium temple which stood at a slight angle to the axis of the basilica, at its southwest corner. Mosaic tesserae were found in the vicinity of the apse.

Basilica 'E' (Fig. 29) stood outside the city walls on the northwest side of the city.¹²⁰ The horseshoe apse, the flanking side rooms and the outer walls were constructed of rubble, of both limestone and conglomerate rock. The nave was divided from the aisles by a series of large piers down each side. The piers were constructed of reused materials, including inscriptions and an Ionic capital. At the west end of the basilica was a narthex which apparently communicated with the nave and the aisles via three doors. There also seems to have been a forecourt or an outer porch, and an additional aisle at least on the north side of the basilica. The roof was at least partially tiled. At a later date, it appears that the basilica was transformed. The easternmost bay of each arcade was completely blocked in by a solid wall of a greater thickness than the piers. The other bays were closed off by a narrower wall, with the result that four rectangular niches were left down each side of the nave. Also apparently part of this later transformation was the erecting of two screens in the north aisle, one across the nave and, possibly, a fourth in the south aisle.

Built tombs in the vicinity imply that this was a cemetery church.

Basilica 'F' (Fig. 30) stood outside the city walls on the east side of the site.¹²¹ Machatschek and Schwarz traced a semi-circular apse, which seems to have been inscribed and flanked by a chamber on either side. Two reused limestone column stumps noted in situ, and a fallen column in the south aisle, indicate that the nave was divided from the aisles by colonnades. Five free-standing columns down each side were conjectured. No capitals or bases were noted. The walls, including the wall of the apse, were constructed of limestone and conglomerate rubble. The extent and the details of the west end of the basilica are unclear, as are the details of the aisles. The basilica stood in the eastern cemetery of the city, and presumably had a funerary function. Machatschek and Schwarz associated traces of construction on both north and south sides of the building with the basilica, and suggested that it may have been a monastery church.

Basilica 'G' (Fig. 31), probably also a cemetery church, stands outside the city walls, to the west of the Kesbedion hill.¹²² The enclosed semi-circular apse and the flanking side rooms were built of sandstone; the rest of the basilica was constructed from conglomerate rock. The dimensions of the building were recorded as 31 by 14.10 metres. Details are very unclear. Machatschek and Schwarz concluded that the basilica was destroyed, perhaps by fire or by earthquake, and a small church was built from the ruins, by closing off the original arcades and erecting a new west wall, so that the western part of the original basilica became the forecourt of the church. Traces of mortar were found which were attributed to the second phase of construction. Also noted was a marble slab bearing a Latin cross.

The chapel was situated near the road from Ikiz Yaylası to Selge, at a considerable altitude above that of the ancient city.¹²³ Very little survives, but it seems that this was a single-chambered structure, built of rubble, 4.80 m. wide, with a horseshoe apse, 3.90 m. wide.

ETENNA

The city of Etenna has recently been conclusively identified with the ruins above Syrtköy by the discovery of an inscription bearing the city name.¹²⁴ Although the city might be thought to lie outside the geographical boundaries outlined at the beginning of the chapter, the site has not been thoroughly investigated and there have been only brief references to the ecclesiastical remains. There are three churches at the site. The largest of these is of basilican plan. A smaller structure, also apparently of basilican plan, lies immediately to the south of the large basilica and may possibly have been associated with it. Further up the hill, to the north, is another church whose plan is unclear.

The upper church lies below and to the south of the acropolis. The apse is the only feature which has survived to any extent (Pl. 49). Its construction material consists of extremely cleanly cut, well fitting and neatly coursed limestone masonry, with pieces of broken brick filling a couple of gaps. Three courses remain; these are of alternating heights. At least one of the blocks is definitely reused. Both faces of the apse are curved and the inner face remains well smoothed. The uppermost course is pierced by a series of holes around the whole of the inner curve. These were presumably joist holes for the fixing of a wooden synthronon. The left side of the apse is incomplete and obscured by bushes. At the right side, it is clear that a wall led from this end of the apse to meet the outer south wall. There are no in situ traces of other walls or internal divisions, but among the large amount of debris in the body of the church are column fragments which might imply that the building was of basilican plan with colonnaded divisions between the nave and the aisles. Other fragments include simply moulded architrave blocks and Hellenistic or early Roman inscr-

options which must have been reused, a tapering, elongated Byzantine capital with simple mouldings on its upper part, and a simple Ionic-type capital which can be dated by comparisons to the 6/7th century. Blue, yellow and green glass tesserae imply that there was a wall mosaic. Bright red tile fragments indicate a tiled roof.

The large basilica (Fig. 32) stands some distance directly south of the upper church. The outer walls are fairly high and the apse survives to a height of over 3 metres. (Pl. 50). The lower c. 2 metres of the apse is built of both small and massive blocks, sections of which are coursed. Above, is a course of narrow blocks, surmounted by a course of upright rectangular blocks. The masonry is reused. Roughly a metre from the bottom of the apse is a row of joist holes for the fixing of a wooden synthronon. Against each end of the apse is a pier formed from three blocks, with a moulded top. On the west face of each of the uppermost blocks is an incised Latin cross. There may have been shallow side chambers flanking the apse, but the apse appears not to have been enclosed.

The south wall stands about 2 metres high. The north wall is rather more delapidated but some parts survive to this same height. The outer walls are again built of reused masonry, the coursing slightly hampered by the different sizes of the blocks. The basilica is much overgrown with trees and bushes, as is the rest of the site, but clearly discernable are the rectangular pillars which divided the nave from the aisles. All four of the free-standing pillars of the south division (Pl. 51) and three of the north division remain in situ. Of the same width as the pillars is visible a series of limestone slabs which join the pillars at ground level. The distance between one pillar and the next, c. 3 metres, is the same as the measurement between the easternmost pillar and the pier standing against the end of the apse. This

pier was presumably used as the support for the east end of the arcade. The aisles are less than 2 metres wide and the nave about 6 metres wide. The length of the nave is c. 20 metres.

A fifth pillar incorporated into the west wall seems to have served both as the support for the west end of the arcade and as the jamb of the door into the south aisle. Unless this is a sign of reuse, a hole in the south face of the pillar may have been for a door fixture. The actual entrance is marked by a row of slabs at ground level. There is a short section of wall on the south side of the entrance which abuts against the south wall of the basilica. Both north and south outer walls continue to define the sides of the narthex. Traces of the west wall of the narthex show that the narthex was deep. There is no sign of the form of the main entrance into the basilica, but it was quite plausibly a single central doorway. There is no evidence for decorative devices used in the basilica, apart from the crosses on the piers at the ends of the apse and a few fragments of white marble. An abundance of tile fragments indicates that the roof was predominantly tiled.

The small basilica stands immediately to the south of the large basilica (Fig. 33). The apse is about midway along the length of the large basilica and its western extreme coincides with the narthex of the large basilica. Of the apse, only the northern part remains. Its thickness is formed by two fairly well cut blocks. There is the suggestion of a wall extending to the north from the corner of the apse. The deep south wall survives to a height of over a metre, but it is mostly buried. Sections of the double row of blocks marking the western extreme of the body of the basilica are visible at ground level. The northern jamb of a narrow door at the south end of this wall remains in situ. The outer row of the double row of blocks which

form the south wall begins to continue westwards, suggesting that the building had a narthex. That the church was of basilican plan is implied by a squat squared pillar which stands against the west wall, approximately a metre to the west of the door jamb, presumably on line with the south end of the apse. A further pillar of the same dimensions is in situ directly west of the north end of the apse. There is no trace of the north outer wall of the basilica, but the dimensions imply that it was less than 10 metres to the south of the large basilica. Just outside the apse are fragments of what may have been an ambo fashioned from a grey stone. The decoration suggests a c. 5th century date. Dark and bright red tile fragments lie scattered about the site of the basilica.

It is uncertain whether this building was completely independent of the large basilica or is to be associated with it. The proximity suggests an association but, if so, its function can only be surmised. If the fragments of grey stone do indeed constitute an ambo and this ambo did belong to the small basilica, it is conceivable that this was a regular church for a congregation of a different denomination than that which attended the large basilica, or that this was an early civic basilica whose function was replaced at a later date by the erection of a larger building.

LYCAONIA

VASADA

No ecclesiastical building has been discovered at the main city site on Kestel Dağı. Between the site and the village of Bostandere, however, the foundations of a church were unearthed by villagers in the 19th century.¹²⁵ Unfortunately, there is no longer any trace, and no details were given by Sterrett apart from a remark about a marble female statue

of poor workmanship which was discovered on the church site. This was probably an extra-mural church, rather than an indication that the site was relocated during late Antiquity.

In the village of Bostandere are Byzantine architectural fragments and Christian inscriptions.¹²⁶ One of the inscriptions records a baptist-

erion.¹²⁷ On the south slope of the valley to the east of the village, a Byzantine ossuary was noted by Hall.¹²⁸ This comprised two chambers with recesses for the dead, and contained an altar with a niche and a cross in a roundel.

A story recounted by Basil of Caesareia, referring to c. AD 384, throws interesting light on provincial ecclesiastical politics.¹²⁹

Longinus, a priest who practised in the see of Mistea, had been relieved of his position for insubordinate behaviour. Cyriacus, a priest of Mindana, which was in the see of Vasada, was appointed as Longinus' replacement. When Cyriacus was ordained, he had taken a vow that he would remain at Mindana. In order that this oath should not be violated, the see of Mistea was annexed to the see of Vasada.

AMBLADA

Jüthner recorded the remains of two large churches at the site of Amblada.¹³⁰ The remains of one of these, on the summit of the hill, west of the rocky acropolis, can still be seen. Only indistinct foundations survive to indicate the lines of the apse and the outer walls. The apse is marked by occasional partially buried blocks. The north wall is defined by three adjoining blocks at its west end and two adjoining blocks at its east end. A single block of the south wall remains in situ. Internal details are no longer visible. To the south of the church is a hollow faced with small stones which was perhaps a cistern. Certain of the fallen blocks were definitely reused, and a particular block bearing a triglyph made Sterrett indecisive in

pronouncing the building a church.¹³¹ A chancel screen post and fragments of double columns or mullion shafts lie scattered about the site of the church. Just outside the north wall, Sterrett noted a peribolos, its pavement of large quadrangular slabs still undisturbed. This is no longer evident, perhaps buried, and it is uncertain if it was an integral feature of the church complex or, possibly, a sign that the church had been built on the site of another structure,

In the nearby villages and cemeteries are Christian inscriptions and ecclesiastical fragments, including further mullion shafts (Pl. 52) and double columns, one of which was inscribed.¹³²

Other bishoprics of the highland region are less well represented. Some of these have not been located and therefore neither church nor ecclesiastical fragments can be attributed to the cities. The sparsity of evidence from some of the located bishoprics is not always a sign that there is nothing to be found. It often reflects the need for further investigation.

The site of Conane has not been positively identified, but was doubtless at or near Gönen. Rott suggested that one of the three mosques in the village was built on the foundations of a church, but does not give any details.¹³³ A fragment of a church screen bearing a Christian

inscription, found in Isparta, was said to have originated from Gönen.¹³⁴

Isparta is not thought to have been the site of a significant ancient settlement, despite early travellers' attempts to find an ancient name for the modern town, and it is likely that the provenance of other fragments in Isparta was Conane or Seleuceia. One interesting piece was a door lintel, highly ornamented with egg-and-dart, dentils and palmettes. An inscription on the lintel records the name of the bishop Paul and shows that it belonged to a church of the Archangel. Unfort-

unately, the date is not clearly decipherable.¹³⁵

The site of Pogla has been located, but there are no standing ecclesiastical remains. There is, however, epigraphic evidence of Christianity in the form of an inscription on the base of a small column which, according to the inscription, must have served as the pedestal of a cross.¹³⁶ Grégoire dated the inscription to the 4th or 5th

century. In addition, a Byzantine font was found in a field near Çomaklı.¹³⁷

The site of Andeda has not been located with absolute certainty, but it is presumed to have been in the vicinity of Yavuz, formerly Andiya. Ecclesiastical fragments have been discovered in Yavuz. In one house, Bean recorded a handsome marble font bearing a cross and a brief inscription.¹³⁸ In the same house were found limestone slabs which Bean suggested might have belonged to a church floor. Also in Yavuz was found an oblong slab of polished marble, bearing an inscription along one side which records the names of Constantine and Helena.¹³⁹ This was perhaps from an altar dedicated to the two. On the top is a cross in a roundel, and on the front face survive the first letters of an inscription.

The modern town of Beyşehir is thought to obscure the ancient site of Mistea. In the cemetery of İçerişehir, now the part of Beyşehir to the north of the river, the sparse remains of a small church were noted by Jüthner.¹⁴⁰ Many of the fragments in Beyşehir, notably built into one of the mosques, and recognisable as 11/12th century, can be attributed to Mistea.

In addition to the evidence for ecclesiastical activity at known bishopric sites, there are also a number of churches and fragments from non-bishopric sites. Of course, several of these are candidates for unlocated bishoprics. Tityassus, for example, which is probably to be

located either south of Lake Beyşehir or in the mountainous region between Beyşehir and Eğridir, has frequently been indentified with the site of Ivrim Kalesi, near Kaşaklı, at the southwest corner of Lake Beyşehir. There are, however, other sites in this region, some of which, namely those near Üskerles, Dumanlıyeniköy and Çetmi¹⁴¹ have yielded ecclesiastical material, and although this in itself is no exclusive criterion for the identification of a bishopric, one must be aware that there are alternative locations for the site of Tityassus.

Occasionally, a solitary church has been discovered which may be the only surviving building of an ancient settlement, or it may have been a communal church which served a number of surrounding villages and farmsteads, perhaps presided over by a chorepiscopus, a kind of parish priest. Sozomen informs us that even villages had their consecrated bishops.¹⁴² In some instances, the purpose of an isolated church may have been monastic.

Olbasa is the only named settlement which is not known to have been a bishopric but at which has been found evidence for a church. On

the site, Levick noted the remains of a well constructed building, with an apse of large dimensions at its east end.¹⁴³ The apse was horseshoe in plan, with internal projections, 18" deep and 17" wide. The external width was 27 feet, and the depth was 31 feet. The wall of the apse was 20" thick. Despite the incongruity of these measurements with the dimensions of a regular church, a fragment recorded by Duchesne proves that there must have been a church at the site.¹⁴⁴ This fragment was part of a door lintel decorated with palmettes and a Maltese cross. There is no other trace of a Christian presence at the site, but numismatic evidence testifies to occupation on some scale in the early 7th and the 11th centuries.¹⁴⁵

Near Döşemealtı, at the foot of the road lined with sarcophagi which

leads through the Taurus from Dağ to the Pamphylian plain, have been noted the remains of a settlement, which is perhaps to be identified with Panemoteichus.¹⁴⁶ On the outskirts of the settlement were recorded two basilicas, here referred to as 'A' and 'B', after Rott.

Basilica 'A' (Fig. 34) stood towards the foot of the hillside, across the valley from the settlement.¹⁴⁷ There was a semi-circular apse, 4.15 m. wide, at the east end and a narthex, 3.40 m. deep, at the opposite end. The apse was pierced by a large window, 1.90 m. wide, divided into two by a central shaft. The nave was 5.30 m. wide, and the aisles each 2.60 m. wide. Pilasters, 0.70 m. square, were noted still in position at each end of each nave-aisle division. The inside of the basilica was much overgrown with thorny bushes, but fragments of columns lying on the ground suggested to Rott that the nave was divided from the aisles by colonnades. The outer walls, 0.80 m. thick, were constructed of mortared rubble, with well fashioned ashlar used for the corners. On the east side, the walls stood several metres high. Rott's surprise that there were no traces of windows in the outer walls might suggest that the north and south walls were high enough to show that there were no windows at all. He does not, however, specify the exact extant height of the walls all round, so it is possible that there were originally windows at a high level, perhaps only in the south wall, which faces away from the hillside. In the west wall was a central door, 1.70 m. wide, and a door, 1.10 m. wide, led from the narthex into each of the aisles. The west wall of the narthex was partly buried by rubble, but there seems to have been a wide central entrance.

Basilica 'B' (Fig. 35) was built into the hillside, higher up than basilica 'A'.¹⁴⁸ The total length, including the apse, was 25.80 m., and the width 12.85 m. A central nave, 5.90 m. wide, was divided from the aisles, each 2.70 m. wide, by a series of rectangular pillars, 7 down each side. The distance between the pillars was 2.10 m. At the east

end of the basilica was the semi-circular apse, with a broad central window, divided into two by a central shaft. The window was flush with the bounding wall which enclosed the apse. To the south of the apse was a side chamber, with a narrow slit window and a narrow doorway in its east wall. On the north side of the apse there was no side room; the wall was solid, but there was a small apsidal niche, just over a metre deep, at the end of the north aisle. The construction of the walls was the same as that used in basilica 'A' - rubble bound by good quality mortar, with ashlar used for the corners. The thickness of the walls was one metre. Rott estimated that there must have been three windows in the upper part of the south wall. He also noted, among the debris in the body of the basilica, masonry of the same thickness as the walls, bearing traces of plaster. His conclusion from this, that the roof was vaulted in stone, is by no means certain. At the west end of the nave and the south aisle was a door. Because of the sloping nature of the terrain, there was no narthex. Instead, a strong buttressing wall was built against the west wall of the basilica, protruding c. 3 metres to the south, to prevent the foundations from slipping. Stairs led from the valley below, both to the main entrance in the west wall and to the narrow doorway at the south side of the apse.

By far the greatest amount of evidence for ecclesiastical activity in the region has been recorded in the districts south and, in particular, east of Lake Beyşehir. Whether the number of churches in this area is significant in religious terms, or is merely the result of the isolation of the sites having helped to preserve their remains, is uncertain.

At a place called Parisbelaeni Çoluk, west of Çetmi, was noted a basilica with nave, two aisles and a narthex.¹⁴⁹ The length of the building was 19.50 m. and the width 9 m. Other remains on the site were apparently also of a late date. In Çetmi itself were noted ecclesiastical fragments, quite probably from this church.¹⁵⁰ An interesting piece was an

ornamented lintel which bore the representation of a bird holding a branch in its beak.

On Erenler Dağı (formerly Elengirif Dağı), south-west of Yatağan, a "ruined church and monastery" were reported by Sterrett.¹⁵¹ Details of the building were published by Swoboda.¹⁵² The external length of the church was 15.70 m., and the external width 11.74 m. The apse was horseshoe in plan, with the ends turning inwards, 3.10 m. deep by 4.05 m. wide. The nave was divided from the aisles by two series of rectangular pillars with simple incorporated capitals (Fig. 46). In each division were three free-standing pillars, with one protruding from the wall at each end. On the ground were found arched fragments whose dimensions fitted the 3 metre distance between the pillars, showing that there was an arcade with four bays down each side of the nave. The width of the nave was 4.95 m., and that of the aisles 2 metres (Fig. 36). The thickness of the outer walls of the church was 0.90 m., whereas the apse wall was 1.10 m. thick. The apse was pierced by three small windows which were connected by well-fashioned blocks; the rest of the masonry was not so neatly fitted. Along the north and south outer walls of the church were four double-arched windows, each facing an arch of the arcade. The windows were formed by two openings, 0.70 m. wide, with a central dividing shaft, 0.36 m. wide. These mullion shafts were ornamented with a bead-and-reel and zig-zag design on their inner faces (Fig. 47). Down each side were three bar holes, presumably for a window grille. In the west wall of the nave was a single doorway, 1.10 metres wide. No door led directly from the outside into the aisles. From the ground plan published by Swoboda and the silence of the account it must be assumed that there was no narthex. In the vicinity of the church were found considerable remains of what were identified as cloisters, thereby explaining Sterrett's 'monastery'.

At a place known to 19th and early 20th century travellers as Bey Etjo Kozu,

between Yatağan and Bulumya, were discovered the remains of a Christian settlement.¹⁵³ Among the ruins was a church which Strykowski classed, along with the church on Erenler Dağı, among his 'Isaurian type.'¹⁵⁴ Knoll considered the church as a type between those of Binbirkilise and Sagalassus, as far as the ground plan is concerned.¹⁵⁵ At the turn of the century, sufficient masonry was still in situ to indicate the complete plan, part from the exact form of the extreme west end. Much of the south part of the church was missing, but it can be conjectured from the extant remains of the north part. There exist two published plans, both apparently by Knoll. One of these gives individual measurements;¹⁵⁶ the other gives only a scale, but the extant sections of the walls are shaded.¹⁵⁷ The plan used here (Fig. 37) is a combination of the two, both giving the measurements and showing the extant sections of the walls. The apse was rounded inside and out, slightly horseshoe in plan, with the ends barely turning inwards, 3.50 m. wide by 2 m, deep. The body of the church was of cruciform plan, with a transept across the width, just in front of the apse. Side aisles extended westwards from the arms of the transept. The internal length of the nave, including the transept, was 10.20 m. The internal width was only very slightly more, 11.10 m., with the result that the whole formed almost an exact square. The nave was 3.80 m. wide. Knoll noted that the nave was divided from the aisles by double columns, but there is no clear indication that these were found in situ. The plan implies that sections of the foundation of the division between the nave and the north aisle and of that between the north aisle and the transept were still preserved. The walls were 0.80 m. thick; the wall of the apse was slightly thicker at 0.90 m. In the centre of the west wall was a central door. Leading westwards from this wall were sections of walls which indicate two rectangular chambers, 5.20 m. long by 2 m. wide, the inner wall of each on line with the corresponding nave-aisle division, and the outer wall recessed by a wall's width, 0.80 m., from

the line of the outer wall of the church. There was no communication between the chambers and the aisles. It is not clear whether the space between the two chambers was completely closed at its west end or partially walled and pierced by a door. The walls of the chambers themselves were too fragmentary to show the position of entrances. These chambers probably served as pastophories, as is common in the Lycaonian churches. Apart from the double columns, the only trace of decoration seems to have been a moulded architrave fragment bearing a simple frieze of stylised grape clusters and vine tendrils.¹⁵⁸

Near Milligöz, Jüthner noted the remains of a small chapel and a small church with cloisters.¹⁵⁹ The latter building was presumably that described briefly by Strykowski.¹⁶⁰ The body of the church was 5.10 m. long and 3.10 m. wide. The entrance to the church was described as 'typical'. Outside the walls was found a pillar with double columns. Further details are unknown. In Milligöz itself were found a Christian inscription and many other fragments with Christian decoration, including two fragments of arched windows.¹⁶¹

On a summit called Ali Suması Dağı, between Yatağan and Gavur Gölü, 2 hours climb from Kilisra, a church and monastery complex was recorded by Bell.¹⁶² The church was of Latin cross plan, the arms of the transept extending freely from the nave (Fig. 38). The external length, including the apse and the narthex was over 20 metres. The nave was c. 4 m. wide and the transept c. 13 m. wide. The apse was horseshoe in plan, with a central window, divided into two by a double column. Down either side of the nave and in the north arm of the transept were two V-shaped windows. The deep narthex was much delapidated, and only the thick south wall survived to any extent. Set into the inner face of this wall was a rectangular niche, arched at the top. The south wall seemed to have undergone repair at some time. In the south wall of the south

arm of the transept was noted a door, with the heavy undecorated jambs still in position. The church was constructed of well finished large ashlar blocks. Around the church, above window level, ran a course of narrow simply moulded stones. To the north and west of the church were precipitous rocks. On the east and south sides, the church was enclosed by a thick wall, pierced by doorways. A few metres to the west of the church was a small square building with a door in its west wall. Fallen double columns indicated windows in the other three walls. Around the building, below window level, ran the same simply moulded course as that noted in the church. A second rectangular building, much delapidated, but also with a door in its west wall, stood to the west of the first. The associated buildings clearly suggest a monastery complex, and according to Sterrett, the site was still called Monastir in the 19th century.¹⁶³ This church was presumably the same as that in inside which Sterrett noted two vaulted mausolea, which suggests that this particular church was a funerary church. There was conceivably another church or chapel at the site, although, Bell, despite the fact that her visit was cut short by bad weather, doubted this.

Near the village of Dikilitaş, a few kilometres east of Vasada, a Christian settlement with more than one church was noted by Jüthner.¹⁶⁴ Swoboda referred to a large church and a small church at the site.¹⁶⁵ The large church is presumably the one which was briefly described by Strygowski,¹⁶⁶ who classed the church as of 'Isaurian type', particularly similar to the Binbirkilise churches. The body of the church was measured as 21 m. long and 11.50 m. wide. The nave was divided from the aisles by pillars with moulded half-columns, six down each side. On each side of the entrance was a rectangular chamber. These were probably pastophories, but it is uncertain if the resulting plan of the west end was like that of the church at Bey Etjo Kozu or similar to that of the church at Apameia. Sterrett noted crosses on stones at this settlement and a

number of sarcophagi in the vicinity of the church.¹⁶⁷ Swoboda recorded a limestone grave cippus bearing a Latin cross near the church,¹⁶⁸ which might imply that this was a cemetery church.

The remains of a multi-period settlement at Kilise Kalesi, 1 km. east of Akkise have been described by Hall.¹⁶⁹ This was undoubtedly a settlement of the Gorgoromeis. As indicated by the name Kilise Kalesi, a church stood near the late Roman site. The walls survived to c. 2 metres in height. The internal length was 30 metres, the width 12 metres. Internal structural details were obscured by debris, but a number of plaster fragments bearing traces of fresco were noted. A great deal of heavy tile indicated the roofing material. In Akkise itself, built into the village houses, were fragments of ecclesiastical decoration. In particular, almost the whole of a balcony front was constructed of fragments which can be dated to the 11/12th century.¹⁷⁰ One other fragment was considered by Hall to have been the back of a rounded seat from the church.¹⁷¹

Other churches in this district are not so well preserved or have not been thoroughly recorded or investigated. Sterrett recorded the ruins of a large church at Keşlik Mevkii, near Gavur Gölü.¹⁷² Ecclesiastical fragments, including an inscribed epistyle block of 11/12th century date and an elaborately decorated capital of c. 7th century date from a settlement near Boyalı, south of Vasada, indicate that there was a church at the site.¹⁷³ Architectural fragments in Üskerles, supposedly from a site near the village of Yaranşehir, to the north, include capitals of c. 7th century date and epistyle blocks of 11/12th century date.¹⁷⁴ Ecclesiastical architecture in Dumanlıyeniköy, from a site at Saraycık Yaylası in the mountains to the west, indicate the existence of a church at the site.¹⁷⁵ Numerous ecclesiastical fragments of unknown provenance have been recorded especially in the villages in the vicinity of Erenler Dağı.¹⁷⁶ Many of the fragments are double columns and mullion shafts

which supports the evidence already given, that the churches in this district derived much of their architectural inspiration from the churches of Isauria.

A rock-cut chapel near the site of (?) Sinethandus, near Kızılören, has already been mentioned. Another rock-cut church was noted in western Pisidia, near the village of Avdan, some kilometres to the northwest of Dağ. (Fig. 41)¹⁷⁷ This church was partly cut out of the rock and partly built of small stones. Pieces of low quality brick were used for the arches of the windows. At the east end was a rounded apse, and in the centre a dome on a square base. Because of the frescoes painted on the walls, Pace compared the church to that on Yeşil Adası, at the south end of Lake Eğirdir. He attributed cuttings in the surrounding rock to the presence of some Mediaeval hermit who might have taken care of this unknown sanctuary. No other remains have been reported in the vicinity to suggest that the church was attached to a settlement, and it might be that it belonged to a group of ascetics.

Near the village of Gaziri, towards the north end of the east side of lake Eğirdir, was a rock-cut chapel of the Virgin which was the object of an annual pilgrimage of the Greeks of the region to commemorate the day of the Assumption.¹⁷⁸ The chapel was small in size, 4.15 m. long and 3.49 m. wide, with a broad shallow apse at one end and a single entrance at the opposite end (Fig. 42). A dome was hewn out of the roof. In front of the apse was noted the rectangular base for the altar, and about a third of the way along the church from the apse was the base for an iconostasis. This extended the whole width of the chapel and had the usual gap in the centre. Pace noted faint traces of a fresco on the vault at the right side of the entrance. This depicted a saint on horseback, shown by an inscription, also in paint, to have been a certain Saint Cornutus.¹⁷⁹ Nearby the chapel entrance were a number of small rock-cut cells. Pace suggested that these indicate that

the chapel was originally associated with the hermitage implied by the cells. In the vicinity was a further rock-cut chamber with a dome cut into the roof and a large central niche which may have served as an apse. The chronology is, however, uncertain. The iconostasis, and perhaps also the place for the altar, is doubtless to be associated with the Greek pilgrimages. The spot, however, may have been considered sacred from pre-Christian times, perhaps partly on account of an arched doorway of natural rock which stands at the water's edge. Nearby is an ancient carved Phrygian grave,¹⁸⁰ and apparently there was a temple of Artemis of the Lake on an island just off the opposite shore. This island was later inhabited by a Christian community.¹⁸¹ It is not improbable that a cult of Artemis would have been succeeded by a cult of the Virgin, as suggested by Ramsay, particularly if there was some natural wonder in the vicinity.¹⁸² The Acts of the Council of Nicaea of AD 787 record *Επιφανιος ηγουμενος της Αγιας Θεοτικου Λιμνης*.¹⁸³ If, as Ramsay suggested, this epithet is to be associated with Lake Eğirdir, there was no doubt already a cult of the Virgin in the district at this time and it is not improbable that this sanctuary was hewn out of the rock by the 8th century at the latest. The Virgin was not an unpopular dedicatee,¹⁸⁴ but this is the only known example of a church of the Virgin being so obviously associated with a lake. The representation of Saint Cornutus, however, causes some confusion if it implies that the chapel was at one time dedicated to the saint. Pace's suggestion that the rock-cut cells imply a hermitage brings to mind Ramsay's theory that this was the hermitage of Saint George Limniota who was persecuted during the reign of Leo the Isaurian around AD 742 and retreated to Mount Olympus.¹⁸⁵ Ramsay's reasoning was that George's epithet implies that his hermitage was near a lake and that the recording of a village by the name of Olympus in the Tekmoreian inscriptions is too much of a coincidence. The argument, however, is not foolproof. There may have been a hermitage of sorts here, but whether or not this was the place

to which George retreated is open to question. Some distance south of the chapel, in a little valley called Dutlu, were noted the remains of a small settlement of an uncertain late date.¹⁸⁶ Among the ruins were observed the curve of an apse and two small column bases.

The fragments, now in Yalvaç museum, belonging to a church of the village of Pidron, were found in two separate groups in a field near Çamormanı, some 40 kms. west of Antiocheia. The fragments consist of miniature pillars and capitals, one very fragmentary arch, and a second, almost complete, which bears the inscription recording the name of the village (Pl. 53). Although the fragments are from virtually the same find spot and of a similar date, 4/5th century, the simple palmette designs vary slightly, implying that more than one single decorative feature of the church - or, conceivably, of more than one church - is represented.

On the island of Yeşil Adası, at the south end of Lake Eğridir, have been recorded a number of churches and chapels which belonged to a monastery complex. One of the best preserved of the churches was that of St. Stephen (Fig. 43) which has been described at length by Rott.¹⁸⁷ This was a sturdily built structure, with thick walls and a central dome supported on pillars with incorporated acanthus capitals. The orientation of the church was east-west; there was a double window in the north and south walls, and two small openings in the apse wall. The original date of the church is uncertain. Some of the frescoes on the walls were given a late Byzantine date, but, due to long use, the building was obviously remodelled and redecorated a number of times, including the addition of the forecourt. Much of the masonry was reused, but its provenance is unknown. The arcade of the still-standing medrese in the town of Eğridir, is composed of reused columns and capitals. The columns are mostly of marble; one is grey granite.

Some of the capitals are recent copies, but the elaborate decoration and the motifs of the originals suggest a 6th century date. These columns and capitals may have originated from the monastery complex or, possibly, belonged to a church of Prostanna or Bindeus. In the monastery, Hirschfeld found fragments of the biography of St. Eutychius.¹⁸⁸

Both Sterrett and Ramsay recorded a huge monastery at a place called Koca Asarı, situated on a steep mountainside overlooking the plain of Siğirlik, to the southwest of Adada. Sterrett gave no description of the structure, apart from mentioning a cross and inscription over the doorway.¹⁸⁹ From Ramsay, we learn that the walls were well built, of polygonal masonry, using fine cement.¹⁹⁰ Further characteristics are unknown. Ramsay's suggestion that this monastery represents the Dadileia which is recorded as a joint bishopric with Malus in Notitiae X and XIII¹⁹¹ can be discounted, as Malus has recently been located at Sarıidris, much further north.

Discussion.

As pointed out in the Introduction, there is such a wealth of material on the various aspects of paganism in Anatolia that a separate detailed study is required and it is impossible here to follow the process of religious development in Pisidia from its earliest known origins.¹⁹²

Antiocheia might serve as an example of how strong a hold was retained by the native pagan deities in the highlands. The sanctuary of Men Ascaenus described by Strabo was located on a high hill about 5 kms.

to the east of the main city site, and there is evidence to show that the second sanctuary alluded to by the same author was in the vicinity, at Sağır, some 40 kms. northwest of the city.¹⁹³ The priesthood of

Men executed great political control over the local populace and, although the supremacy of this power was diminished when Antiocheia became an

Augustan colony, the sanctuary coming under the authority of the municipal government, the social and religious influences of the cult survived for at least three more centuries. Evidence of the wide-ranging influence and the high level of organisation of the cult of Men in this district are the 3rd century monuments which record the monetary contributions of the members of the society associated with the cult.¹⁹⁴

When Paul and Barnabas journeyed through Asia Minor, they were not planting the first seeds of Monotheistic thinking. One of their principal aims seems to have been to clean up some of the more objectionable aspects of Judaism, such as the worship of angels, a subject on which Paul expounded in his letter to the Colossians.¹⁹⁵ It is known from the Acts of the Apostles that at least one synagogue existed at Antiocheia at the time of Paul's visit. This was the synagogue in which Paul preached, but his sermon was addressed to "Men of Israel and you who worship our God",¹⁹⁶ implying that there were already Christians in Antiocheia at this time.

According to the Acts, Paul and Barnabas travelled from Pamphylia to Antiocheia.¹⁹⁷ It is not certain which route they took through the highlands. There are three alternatives - one to the west via Sagalassus, the second through the valley of the Aksu Çayı and via Adada, and the third the ancient equivalent of the modern road through Akseki, by the Melas valley.¹⁹⁸ On the strength of the argument that they embarked at Attaleia for their return sea voyage, Bérard proposed a route via Sagalassus.¹⁹⁹ It is, however, equally possible that they sailed up the Cestrus, both disembarking and rejoining their vessel at Perge, and making a detour to Attaleia on their journey home. Because it is certain that they visited Perge both at the beginning and at the end of this first mission, the road via the Aksu would have been logical in any case. Ramsay's theory that Karabaulo, the former name of Karadiken,

and Baulo, the former name of Sütçüler, each has some onomastic connection with the name Paul and implies that Paul might have indeed taken this route,²⁰⁰ is fanciful but interesting. Since Paul and Barnabas visited Perge, it is conceivable that they did travel the relatively short distance to Side, where there was a Jewish community and more than one synagogue.²⁰¹ There is no record of them having visited Side, but as the accounts of Paul's missions are not complete in any case, the omission from the record of a visit to Side would cause no surprise. From Side, they could have journeyed to Antiocheia via the Melas valley.

It would be useful to know of Paul's exact route since he must have passed through many minor settlements, details of which are not recorded in the Acts, and it is not unlikely that he imparted some influence on those communities with which he had contact on his journey. Ignatius and Eusebius confirm that Paul helped establish some of the first Christian communities.²⁰² Tradition has it that Artemon, the first bishop of Seleuceia Sidera, was converted by Paul,²⁰³ and the church of Apollonia was supposedly founded by Barnabas' cousin Mark.²⁰⁴ Whether these accounts, written long after the event, are based on truth will probably never be known.

The first Christians congregated in houses, especially when Christianity was a minority religion and fear of persecution made anonymity the safest course. Special meeting houses may have served the same purpose, and although in architectural terms these early Christian meeting places might not be called churches, in a functional sense they were. As there was presumably no significant difference between a Christian meeting house and private dwelling in archaeological terms, however, there is little evidence to show what form the first churches might have taken. The edicts which brought an end to persecution in the early 4th century all order that churches should be restored to Christians,²⁰⁵ indicating

that special buildings did exist by this time.

The great age of church building began under Constantine when the complete freedom given to Christians by the Emperor and the increase of financial support to the Church served as an impetus to Christians communities to construct houses of worship. Presumably all those bishoprics which sent representatives to the first synod in AD 325 already had ecclesiastical buildings in their cities, but there is little archaeological evidence to prove this. However, as building space in an already planned out city might have been restricted, it is possible that the standing remains of a number of churches of a later date may overlie original buildings of an early 4th century date. Moreover, some churches which have been attributed to the 5th century might actually have been built in the 4th.

Unfortunately, there are too few churches surviving to make a balanced survey, although a few interesting points might be raised and comparisons made. Uncertainties with dating, however, mean that some comparisons might be redundant. The only Pisidian church which can be dated to any degree of accuracy is the early basilica at Antiocheia whose mosaic provides a date three quarters through the 4th century. Still it is unknown whether the actual building was contemporary with or significantly earlier than the mosaic. No structural remains of the early basilica survive, and although it appears that the later basilica was built consciously along the lines of the early building, and it is possible that the same basic materials were reused in the rebuilding, one cannot include the standing remains in a discussion of 4th century planning and technique. By the same token, the later basilica cannot be regarded as typical of post-4th century building practice in Pisidia.

Other basilicas which may have been erected in the 4th century include basilica 'A' at Cremna, the church on the main site at Antiocheia, the

church at the sanctuary site, and basilica 'B' at Selge. Of these, only the dating of the basilica at Cremna is proposed with confidence. The others may have been 5th century. It was suggested above that the basilica at Pednelissus was quite possibly of a 4th century date. Yet, if it is true that there was a universal fear that pagan temples and their sites were haunted by demons, a 4th century date might be improbable as it appears that the basilica at Pednelissus was converted from a temple. Many of the basilicas can be given a c. 5th century date, a vagueness which covers the 4th and 6th centuries as well. However, there is a significant difference between one end of a three century time span and the other. Because of the combination of elements used in the basilicas and the variety of planning types, it is difficult to define chronological criteria for the Pisidian churches. One cannot base a dating scheme on the forms of the early basilica at Antiocheia and basilica 'A' at Cremna because the exact structural details of the first, as already pointed out, are not known and the second was a converted building. A 5th century date might be proposed fairly confidently for the Sagalassian transept basilicas. A further problem in dating is that seldom do decorative features which must have been designed specifically for the churches survive at the sites and even when they are found in nearby towns and villages it is unknown to which church they belonged.

The majority of the Pisidian churches were constructed from more anciently cut masonry and this, in some cases, can be shown to have originated from a temple building. Some of the churches were built on the sites of pagan temples, and a few were converted from temples. The 'Ionic' basilica at Sagalassus was built almost entirely from the materials of a temple of Apollo Clarius and in all probability on the site of the former temple. The transept basilica at Sagalassus was also built from the materials of a pagan building which was

possibly a temple of Dionysus. The same site may have been retained for the basilica. The church at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia reused a great amount of material from the temple of Men and its associated buildings. Basilica 'C' at Selge was converted from a temple of Zeus, and basilica 'D' incorporated a temple into its southwest end. The basilica at Pednelissus appears to have been converted from a pagan temple building. The church at Adada may have been converted from an earlier building which was possibly a temple. Merely the choice locations of some of the basilicas at Cremna, namely 'D', 'G' and 'H', might lead one to suspect that these were formerly temple sites. Basilica 'A' at Cremna was a remodelled secular basilica. Basilica 'B' at Selge was converted from an odeon. The small church at Pednelissus was converted from a Hellenistic heroon.

The most common basic building stone in the Pisidian highlands was a greyish or white limestone which was quarried locally. Quarrying was not, however, a problem for the builders as the churches were constructed of reused masonry, some to a greater degree than others. Even the marble used for more decorative features was refashioned from marble blocks which had been hewn out of the quarries in the Roman period, or decorative architectural pieces were lifted from earlier buildings and reused without being modified. Despite reuse, however, the masonry was sometimes extremely well fitted, especially if it had been put together in its original series, such as in both Sagalassian transept basilicas and the church at Apameia. Most often, however, walls were constructed of reused blocks of varying sizes, usually fairly well fitted, with coursing hindered by the different sizes of the blocks. As the walls were usually plastered, or covered with revetment, providing they were solid enough neatness was of little importance. As is usually the case, some of the apses were so well constructed that it is not surprising when an apse has survived to

a greater height than the rest of the basic structure of a church. This is particularly true of the upper church at Etenna and the church on the main site at Antiocheia both of whose neatly constructed apses survive to three courses whilst virtually nothing remains of the rest of the churches. A section of the apse of the transept basilica at Sagalassus stands to a considerable height. Even some of the apses with a less neat appearance, such as those of basilica 'A' at Selge and the large basilica at Etenna, have weathered the centuries well. The apse of the basilica at Etenna is a veritable jigsaw of masonry of widely varying sizes, yet almost perfectly put together.

Local sandstone was used in the construction of basilica 'G' at Selge, and local conglomerate rock was used in other basilicas at the same site. Mortared rubble, however, has perhaps proved to be the most enduring building material, as shown by the high walls of the church at Adada, the core of the apse at Ariassus, the church at Barla and the basilicas at the site near Döşemealtı.

The apses of the Pisidian churches were mostly semi-circular. Exceptions are the basilica at Antiocheia whose apse was semi-circular on the inside and polygonal on the outside, and the transept basilica at Sagalassus whose apse was three sides of an octagon. Some apses were horseshoe in plan, but there seems to be no significant regional concentration of this form. Horseshoe apses appear in the church on Erenler Dağı, the church at Bey Etjo Kozu, the church on Ali Suması Dağı, the church at Apameia, basilica 'F' at Cremna and basilica 'E' at Selge.

Windows were common in apses to provide light for the activities taking place at the east end of the church, but seldom does the apse survive to a sufficient height to confirm the presence, the number and the

form of the windows. There were probably three rectangular windows in the apse of the transept basilica at Sagalassus, one in each of the three sides. There was a fairly low and wide central window, probably compartmented, in the apse of basilica 'A' at Selge. In the apse of the church on Erenler Dağı were three arched windows. This is the only church where the form of the upper part of the apse windows is known, but arched windows were no doubt the most common form. In the apse of the church on Ali Suması Dağı was a central window divided into two and probably arched. There are no windows in the extent c. 3 metres of the apse of the large basilica at Etenna.

As a synthronon was often wooden, the evidence does not always survive. Only in the upper church and the large basilica at Etenna and in basilica 'A' at Cremna are the joist holes for the fixing of the synthronon visible around the apse. The transept basilica at Sagalassus may have had a synthronon which was partly wooden and partly of stone. Machatschek and Schwarz noted a stepped stone synthronon in each of basilicas 'A', 'B' and 'D' at Selge.

Some of the churches had enclosed apses. This could take one of two forms. Either the apse was incorporated into the bounding wall, or the apse was independent of the bounding wall. In the occurrence of the first of these forms, it was possible to have windows in the apse and there were usually side chambers flanking the apse. This phenomenon appears in most of the basilicas at Selge, perhaps suggesting influence from the coast. In basilica 'B' at Selge and basilica 'B' at the site near Döşemealtı, there was a chamber at the right side of the apse only. In cases where the apse was independent of the bounding wall, an eastern passage is implied. Instances occur at Antiocheia and Cremna. The enclosed apse of basilica 'B' at Cremna was no doubt related to its function as a funerary, and possibly also martyrial,

church. There was definitely a chamber on the north side of the apse, and there seems to have been an eastern passage. Basilica 'C' at Cremna also had an enclosed apse and probably also an eastern passage. The church on the main site at Antiocheia seems to have had a small apsidal chamber within the bounding wall, on the south side of the main apse. There was probably also an eastern passage, which might be reason for supposing the church to have had a martyrial function. The nature of the enclosed apse of the basilica at Sozopolis is unknown as too little of the structure survives; there may have been simple side chambers .

The majority of the churches had the basilican feature of a central nave and two aisles. Variations are the 'Ionic' basilica and the transept basilica at Sagalassus, the church at Bey Etjo Kozu and, possibly, the church on the main site at Antiocheia. Exceptions, apart from the rock-cut churches, which form a separate group as far as building technique is concerned, are the church at Adada, the lower church at Pednelissus and the church on Ali Suması Dağı.

The Sagalassian transept basilica had a true cross-transept, wider than the nave and aisles. The 'Ionic' basilica also had a cross-transept, only slightly wider than the nave and the aisles but emphasized by the single column which stood at the east end of each aisle and defined the west side of each arm of the transept. The church at Bey Etjo Kozu was of Latin cross plan, with aisles extending westwards from the arms of the transept, the transept being the same width as the nave and the aisles. The church at Antiocheia, which might be thought to have been of a similar plan, perhaps had no transept at all. In the absence of confirmative evidence from the structural part of the church above floor level, the ground plan suggests that there was in effect a central sanctuary area with flanking side rooms, a response to the need to make private both the sanctuary area in front of the

apse and the area behind it, by marking a division at the east end of each aisle, some metres before the entrance to the eastern passage, and further divisions on either side of the sanctuary area. The full transept was apparently a development of this idea.

The church on Ali Suması Dağı had a cross-transept, the arms extending some metres from the relatively narrow body of the church. The narrowness of the nave indicates that there would have been no internal longitudinal divisions. In view of the small size of the church at Adada, it is unlikely that there were internal divisions. The lower church at Pednelissus appears to have had a domed roof. The apse of this church, like the apse of the church at Adada, was almost as wide as the body of the church itself. The size of the church suggests a pre-8th century date and, if so, this church is important as the only domed church of a relatively early date found in the Pisidian highlands. It is, however, conceivable that the church was originally of regular basilican plan and that the dome and the apse were later modifications. Signs of remodelling were noted at the western end of the building.

The majority of the churches of basilican plan had rectangular pillars dividing the nave from the aisles. Some, including the basilica at Antiocheia, the 'Ionic' and the transept basilicas at Sagalassus, the basilica at Pednelissus, basilicas 'B' and 'F' at Selge, and probably the upper church at Etenna, the church at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia, basilica 'C' at Cremna and basilica 'A' at the site near Döşemealtı, had internal colonnades. In the church at Bey Etjo Kozu, double columns seem to have been used for the nave-aisle divisions. Several double columns in the cemetery of Kızılca near Amblada, and on the church site, suggest the same form of divisions. In the church at Dikilitaş, "pillars with half-columns" were used. This may be a long-winded term for the typical double column found in this region (e.g. at Kızılören, see Fig, 44) or might indicate pillars such as

those used in Church II (34) at Binbirkilise. The double column found in the fortress at Asar Kalesi was of this type (Fig. 45).

The forms of the west ends of the churches varied greatly. Most of the churches with the basilican feature of nave and two aisles had regular nartheces, with three doors connecting the narthex to the nave and the aisles. Basilica 'C' at Selge appears to have had only a single central door. The west wall of a narthex was often colonnaded, with no actual door, but this, although not a rule, was a trend not followed consistently in Pisidia. The narthex of basilica 'F' at Cremna was colonnaded, and the narthex of basilica 'B' was defined by a colonnade of simple double columns. Basilica 'C' at Cremna appears to have had a narthex defined by a colonnade, possibly of double columns, on a high stylobate which must have been approached by steps. There seems to have been a colonnaded narthex or porch at the west end of the church at Adada. The form of the west side of the narthex of the basilica at Antiocheia is uncertain. The colonnade on Woodbridge's plan is conjectural. There is no evidence to show that the narthex was colonnaded, but, as Antiocheia is a site which has suffered quite drastically from robbing, the possibility remains open.

That the narthex of basilica 'A' at Cremna was defined by a wall pierced by three doors is understandable as this was a feature which was inherited from the secular basilica. The church at Apameia had two doors in the west wall of the narthex, one in the centre and a second to the north. The narthex of the 'Ionic' basilica at Sagalassus was defined by a wall with a central door, and the same form seems to have occurred in basilicas 'A' and 'E' at Selge, basilica 'A' at the site near Döşemealtı and, possibly, the church on the main site at Antiocheia. The church at the sanctuary site and basilicas 'D' and 'E' at Cremna had their main entrances in the short north wall of the narthex.

There was apparently no narthex at the west end of the church on Erenler Dağı, which had a central door leading into the nave. Basilica 'B' at the site near Döşemealtı appears to have had no narthex; a doors led into the nave and the south aisle. There was no regular narthex at the west end of the church at Bey Etjo Kozu, which had a single central door leading into the nave. Instead there were two elongated chambers extending westwards from the aisles, but with no communication between the chambers and the aisles. The space between the chambers may have served as a narthex. The church at Dikilitaş may have had the same features at its west end. The church on Ali Suması Dağı had a walled narthex, probably with a central door. The lower extra-mural church at Pednelissus had a long forecourt with two side doors leading into the body of the church, but it is not certain how much of this constituted later modifications. Two elongated chambers seem to have been an additional feature of the church at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia, extending westwards from the narthex. The main entrance to this church was in the short north wall of the narthex, but it is possible that there was a small door in the west wall, in the space between the two chambers, which was quite plausibly a later modification. Two squared chambers adjoined the narthex of the church at Apameia, one on each side, creating a wide façade at the west end of the church. The purpose of the side chambers of this church may have been to house wooden staircases which led up to galleries, but it is also possible that they served as pastophories. The elongated chambers at the west end of the other three churches presumably had this latter function.

An added forecourt or porch was a common feature. However, as it is often the west end of a church which is more delapidated than the east end, the forms of these forecourts are seldom clear. The best preserved forecourt is that of the 'Ionic' basilica at Sagalassus which was walled on north and south sides, with a door in the north wall, and possibly also in the south wall, and perhaps colonnaded on the west side. The

forecourt of basilica 'B' at Cremna was defined by double columns on all four sides. The rectangular walled forecourt of basilica 'A' at Cremna was an inherited feature.

The long outer walls of the churches were usually solid, but there were sometimes additional doors to those at the west end. There were possibly two doors in the north wall of the basilica at Antiocheia; although this is by no means certain, it would not be such a remarkable feature. At the west end of the south wall of the church at Apameia was an extra door. The doors in the long northwest wall of basilica 'B' at Selge were to provide communication with the narthex which was apparently on this side of the church. There were additional doors in the arms of the transept of the transept basilica at Sagalassus, and an additional door in the south arm of the transept of the church on Ali Suması Dağı. Some of the basilicas with side rooms flanking the apse had small doors, usually in the east wall of the south chamber.

Windows in the outer walls of churches were not uncommon, but as few of the walls survive to a decent height, this cannot always be confirmed. There were four double-arched windows, each with a central rectangular mullion shaft, in each of the outer walls of the church on Erenler Dağı. There were two V-shaped windows in each of the walls of the nave of the church on Ali Suması Dağı. The windows of the church at Adada were single-arched, the sill and the side formed by large limestone slabs, the arches formed by small wedge-shaped stones. Windows were recorded in both basilica 'A' and basilica 'B' at Selge. The windows of basilica 'A' seem to have been at irregular intervals. Double-columned mullion shafts have been noted in Kizilca and on the church site at Amblada, indicating that double-arched windows were a feature of the Ambladian church, or churches. Double-arched windows with this type of dividing shaft seem to have been a feature typical of the churches in eastern

Pisidia. Examples have been recorded in a number of villages in this region. Fragments of window arches recorded in Milligöz perhaps belonged to the nearby church. The windows of the church at Barla, arched on the inside and squared off on the outside, were most likely of a post-Byzantine date. The same is probably true of the small round windows of the converted church in Islamköy. The date of the double windows of the church of St. Stephen on Yeşil Adası is uncertain.

Apart from the rock-cut churches, there is, not surprisingly, little evidence for roofing technique, although it is almost certain that there would have been few exceptions to a roof of timber, or tile, or a combination of both. The roofs of many of the churches seem to have been predominantly tiled, judging from the amount of tile fragments lying scattered about the church sites. Part of the roofs may have been wooden. The transept basilica at Sagalassus possibly had a timber tower over the centre of the transept. Ballance suggested that the roof of the church at Apameia was completely, or predominantly, of wood. There is no confirmation for Rott's theory that the roof of basilica 'B' at the site near Döşemealtı was vaulted with stone. The roof of the lower extra-mural church at Pednelissus appears to have been dominated by a central dome. There is no indication of the material used for the roof, but the size of the piers could have supported a stone superstructure.

Walls were usually plastered, but little evidence for this survives in the Pisidian churches. There are large areas of plaster in all of the niches of the church at Barla, but this was presumably applied in the post-Byzantine period. Some of the frescoes in the church of St. Stephen on Yeşil Adası have been given a late Byzantine date, possibly 11/12th century, but others were later. The frescoes on the walls of the rock-cut church at Avdan were compared to those in the church of St. Stephen. Traces of plaster were noted on some of the fallen masonry in basilica

'B' at the site near Döşemealtı, and traces of fresco were found in the basilica at Kilise Kalesi near Akkise.

Marble revetment may have been more common than the evidence suggests. Fragments of marble revetment can be found on several of the church sites, usually of a white or a grey stone. In the vicinity of the apse of basilica 'C' at Cremna were noted revetment fragments of green and grey cippollino, purple porphyry, pavanazetto and white marble. Mosaic of marble, glass or stone must also have been used as a decorative wall covering for focal points of a number of the churches. Sometimes the tesserae were of plain colours, namely white and grey, but very often brightly coloured tesserae can be found, usually in the vicinity of the apse. The apse of basilica 'C' at Cremna must have been decorated with the most colourful mosaic of all the Pisidian churches.

There is little evidence for floor covering. The most common forms would have been limestone flags, mosaic or concrete. Large marble and stone tesserae have been found on the sites of several of the churches. The colours are usually white, grey and, sometimes, black. A variety of muted colours were found in basilica 'B' at Cremna and in the church at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia. The best in situ evidence for floor covering is of course the mosaic of the 4th century basilica at Antiocheia where large sections of the mosaic, which completely covered the floor of the nave, were discovered undisturbed. Concrete seems to have been used for at least the aisles of the second phase of this basilica.

The majority of the churches, particularly those of basilican plan, can be dated to the 4th, 5th or 6th centuries. Some may have been of a 7th century date. The only churches which might be attributed to the late Byzantine period are the small ones such as that at Avdan, the church of St. Stephen on Yeşil Adası, the chapel near Kızılören, the

chapel near Gaziri and the converted church at Islamköy. These latter three churches may have been of a middle Byzantine date, possibly as early as 8th century. The original date of construction of the lower extra-mural church at Pednelissus is unknown, but its size suggests a relatively early date. It seems, however, that this church was quite extensively remodelled at some uncertain later date. Evidence has been noted at Selge for the remodelling of three of the basilicas at a later date, the resulting churches much smaller in size than the originals.

There is little evidence to show the functions of the churches, apart from those which must have been cemetery churches, indicated by their locations outside city limits and the presence of a necropolis in the vicinity. A few of the churches can be identified as monastic in purpose. All three of the extra-mural basilicas at Selge, 'E', 'F' and 'G', seem to have been cemetery churches. The church at Adada may have been a cemetery church. Basilica 'B' at Cremna was a cemetery church and perhaps also functioned as a martyrial church. The small church outside the walls of Pednelissus was presumably a cemetery church, as it was converted from a heroon in the necropolis. The church on Ali Sumasi Dağı was part of a monastic complex, but seems to have served as a funerary church. The church on Erenler Dağı was apparently part of a monastic complex. Basilica 'A' at Selge was perhaps monastic, but, if so, it appears that the monastery buildings were added at a later date. There is no certainty that the church at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia was a monastery church. The church of St. Stephen on Yeşil Adası was part of a large monastery complex, but there is no idea of the date at which this monastery was founded. The small size of the rock-cut chapel near Kızılören and the nearby rock-cut cells might suggest that the chapel served a group of ascetics who preferred to live outside the confines of the nearby city.

Basilica 'A' at Cremna was presumably the civic basilica of the city.

This may have been replaced in the 5th or 6th century by basilica 'C'; alternatively, basilica 'C' represents a second, rather than a replacement, civic basilica which was used by a different sect. The grandeur of this basilica suggests that it had a civic function, but the eastern passage may imply that it was a martyrial church.

Antiocheia's civic church was presumably the 4th century basilica, and its replacement. The church at the main site may have had a martyrial function.

One of the most interesting observations to be made from a study of the Pisidian churches is that no distinct type of 'Pisidian' church can be defined. Almost all of the churches have individual features, but these are not usually shared characteristics. The confusion of planning types suggests a combination of inspiration from both the coast and the plateau. Influence from Isauria dominates the churches of eastern Pisidia. Influence from the coast is evident in the churches of Selge, but is not so marked in the churches of Etenna. In the heart of the province, the mixture of coastal and Anatolian elements and planning types is unmistakable.

CHAPTER VIII

LATE ANTIQUITY - DECLINE, CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

The question of decline is a complex one. Difficulties lie in recognising the signs of decline, in identifying the causes and in pinpointing a date at which the process of decline began. The archaeological evidence is mostly negative: the apparent slow-down of building activity, the deterioration of building technique, the cessation of coinage, together with the suggestion of depopulation and demographic movement, all of which have been proposed as evidence for decline in that they imply civic decay and economic instability. There is no denying from the documentary sources that there were periods of political instability during late Antiquity - wars on all fronts of the Empire, invasions of Asia Minor by foreign powers, civil war and organised banditry - and it is not presumptuous to conclude that the financial hardships brought about by the expenditure laid out for the purpose of trying to eliminate these problems and the redistribution of manpower would have affected the general economic situation, but to what extent is uncertain. The sources must be assessed very carefully, taking into account, for example, the pessimism of the particular author, the literary climate of the times, and whether or not accounts relate to specific localised incidents or to universal phenomena. Environmental changes have also been considered to have been responsible for decline. Although the arguments are for the most part hypothetical, there is reason to suggest that the subject should be investigated more deeply.

The organisation of the subject matter of this chapter is not straightforward as the questions of decline, continuity and change are interwoven. Whilst it cannot be denied that late Antiquity is portrayed as a period of general misfortune, there is insufficient evidence to ascertain whether this was in reality a series of short-lived periods of adversity or whether decline was in fact a continuous downhill spiralling. There

was, at the same time as the appearance of general adversity, an element of prosperity which defies the theories of total and universal decline. A further point to be considered is that some of the proposed factors and symptoms of decline might be better viewed as aspects of change.

An example of the impossibility of dividing the subject matter simply into factors and symptoms of decline is the question of the economic situation which is in effect the key to any discussion on decline and prosperity. The apparent economic depression might be considered to have been brought about by external pressures, both political and environmental, and might in itself be seen as a contributor to general decline. Another complex subject is that of demographic change, both depopulation and demographic movement.

This chapter is, then, divided into topics as follows: a) the political situation; b) environmental changes; c) the economic situation; d) the archaeological evidence; e) demographic change; f) an assessment of the questions of decline, change and continuity.

The Political Situation.

The period of expansion begun under Alexander continued for the following few centuries. The limits of the Greek and, later, the Roman Empire were continually being expanded and territories consolidated. The process of the development of Asia Minor was at its most vigorous under Augustus, and for the following two centuries at least, urbanisation, civic improvements, road building, conformation to Roman rule and profitable exploitation of the environment more or less followed a smooth progressive curve. There were economic hiccups during this period, but the first two and a quarter centuries AD were ones of political stability. No serious threats appeared

to challenge the strength of the Roman Empire.

With the end of the Severan dynasty, however, there began a series of civil wars which lasted intermittently until the reign of Diocletian, and, in the mid 3rd century, the Empire was subjected to the first of a series of threats from external powers. During the reigns of Gordian III and Valerian, the Persians invaded Syria, Cilicia and Cappadocia. Valerian was captured in AD 260, and the Persians advanced on Tarsus and Lycaonia.¹ At the same time the Scythians and Goths were making inroads from the north and west. They got as far as Phrygia, Galatia and Cappadocia, and sacked Ephesus in AD 263.² This was followed by a temporary occupation of Asia Minor by Zenobia who made inroads on Cappadocia, Galatia and Bithynia.³

From then onwards, until the end of the Byzantine Empire, the Imperial government was almost continually engaged in protecting its frontiers from barbarian forces.⁴ The Persians on the eastern frontier were a constant threat. The 4th century saw the invasion of Britain by Saxons, Picts and Scots, and the beginning of a long series of troubles from Germanic tribes, first Visigoths, Ostrogoths and Huns, later Vandals and Alans, Slavs, Avars and Bulgars. There were few periods of comparative peace. Peace treaties were short-lived, almost always resulting in huge financial losses to the treasury and the surrender of tracts of land to the barbarian tribes. Alaric's capture of Rome in AD 410 meant disaster for the West, but a brief period of respite for the East. In the mid 5th century, the Vandals set up their own kingdom in Africa, the Visigoths in Gaul and Spain. Odoacer set himself up as ruler of Italy but was ousted by the Ostrogoth Theodoric the Amal (the Great). With Theodoric's take-over of Italy in AD 493, the East was freed from direct contention with the Goths, but Italy was totally lost to the Roman Empire, apart

from three decades of control under Justinian. Africa remained in Vandal hands for a century.

The government was weakened not only by financial losses but also by internal dissension and, in the 4th century, differences between East and West. The employment of barbarians in both the military service and at court, often in quite high positions, resulted in strife within both army and government, treachery, divided loyalties and distrust. The settling of barbarians in Asia Minor must have aggravated local feeling at the very least. An example is the disturbance caused by Trebigildus and his band of Goths who, in AD 386, had been settled in Phrygia by Theodosius I. In 329 Trebigildus and his followers revolted and plundered the countryside of Galatia, Pisidia and Bithynia. Eventually, avoiding soldiers sent to suppress him, Trebigildus turned to Pamphylia and attempted to attack Selge. Here he was defeated by an improvised army of slaves and farmers.⁵ This episode also illustrates the treachery of the foreign elements in Imperial service. Gainas, one of the two generals sent against Trebigildus, was also a Goth and, unknown to the government, was in league with his fellow tribesman.

Leo I's policy of eradicating the power and influence of the Alans and the Ostrogoths in his government involved enlisting the help of the Isaurians, securing the loyalty of Tarasicodissa by marrying him to his eldest daughter. This tactic both achieved the elimination of the Alans and was the beginning of the downfall of the Isaurians. The struggles between Blues and Greens from the mid 5th century also contributed to dissension within the government, as did the religious controversies which, although they seemed to strengthen the Church itself, raged through the Empire from the 5th century and were the cause of continual opposition to the current Emperor.

The tide turned under Justinian, but good fortune lasted only briefly. In AD 533/4 Justinian's general Belisarius regained Africa from the Vandals, and conducted numerous successful campaigns against the Ostrogoths in Italy between 534 and 540. Justinian's reign was marked not only by military achievements. He put into action an expansive building programme, renewed and expanded commercial links, and instigated the codification of Roman law. However, the period was not all roses. AD 532 saw the combining of the Blues and the Greens in a common cause against the government; the ensuing Nika revolt almost put an end to Justinian's reign. With concentration of military affairs in Africa and Italy, the Danube frontier and the eastern frontier were neglected. A treaty of 'everlasting' peace with the Persians, signed in AD 532, lasted for only nine years. In 562 a second treaty was drawn up, but this was later broken by Justin II's refusal to pay the huge tribute which had been part of the agreement. Both treaties meant continual financial loss to the treasury, and Justinian's military successes and his building programme also incurred immense financial debts. Justinian's reign was marked by the plague of 542 which resulted in countless deaths and weakening of morale.

Between the reigns of Justin II and Phocas, there was intermittent trouble in the Balkans, unrest within the army on the eastern frontier, dissension among the factions in the capital, conspiracies within the government, and civil war. Maurice temporarily relieved the Persian threat, but at the beginning of the 7th century Chosroes II renewed hostilities, ostensibly avenging Maurice's murder. During Phocas' reign, there was incessant war with the Persians and invasion of the Balkans by Slavs and Avars.

The renewed hostilities with the Persians marked the beginning of

a long period of invasion of the interior of Asia Minor which, for three and a half centuries, had been untouched physically. After the Goths, the most serious incursions into Asia Minor had been marches on Constantinople or tussles in the eastern provinces. The war began under Phocas and ended some 20 years later in the middle of the reign of Heraclius.⁶ During this time, the Persians took Mesopotamia, Syria and Armenia. In 613 they invaded Tarsus, beseiged Chalcedon two years later, attacked Cyprus in 617, captured Ancyra in 620 or 622, and Rhodes in 622 or 623. In 619 they had conquered Egypt and placed in jeopardy the grain supply of Constantinople. Heraclius' answer to the situation was to organise the Empire into themes and use his knowledge of military science to train a native army, free from foreign elements. He gave moral support to his troops by personally leading his army. Ostrogorsky considers that the eventual success of the Byzantines was aided by the reorganisation of the central administrative system and the voluntary channelling of money from the Church to augment the meagre supplies of the treasury.⁷ In a war lasting from 622 to 628, Heraclius succeeded in recapturing all the former territory of the Empire, including Egypt. Details of the Persians' ravages of central Asia Minor are scarce, but Foss has argued for considerable destruction and terrorisation, large-scale refortifying of defences, and decline of cities which are not known from the documentary sources to have been in the path of the Persians. Archaeological evidence confirms the documentary attestation of the destruction of Ancyra.⁸ Foss uses archaeological evidence to infer the total or partial destruction of Sardis, Ephesus, Pergamum, Magnesia-on-the-Meander and Aphrodisias.⁹

Despite the ultimate success of Heraclius, the war had been a considerable drain on the financial and physical resources of the Empire. Famine and disease, inevitable consequences of war and

devastation, were no doubt prevalent to varying degrees along the paths of invasion. The Empire was enfeebled and easy prey for the Arabs, who began their onslaught on Asia Minor only six years after war with the Persians had ended. The 7th, 8th and 9th centuries in particular were marked by almost continual trouble from the Arabs.¹⁰ Between 634 and 640, their efforts were concentrated on the eastern provinces, Syria, Mesopotamia and Armenia. Success enabled them to advance to Egypt, which fell completely into Arab hands in 642. From the middle of the 7th century, the Arabs began to penetrate the interior of Asia Minor and their fleet achieved remarkable success, considering the novelty of naval warfare. Between 649 and 670, Cyprus, Rhodes, Cos and Chios were taken. Cyzicus was captured in 670. This was followed by the seizure of Smyrna, and occupation of the coasts of Lycia and Cilicia. The Arabs then suffered a period of adverse fortune. Four years of unsuccessful attempts on Constantinople, between 674 and 678, resulted in a diminishing of Arab forces¹¹, and a storm off the Pamphylian coast was disastrous to the Arab fleet.¹² A peace treaty, to the advantage of the Byzantines, lasted for 13 years. Renewed hostilities were just as fierce as before. By 711, the Arabs held the whole of the North African coast. Pisidia may have been avoided in the 7th century, but did not escape in the 8th. Antiocheia was burned in 712/3 and the inhabitants either perished or were taken as prisoners.¹³ Around the same time the castle of Mistea was captured,¹⁴ If the settlements of the highlands had not already taken steps to protect themselves during the years of Persian invasion, they surely must have done so now. Pamphylia, which seems to have been treated lightly in the 7th century, came under constant attack, possibly with the principal aim of capturing Attaleia, which was held by the Arabs for brief periods in the 9th and 10th centuries.¹⁵

Brigandage - The highlands and southern coastal areas of Asia Minor were particularly susceptible to the ravages of brigandage and piracy, by virtue of their geographical features. The mountains and hill country provided safe refuge, as did the harbours and coves of the littoral, especially where mountain ranges ran directly to the sea. Brigandage seems to have been a characteristic trait of Isaurians, Pisidians and Pamphylians. Strabo says that the Isaurians had always been a nation of brigands,¹⁶ that the Pisidians indulged in piracy,¹⁷ and that the Pamphylians, showing signs of Cilician stock, disturbed their neighbours with their piracy.¹⁸ It was a problem which involved all communities of Pisidia, Lycaonia, Isauria, Cilicia, Pamphylia and Lycia, whether they were the perpetrators, or the victims through physical molestation or fear. During the 1st century BC, the problems of brigandage and piracy were suppressed by the efforts of Servilius Isauricus, Pompey, Amyntas and Augustus.¹⁹ Although there followed two centuries of comparative peace, the problem had not been eradicated completely. To earn a living by rape and pillage was easier for the highlanders than to till fields endlessly in order to force a meagre livelihood from the soil. Frequently it is clear that the activities of the brigands were a form of political protest against a régime which they did not accept. Later, it was often a reaction against oppressive social and economic conditions, which seem to have been escalating with few periods of relief. In AD 6, there was a short-lived revolt of the Isaurians against Rome,²⁰ but this was very quickly and forcefully suppressed. In AD 36, there was an uprising of the Cietae of Cilicia, ostensibly a protest against taxes. They retreated to the Taurus mountains, and 4,000 legionaries, plus auxiliaries, were required to force their surrender.²¹ Some years later, Cilician tribesmen launched a series of indiscriminate raids on coastal cities, even besieging Anemurium and defeating a cavalry unit sent against

them. They were finally subdued by the client king Antiochus.²²

Little else is recorded until the 3rd century, but there are signs of unrest in the 2nd century, which is generally viewed as a relatively peaceful and trouble-free period.²³

The outbursts of brigandage which broke out in the 3rd century already show signs of the organisation that was a major asset to the Isaurian brigands in the following two centuries. Their numbers were probably greater, reinforced by unsatisfied individuals and military deserters, or they formed alliances with groups of barbarians who had the same anarchistic cause. Deserters from the army, unable or unwilling to return to their former civil lives, could assist with tactical advice.

General brigandage is considered to have been on the increase during the reign of Septimius Severus,²⁴ and there was trouble from the Isaurians in particular under Severus Alexander.²⁵ Zosimus gives a detailed account of the activities of the Isaurian brigand chief Lydius,²⁶ possibly the same as the Palfuerius recorded by the Historia Augustus.²⁷ In the latter half of the 3rd century, Lydius overran, unchecked, the whole of Lycia and Pamphylia, and it must be remembered here that the boundary of Lycia-Pamphylia at this time extended at least as far north as Cremna and Adada, possibly even as far as the southern shores of the Pisidian lakes.²⁸ Lydius eventually occupied Cremna where he was besieged by Probus' forces before he was killed through the treachery of one of his own artillery men.

A certain Trebellian, archipirata, supposedly set himself up as Emperor of Isauria in a palace of an Isaurian stronghold.²⁹ He even minted his own coins. He was eventually routed and killed by one of Gallienus' generals. The figure Trebellian, however, is thought to be merely a fictitious character³⁰, but, even so, the story illustrates the political climate of the times and the strong separatist feelings

of the Isaurians.

In AD 354, there was a wide-spread revolt of Isaurians, ostensibly protesting at the feeding of Isaurian captives to the lions at Iconium.³¹ The Isaurians took to piracy of the seas as far as Cyprus, and became a menace to merchant shipping. Their activities in Lycaonia seem to have been restricted by the open lowland plains, so they focused their attention on Pamphylia. Halted by legions wintering around Side, they besieged Seleuceia, but eventually fled from fear of the numbers of relief troops approaching to rout them. Further trouble is recorded for the years AD 359, 368 and 377, when the Isaurians ravaged Cilicia and Pamphylia.³² In the early 5th century, they turned their attention to the East and caused havoc as far as the Persian border and Palestine.³³

In the 5th century the fortunes of the Isaurians changed. They appear in the services of the Emperor, perhaps regarded as a lesser evil than treacherous foreigners who had previously held positions at court. The Isaurians proved their worth by successfully foiling Attila's attempts on Constantinople in AD 447. Their leader, Flavius Zeno, was awarded a consulship in the following year and the office of magister militum per Orientem in 449.³⁴ After Zeno's death, there is a blank in the history books until AD 466, when Leo married his daughter to an Isaurian. Tarasicodissa, who took the name Zeno, perhaps in honour of his predecessor, was given great responsibilities by Leo, and proved his worth against Leo's enemies at court. After Leo's death in 474, Zeno and his son, Leo II, became joint Emperors, but Leo died in the same year and Zeno emerged sole ruler.³⁵ His reign was turbulent, plagued by the attempts of opposing Isaurian chieftains to usurp the throne. This internal dissension contributed to the downfall of the Isaurians. They were eliminated as a major threat to the government by Zeno's successor, Anastasius, at the end

of the 5th century.³⁶

Brigandage still continued but on a scale not large enough to create any serious political upheavals. The highlands naturally always remained an ideal hideout for bands of robbers and brigands, even into the last century. During the reign of Justinian, the governors of Asia were ordered by the Emperor to repress subversive activities by force because Pisidia possessed men who were just as brave as the Isaurians.³⁷

It was not only the brigands who might have been feared by the local communities. Once troops were being used against the brigands they began to take advantage of the protection guaranteed by their numbers and the licence given them. In AD 409 the post of irenarch had been abolished as a 'genus perniciosum rei publicae'.³⁸ A rescript of AD 527, from Küçük Alifahrettin Yaylası, west of Lake Söğüt, promises to defend an oratory of St. John against both brigands and the army.³⁹

The office of dux charged with preventing brigandage in Pisidia and Lycaonia had to be suppressed in AD 553, five years after it had been instituted, because of a petition,⁴⁰ presumably a complaint against the rapacity of the soldiers under the authority of the dux.

The methods used to deal with the brigands were conditioned by the situation of the time, the concern of the particular Emperor in power, and the availability of forces to be spared for specific missions against brigands. During the Republic, the government could only turn a blind eye to the problems of brigandage and piracy for so long. After the Pergamene Empire had been bequeathed to Rome, the establishment of order became the responsibility of the Senate which, nevertheless, declined to undertake direct control of the more troublesome easterly regions of the Empire. Highland brigandage was left to the client kings to take care of, but it soon became clear that piracy of the seas was a problem which could neither be ignored nor dealt with half-heartedly

as it interfered directly with Roman shipping interests. Expeditions were sent out from Rome but these were mostly unsuccessful or made little impression.⁴¹ The province of Cilicia was formed for the purpose of keeping a closer eye on both highlanders and pirates,⁴² but it was not until the early 70s BC that Servilius was sent against the marauders of land and sea, and earned the name Isauricus in recognition of his accomplishments.⁴³ Servilius, however, made merely a dent in their defences and his actions were not followed up immediately. Ten years later, Pompey, backed by a huge fleet, succeeded in eliminating the pirate threat to the extent that it never again reached the same proportions.⁴⁴ Between 39 and 25 BC, the client king Amyntas was given control of much of central Asia Minor, his major task apparently being to try to effect the subjection of the hostile highland tribes.⁴⁵ His successes paved the way for Augustus who, after Amyntas' death, increased the strength of Roman authority in the highlands by forming the province of Galatia, setting up a series of colonies in and around Pisidia and establishing the Via Sebaste.⁴⁶ In about 4 BC the threat of the Homonadeis, the most powerful anti-Roman tribe of the highlands, with whom Amyntas had been engaged in war when he was killed, was wiped out.⁴⁷

After the Homonadeis, there was no serious trouble until the rise of the Isaurians as an organised brigand group three centuries later, but the laws which appear as a precaution against all kinds of criminal show that brigandage was still rife, especially in rural areas. Laws were formulated forbidding citizens to carry arms to try to minimize incidents of petty thieving and robbery.⁴⁸ Septimius Severus in particular must have taken severe measures to curtail the brigandage of his reign, as he was known as 'the enemy of brigands everywhere'.⁴⁹ Under Severus a large corpus of criminal law was drawn up.⁵⁰

During the early Empire, cities were generally responsible for order on their own territory, with the help of the provincial governors who, along with their many other duties, were expected to suppress brigand activity in the district under their authority. Later, officials and military police charged with the specific duty of controlling brigandage began to appear. Under Trajan, irenarchs were municipal officials whose general concern was to keep the peace.⁵¹ By the time of Hadrian, the irenarch had been given additional duties, one of which was control of the diognitae, local police officials whose sole function was to apprehend brigands.⁵² The holders of the post of irenarch were often fairly eminent individuals, implying that this was either an attractive job, or one that required a lot of responsibility. In and around Pisidia, irenarchs are known from Comama, Pogla, Ariassus, Termessus, Evdir Hanı (probably Eudocias), Cotenna, Casae, Cagrae, Ayasofya, Amblada, Vasada, Eldeş and Apameia.⁵³ Under Antoninus Pius, an edict was declared that when irenarchs captured brigands they should question them about their associates and those who sheltered them.⁵⁴ Paraphylaces also appear during the Principate. Their precise function is uncertain, but they seem to have been involved in the policing of rural areas, perhaps under the authority of the irenarch.⁵⁵ A paraphylax is recorded at Termessus,⁵⁶ and probably also in the inscription from Amblada which mentions the irenarch.⁵⁷

Control of the brigands may have been too much for the municipalities to cope with alone, for military police were eventually brought in to give assistance. One of the functions of the numerous stationarii found in various parts of the Empire may have been for the purpose of recruitment, but it seems clear that they were, perhaps initially, used as a controlling factor in highland regions. An inscribed relief from Lycia honours a stationarius for having personally killed many brigands.⁵⁸ The posting of a stationarius at Kireli Kasaba in the 3rd

century implies that disorder in this region was expected.⁵⁹ An inscription from Antiocheia, probably of the latter half of the 3rd century, honours Aurelius Dionysius, a regionary centurion whose main duty seems to have been the protection of the region called Mygdonia around the city.⁶⁰ The fact that it was unusual for officers of centurion rank to take on police duties, especially in the cities,⁶¹ seems to indicate the urgency for control of the highlands. Zosimus records the employment of troops against rural criminals in the 3rd and 4th centuries.⁶²

In the latter half of the 3rd century, Probus set in motion a scheme which Claudius Gothicus had unsuccessfully tried to carry out some years previously in an attempt to subdue the Isaurian brigands⁶³. One by one, he took over Isaurian strongholds which he passed over to his veterans on condition that their children should enter military service at the age of eighteen.⁶⁴ An inscription records that the Diocletianic legio I Pontica constructed a parade and drill ground at Ayasofya (?Colybrassus) in the southern Taurus. The inscription is dated to AD 288. That this legion was normally stationed at Trapezus implies urgent measures to cope with the brigands of the Taurus.⁶⁵

Christol discusses the importance of keeping control in the highlands in the 3rd and 4th centuries, as illustrated by the inscription from Termessus which records the dux, L. Aurelius Marcianus.⁶⁶ In the mid 4th century, Bassidius Lauricus, a count and governor with the title of vir clarissimus, is recorded for his occupation of a fort previously held by Isaurian brigands.⁶⁷ A certain Valerius Statilius Castrus was honoured at Termessus for trying to secure peace on land and sea in the vicinity of the city.⁶⁸ Aurelius Dionysius, the regionary centurion from Antiocheia, was praised for keeping the peace and for saving many lives.⁶⁹

In AD 383 an edict specifying the penalties for sheltering brigands was drawn up.⁷⁰ Under Leo comitivae of Pamphylia, Pisidia and Lycaonia appear, newly instituted commands with the aim of conducting campaigns against the Isaurian brigands.⁷¹ Finally, the Isaurians, weakened by internal fighting under Zeno, were suppressed through the efforts of Anastasius in a long war which began in AD 492 and culminated in 498.⁷² However, brigandage was not totally eliminated. Fifty years later, in AD 548, a dux was placed in control of Pisidia and Lycaonia with the purpose of preventing brigandage.⁷³

It might be argued that brigandage was a problem which was not restricted to late Antiquity. It must be admitted that brigandage and piracy were troublesome during the Hellenistic period, under the Republic and during the early years of the Principate, but it might be proposed that there was nowhere near as much cause for concern as there was when brigandage reared its head again in the 3rd century. It is true that commercial ventures were jeopardized and that the problems had to be eliminated before Asia Minor could be completely embraced by the Pax Romana, but in this early period Asia Minor was still on the fringes of the Empire and brigandage and piracy, although posing a demanding challenge to the expansion and development programme, were not a direct threat to the safety of the nucleus of the Empire. The partial solving of the problem coincided with a more settled period in general. The 1st and 2nd centuries AD were years considered to have been the most prosperous in terms of urbanisation and cultural and commercial expansion. Piracy never returned to the same degree, but from the 3rd century brigandage seems to have increased with a vigour not seen under the Republic, possibly partly because the government was applying its time and resources to more pressing problems elsewhere. It might also be proposed, cautiously, that it was now a more serious problem for the municipalities and

dependent communities in the respect that it was a way of life in keeping with a tribal society but an alien and oppressive element in a society which had adopted urbanisation. It must, in any case, have been regarded as more critical when the focal point of the Empire was shifted to Asia Minor. Moreover, the threat to central government was more menacing because of the high level of organisation of the brigand movements which did appear, notably the Isaurians whose successful campaigns and the measures taken against them prove their resilience and strength.

A cautionary note, however, is that the measures taken to deal with the brigands might not be an accurate reflection of the situation, perhaps showing merely that different methods were being applied to a problem that had neither significantly increased nor decreased. The fact that there is less evidence for preventative policies against brigandage between the late 1st century BC and the early 3rd century AD may partly signify a gap in our knowledge rather than that there was little need for countermeasures. A further point is that one has to consider the possibility of exaggeration on the part of the historians; apart from a few incidents, the most destructive of which was Lydius' stand at Cremna, there is little evidence that general brigandage was any more than a harassment to the communities and regions which were subjected to raids. The brigand code seems to have dictated looting and theft of livestock and agricultural produce rather than massacre of the populace and devastation of agricultural lands. Zosimus' account of the activities of the barbarian Trebigildus and his band of Goths in AD 399⁷⁴ shows that local communities could take care of themselves without military assistance. Trebigildus was eventually thwarted by a local army of slaves and farmers whose success was attributed to their experience in fighting constantly against their neighbours. Doubtless this kind of situation occurred more frequently in smaller brigand raids as the local communities would be used to the ways of the marauders

and practised in forming their own protection against them, if not always successful. The greatest disruption caused by the organised Isaurian brigands was in their challenging of Imperial authority; there is no real evidence that they wrought continual destructive havoc on settlements and agricultural lands. To conclude, there is evidence to show that brigandage must have caused a certain amount of insecurity, especially in Pisidia, Pamphylia and adjacent districts from the 3rd century onwards, but there is insufficient reason to consider brigandage as a factor of decline.

Environmental Changes, Drought and Famine.

The study of climate change is still young but it is becoming clearer that climate was partially responsible for the shaping of historical events, settlement patterns and economic trends. As yet, the data are insufficient for specific conclusions, and datable closely enough to relate only to particular centuries rather than to decades. Opinions vary as to the degree of the effect of climate on physical, social and economic changes. Climate certainly seems to have had an important part to play in vegetational changes, but whether or not climate and related changes were a major contributory factor to decline is still debatable.

Deforestation - This is one aspect of vegetational change about which opinions differ. Judging from the sources and the little scientific research that has been carried out, deforestation was certainly an issue during Antiquity, but the extent to which it affected the economy and settlement patterns is open to question.

The evidence from the sources is ambiguous. There are descriptions of forests in various parts of Asia Minor of which there is now little or no trace,⁷⁵ but it is not certain when the denudation took place. One

has to be aware of the dangers of attributing all signs of deforestation to Antiquity. Travellers of the 19th century described the density of forest in southern Phrygia and Pamphylia,⁷⁶ for instance, areas which today are totally denuded. On the other hand, it is not inconceivable that regeneration has occurred between Antiquity and the 19th century. After deforestation and soil erosion on steep slopes, spontaneous regeneration is impossible, but in plains and on gentler slopes, providing the appropriate spores take root, a forest can spring up in a matter of two generations. There are, in fact, references to forests which had already diminished or disappeared during Antiquity. Both Cicero⁷⁷ and Vitruvius⁷⁸ remarked on the bareness of Phrygia. Centuries before the beginning of the Empire non-deciduous forests had flourished around Gordium and timber had been a common building medium of the city there;⁷⁹ today, small stands of pine in an otherwise treeless landscape confirm the former existence of extensive forest, although it is not certain exactly when, or why, the denudation took place. Strabo remarks on the former existence of a forest at Thebe in the Troad which had already disappeared by his time.⁸⁰ Elsewhere, he notes Eratosthenes' concern that the once extensive forests of Cyprus had been reduced by clearing for cultivation and felling for ship-building.⁸¹ Theophrastus records the reckless way in which turpentine was tapped in the forests around Mt. Ida, resulting in unnecessary tree fall and decay.⁸²

The above examples show that there was an awareness of the dangers to the forest, but it is not known if measures were taken to cope with the situation. According to Aristotle, during the 4th century BC commissioners⁸³ were appointed to control exploitation of woodlands and forests. An inscription records a municipal forest at Trebenna in Lycia.⁸⁴ Rock-cut inscriptions show that the famous cedars of Lebanon were pronounced Imperial property by Hadrian.⁸⁵ In none of these cases, however, is it clear that the fundamental motive was to protect, for ecological reasons,

a valuable commodity under pressure, rather than to control the rights to the forest for reasons motivated by self-interest and financial gain. There are other instances where a wooded grove was placed under protection because it was an area sacred to some deity.⁸⁶

It is, however, not completely clear how great an issue deforestation might have been during Antiquity. Robert rightly points out that forests were generally exploited at random in Antiquity and that clearance of the edges of a forest was relatively insignificant.⁸⁷ Meiggs has quite logically suggested that the interior and the highlands must have been protected to some extent from excessive deforestation because of the problems caused by transportation.⁸⁸ The evidence from the sources almost entirely relates to the Republic and the early Empire. The vigorous economic developments during this period suggest that whatever immediate problems might have been brought about by deforestation and its consequences were coped with successfully.

Robert's argument, however, might not apply to all districts or to all periods of history. It is not the reduction in tree cover that is an immediate problem in itself. To the ancients, more extensive settlement areas, arable fields and cultivated tree crops in lowland zones and pasture lands at higher altitudes were obviously favourable. Although it might be doubted that deforestation caused any significant environmental or economic changes during the early Principate, there are reasons to believe that the possibility of detrimental consequences from the mid Principate needs further investigation. There was already an awareness that it was the humus provided by rotting leaves and natural tree decay which gave to the soil the richness necessary for the cultivation of many tree crops.⁸⁹ Moreover, the increasing amount of timber required for the ship-building and the smelting industries suggest, even without hard evidence, that intensive pressure was placed on the resources of the forest during the Principate. Such unrelenting exploitation, without⁹⁰

reaforestation, would naturally result in the reduction of forested areas and the long-term consequences could be detrimental both ecologically and to the economy. Ecological consequences include the retreat of fauna and even the extinction of certain species. Without the binding power of roots, rapid run-off of water can result in inadequate irrigation and the drying-up of streams and springs. This was a problem lamented by Plato with regard to 4th century BC Attica.⁹¹ Logic suggests that it may have been a more serious problem during the Principate when exploitation of the forest must have been more intense. Unfavourable economic consequences of deforestation include the necessity of turning to alternative materials or incurring the expense of importing from elsewhere. It is unknown whether municipal ownership of forests, as at Trebenna, was normal practice but, if so, municipal revenue might be seriously hampered by the disappearance of a forest which was exploited for financial gain.

These economic and ecological implications are of course speculative; reduction of the forest and its disappearance are two entirely different issues and there is no evidence to suggest that forests disappeared so completely as to endanger seriously the economic situation. However, although the more inaccessible forests of the interior and highland zones may have been spared exploitation for wholesale commercial use, there is reason to investigate more deeply the ecological consequences of the exploitation of the forests of the foothills of the mountains and the seaward-facing slopes. There is no evidence that reforestation was practised during Antiquity, and it is obvious that if modern lumbering were not controlled and there were no reforestation programmes today, despite the fact that modern deforestation is more intense than it would have been during Antiquity, both ecological and economic consequences would be serious and, in some cases, irreversible. Studies in other parts of the Empire especially in Greece, have produced interesting results, although the data are still open to a number of different interpretations on the intensity

of the consequences. The very fact that human interference disturbs the natural order of the environment - and one must not forget the possibility of forest fires, especially those which are started by human hands for the purpose of clearance for habitation and cultivation and which can very easily get out of control⁹² - is sufficient reason to suspect that ecological consequences of deforestation were seldom beneficial to the environment.

Soil erosion and silting - One of the more irreversible consequences of deforestation is soil erosion, the enormity of which varies according to soil type, climate and the slope of the land. Mediterranean regions, where limestone soils are dominant, summers are dry, rainfall is often torrential and slopes are steep, are highly susceptible. Excessive ploughing of the fields of Phrygia and Caria by the banks of the Meander, with little regard for, or awareness of, the consequent dangers, was considered by Pausanias to be the cause of soil erosion and silting, particularly of harbours at the mouth of the river.⁹³ Disorganisation and neglect during late Antiquity, assuming this was as serious as it is often made out to be, may have increased the incidence of soil erosion in many parts of the Empire, especially in Mediterranean regions. As already noted, spontaneous regeneration is not always possible. A neglect of cultivated land may result in the growth of garrigue or phrygana, or irreversible soil erosion by wind and water and the ultimate loss of the land to the farmer. Lactantius implies that neglect of the fields during the economic crises of the late 3rd century led to the regeneration of sylvae and the reversion to wasteland of areas which had previously been under the plough.⁹⁴ However, one must be aware of the possibility that Lactantius was exaggerating; with the intention of disparaging the policies of Diocletian, after his death; moreover, this situation may not have been an Empire-wide concern, and the neglected fields may still have been potentially arable.

The build-up of silt plains is caused not only by soil erosion. A change in climate is also thought to be an influencing factor.⁹⁵ According to Strabo, ships could sail 60 stadia up the Cestrus to Perge and an equal distance up the Eurymedon to Aspendus.⁹⁶ This is now impossible because accumulative silting has flattened the profiles of the two rivers. It is not, however, known when the silting of these two particular rivers occurred or became drastic enough to interfere with navigability, or even if there were ship-building concerns at Perge and Aspendus which may have been detrimentally affected by the silting of the rivers. According to Vita-Finzi, the rivers and streams of the Mediterranean regions were engaged mainly in down-cutting during the centuries of Roman rule, the period of deposition not beginning until about the 8th century and reaching a peak four centuries later.⁹⁷ If natural or climatic factors were over-riding and universal, one might draw comparisons with elsewhere. As soil erosion caused by human interference seems to have been a major reason for silting, however, comparisons may not be valid since the degree of soil erosion must have varied from region to region. Pausanias' remark shows that the silting of the Meander was already a problem in the 2nd century AD. The harbours of Miletus, Priene and Ephesus are now inland; silting during Antiquity caused the relocation of the latter two cities.⁹⁸ Alluvial plains might be beneficial to certain types of cultivation, but besides creating marshy ground, encouraging mosquitoes and malaria, accumulative silt can also result in the changing courses of rivers and streams, a phenomenon remarked on by Spratt and Forbes with regard to the Antalya plain.⁹⁹

Unfortunately, environmental changes are particularly difficult to evaluate and the data are insufficient to enable definite conclusions. Although it is possible that, besides deforestation, soil erosion and silting, exacerbated by human activity, were issues, more intensive studies are necessary to confirm whether such changes produced long-lasting adverse

effects, or only temporary or negligible repercussions. Moreover, each district must be treated on its own merits. It would certainly be advantageous to archaeology and history if a connection between environmental changes and settlements patterns could be proved. Pollen samples taken by van Zeist et al. from sediments of lakes Söğüt, Beyşehir, Hoyran, Karamık and Köyceyiz indicate alternate clearance and regeneration over the past 4,000 years.¹⁰⁰ The pattern is different in each case, implying that human interference was involved to varying degrees. Roberts has suggested that since evidence for substantial forest clearance in upland zones coincides with periods of political and economic instability in prehistoric central Anatolia, communities retreated to mountainous regions during times of trouble and placed more intense pressure on upland forest.¹⁰¹ However, more closely dated samples are necessary to be able to apply the theory to the historical period, and the argument has no basis without samples from lowland zones to show a converse relaxing of pressure on the vegetation.

Drought and famine - Carpenter proposed that the troubles of the 7th and 8th centuries in Asia Minor were caused by climatic change, resulting in severe drought followed by famine and depopulation.¹⁰² He believed that the same factors were responsible for the fall of the Mycenaean and Hittite civilisations.¹⁰³ These theories are fascinating, but Carpenter's arguments are too simplistic and assume too much on insufficient data.¹⁰⁴ His evidence is mostly negative. He implies from the apparent decline in building activity during the 7th and 8th centuries that communities were either totally wiped out or reduced to such a small scale that there was in effect a break in continuity. The use of this argument, the ceasing of building activity, and the deterioration of building technique, as a sign of decline is discussed below.

Instances of drought and famine are not well illustrated by the sources. Herodotus describes periods of severe drought in western Anatolia in early Classical times,¹⁰⁵ but there is no reason to believe that this was anything

more than a temporary setback. A famine at Antiocheia in AD 92 or 93 is recorded by an edict of Antistius Rusticus.¹⁰⁶ One of the dangers of crop failure and ensuing famine was that merchants and the ruling class hoarded surplus from the previous year and tried to sell at exorbitant prices, a practice which was prohibited by the edict. It is not certain how wide an area was affected by this particular famine, but it is hardly likely that the alleged cause, the bitter winter of the previous year, would affect one city alone, and it seems that as the citizens of Antiocheia failed to obtain grain from neighbouring cities the famine was at least regional if not more widespread.¹⁰⁷ Hoarding of grain seems to have been the major cause of a famine at Aspendus under Vespasian. According to Philostratus, the ruling class of the city were storing grain supplies in the country, intending to profit from export of the grain.¹⁰⁸ The citizens of Aspendus were having to subsist on vetch which had consequently risen in price. A widespread famine in Pisidia is attested by an inscription from Apollonia dated by Foss to AD 161/2.¹⁰⁹ The inscription is a dedication made by a local stock herder thankful for the survival of his cattle and herdsmen from the famine. Inscriptions testify to a famine at Termessus in the late 2nd century,¹¹⁰ and coins of Cremna showing that Aurelian made gifts of corn to the city may imply a famine in the 270s.¹¹¹

The severity of the consequences of crop failure from drought is well illustrated by Davis' summary of a famine which ravaged the Anatolian plateau in 1874.¹¹² The cause of crop failure was lack of rain in the spring and summer of 1873. The summer drought was followed by a harsh winter during which about one and a half million sheep and goats and a large number of cattle perished, and vines suffered severe damage from frost and hail. The rural communities were harder hit than the urban population. Figures from one small village show that a single sheep and a single goat survived from a total of 1,600. Villagers burned or sold the timber of their houses and furniture and were left with no homes, no

assets and the chance of exposure in the coming winter. The shortage of growing grain for 1874 and the meagre rainfall in this year also to nourish what crops could be sown made immediate prospects unpromising. Prices rose continually, and the rural population emigrated to the towns in the hope of better prospects, thereby placing pressure on the towns and depriving the countryside of sufficient manpower to cultivate fields and vineyards. At least 150,000 people died from starvation or disease in the first half of the summer. This vivid contemporary description is of a famine which occurred only just over a century ago, but in conditions which were not far removed from those of Antiquity where rural life and agricultural subsistence were dominant. An important point is that the consequences might not have been so severe if the government had come to the rescue, but, even though the famine had been anticipated, government aid was not forthcoming.

To a civilisation which depended heavily on agriculture, maintenance of yields sufficiently plentiful to feed the local population and provide surplus for the following year's sowing was of supreme importance. A settlement which was entirely self-sufficient agriculturally was liable to serious consequences in the event of a localised crop failure without government aid or help from a neighbouring settlement. A settlement which relied heavily on imported grain was at the mercy of the fortunes and the production capabilities of the area of supply. Rome and Constantinople depended almost entirely on grain imported from Egypt and North Africa. In turn, the agricultural potential of Egypt was dependent on the annual flooding of the Nile.

Incidents of drought and famine which were features of the 4th to the 7th centuries are listed and discussed by Patlageán.¹¹³ Those which coincided with unsettled political conditions and other disasters between the reigns of Justinian and Heraclius may have significantly exacerbated the general hardship of these years. On the one hand, one has to

be aware of the fact that the nature of the literary genres of later Antiquity led to a tendency to exaggerate and to prophesy doom. There is, on the other hand, reason to suggest that the questions of drought and famine during later Antiquity should be investigated further. Research has shown that the climate of Asia Minor in Roman times was similar to that of today but that, of the intervening period, the centuries from about the mid 8th until the beginning of the 14th were generally colder with a higher rainfall; this period was not consistently moister, however, interspersed with dry intervals and seasons of drought, and possibly also flooding seasons due to short-term climatic variations.¹¹⁴ Severe changes in temperature can not only influence the mortality rate, but can also have a detrimental effect on crops. Severe flooding might also cause serious damage to agriculture, not only ruining crops but causing irreversible damage to agricultural lands by washing away the soil. Only this year, whole orchards of fruit crops were lost on the Aegean coastland due to the ravages of a late frost in the spring.

Water being the most essential commodity for survival, necessary both for human consumption and for irrigation, failure of the water supply might have had dire consequences. During Antiquity, methods of water collection were not as sophisticated as they are today and if there was a significant period of drought the water supplies of settlements would have been a major source of concern. The implication of increased precipitation from the mid 8th century would have helped winter collection of water, but the incidence of droughts during this period, especially if unexpected and unprepared for, might have created a serious water shortage. In addition, there is the possibility of the changing of the water table and the drying-up of streams and springs due to climatic causes or human interference. These issues are discussed further in Chapter IX with reference to the question of demographic change in Pisidia. The fact that these points are conjectural and there is little supportive evidence confirms that

Carpenter's theories are purely hypothetical. It is, however, conceivable that drought, ensuing crop failure and famine were important issues during late Antiquity when climatic instability may have been involved and recovery from famine might have been hampered by periods of war, invasion and chaos within the government, all of which were intermittent from the 3rd century onwards, but before drought can be considered seriously as a decisive factor behind the apparent decline during late Antiquity, further research is necessary. Studies in Spain have shown that the country was hit by several periods of drought during the 6th and 7th centuries¹¹⁵ and this is reason enough to suggest that similar investigations should be carried out elsewhere.

Earthquake is an unavoidable hazard and, as shown by modern comparisons, in particular by the recent earthquake which devastated Erzurum in the east of modern Turkey, its consequences can be severe. The sources and the inscriptions testify that a number of earthquakes occurred during Antiquity,¹¹⁶ and there must have been many more which have escaped the record. Pliny speaks of earthquakes in Lycia as if they were a regular hazard.¹¹⁷

If a city damaged or destroyed by an earthquake did not receive financial aid in order to effect recovery, city life and municipal funds would have been severely crippled. There is evidence to show that during early Antiquity government aid was generous and recovery relatively rapid.¹¹⁸ The archaeological evidence from Cremna shows that the earthquake which appears to have occurred around the time of Hadrian had no disastrous consequences.¹¹⁹ Instead, it seems to have served as a stimulus for energetic building activity until the end of the 2nd century. Recovery from the earthquake which devastated Syrian Antiocheia in the first half of the 6th century, and which was followed immediately by further destruction from Chosroes' army, was rapid. According to Procopius, Just-

inian completely rebuilt the city.¹²⁰ In the Anecdota, however, Procopius noted that the same earthquake caused damage to numerous other cities, extending as far as Philomelium and Polybotus, on the fringes of Pisidia.¹²¹ There is no record that Justinian's generosity extended as far. During later Antiquity, government aid may not have been as excessive as it appears to have been during the preceeding centuries. Evidence from Anemurium indicates that the city was destroyed by an earthquake around AD 580, but it reflects no corresponding indication that there was any kind of recovery. Instead, the settlement which emerged out of the dust of the disaster was a mere shadow of its former self.¹²² There is evidence from a number of sites that they must have suffered from seismic damage at some time. The theatres of Sagalassus and Selge (Pl.54 and 55) show obvious signs of earthquake damage, more so than the rest of the monuments on the sites. This may be because of the nature of the structures, but it is quite plausible that the devastation in both cases occurred at a date when the site was still occupied, but at a time when the theatre had outlived its function and repair was not considered necessary. Ramsay and Robinson sustained a long argument in the 1920s on how much of the damage noted at Antiocheia was caused by seismic movement and how much was a result of the Arab attack of the city in the early 8th century.¹²³

The Economic Situation.

Partly a symptom of the political situation, a degree of economic dislocation was inevitable. Although most of the battles with the Persians and the barbarians from the 4th to the late 6th centuries were fought on the frontiers or beyond, yet, indirectly, all parts of the Empire were involved in the web of war. The expense of war was a burden to the Imperial treasury, and meant restrictions on aid to subject communities. The need for larger armed forces and the replacement of dead and wounded meant intensive recruitment and a redistribution of manpower,

although whether or not this was a significant drain on agricultural labour is open to question. The passage of troops through Asia Minor to and from battle resulted in the obligation of the settlements through which they passed to provide food, billeting and provisions for the journey,¹²⁴ and often illegal pillage and extortion by the soldiers.¹²⁵

Agriculture and animal husbandry might be affected by war and brigandage, famine and disease, and adverse climatic conditions, particularly drought and flooding. The possible consequences of land deterioration, soil erosion and silting have already been discussed. Procopius' comments on the effects of the plague during the 6th century may be exaggerated, but they show that conditions were not as favourable as they had been.¹²⁶

The invasion of Egypt by the Persians in AD 619, and the permanent conquest by the Arabs in AD 642, must have resulted in shortage of grain to Constantinople, which was very much reliant on supplies from Egypt.¹²⁷ Reliance on Egypt was precarious even whilst it was securely under Imperial rule. Although crops in Egypt were usually plentiful, drought and over-flooding of the Nile were perpetual hazards. An inscription recording the export of grain from Pogla to Egypt, probably in the 2nd century,¹²⁸ implies that Egypt had been struck by some disaster at this time. Constantinople's second source of grain supply, North Africa, was less at the mercy of seasonal fluctuations in productivity, and appears to have maintained levels of sufficiency. Yet North Africa was in the hands of the Vandals from the mid 5th to the mid 6th centuries, and had fallen to the Arabs by AD 711. At these times, despite the likelihood that there were less mouths to feed, there may have been widespread insufficiency throughout Asia Minor, as Constantinople must have requisitioned grain from the provinces to meet demands in the capital. A valid point made by Bryer, however, is that the loss of the Egyptian and North African granaries may have stimulated Thracian and Anatolian agriculture.

The above are very general points and do not illustrate local conditions

in Asia Minor. Moreover, the effects of brigandage on agriculture must have been limited, and one must be wary of exaggerating the effects of war.¹²⁹ The influences of climatic and environmental conditions and variations cannot be evaluated as this is an area in which little study has been carried out.

Boak has convincingly demonstrated that there must have been a degree of depopulation during wartime and periods when other disasters are known to have occurred.¹³⁰ His theory that there was a manpower shortage, however, has been brought into question, notably by Finley,¹³¹ who equally convincingly shows that the argument cannot be sustained. There is no questioning the fact that there was a redistribution of manpower, mainly through conscription into the army, but these were times when there would also have been a fall in total population numbers. Even if it could be proved that there was a concurrent fall in levels of productivity, this may have been negligible, as there would have been less mouths to feed and less pressure on the land. By the same token, it cannot be argued that the settling of barbarians on Imperial soil and the probability that the soldiers who fought under Heraclius were given personal plots of land to be tilled when they were not on campaign¹³² was a partial solution to the hypothetical labour problem, because the land provided may have been fallow, which would make its renewed use irrelevant to a question of manpower shortage. Whittaker concludes that, unless one can sustain the proposition of a manpower crisis, or a downturn in the forces of production, implying new and less efficient agricultural methods or combinations of labour, neither of which can be convincingly demonstrated, agricultural productivity must have remained stable.¹³³ Certainly some land was going out of use permanently, yet there was a great deal of marginal land fluctuating between good and bad years. This was accompanied by movements of population, for example, from Imperial to private estates in Asia,¹³⁴ but there is no need to infer that the changing of

hands interfered with productivity.¹³⁵ The opinions that devastation and desertion of the land steadily grew worse from the 3rd to the 6th centuries,¹³⁶ are based on circumstantial evidence or on a biased interpretation of the sources. Whittaker has pointed out the dangers of assuming that law codes were drawn up to deal with a continuous and universal situation rather than considering that they may have been formulated to cover temporary or localised emergencies.¹³⁷ Another danger is in assuming that literary references to adverse circumstances apply to universal conditions rather than to localised crises. Examples are the complaints by Libanius, in the 4th century, and Theodoret in the 5th century,¹³⁸ that oppressive taxation was the cause of the desertion of land around Syrian Antiocheia and Cyrrhus, and the lamenting by John Chrysostom that poor farmers around Antiocheia were placed under intolerable burdens.¹³⁹ There is plenty of evidence to show that the economy of Syria was particularly prosperous during these centuries.¹⁴⁰ Even Lactantius' comments on the neglect of the fields and the reversion of cultivated land to wilderness, as a consequence of Diocletian's policies,¹⁴¹ were doubtless exaggerated and may in fact have been written with a specific localised incident in mind. A further point on the subject of deserted land is that it may have been turned to other, more favourable uses. Evidence from Britain shows that land in the region of the Salisbury plain, which seems formerly to have been part of a series of Imperial estates which supplied grain to the legions of the southwest, was used in the 3/4th century for the prosperous business of raising sheep and cattle.¹⁴²

The oppressiveness of taxation during late Antiquity has come under much discussion. It seems that the question will never be adequately resolved as it is difficult to compare accurately one age with another, and sources tend to be biased in that they more often than not lament the passing of a previous Golden Age and describe contemporary troubles

as diabolical in comparison with those which have been suffered before,¹⁴³
Complaints about excessive taxation are a feature of every day and age,
and made at every level of a structured society, by landowner and
peasant alike.

From the 3rd century, however, it does appear that taxes were a continual
burden to the tenant farmer in particular. One of the problems caused
by taxation of the land was that it did not always take into consideration
the general quality of the soil or the possibility of bad harvests arising
from factors out of the control of the farmer. A tenant farmer who had
to do his utmost to scrape a satisfactory living from the soil would
hardly have the resources to accumulate surplus, and loss of his crops
due to a bad harvest or theft would have resulted in non-payment of rent,
and possibly starvation or flight. The same might apply to the small-
holder who could not afford to pay his taxes. Jones neatly sums up the
evidence from the 3rd century onwards in favour of a relatively high
taxation rate, unfair distribution of taxes, and a continual and unbearable
burden on the colonus in particular.¹⁴⁴ The status of the colonus was
technically free, but a law of AD 393 places huge restrictions on the
colonus and denotes him a 'slave of the land'.¹⁴⁵ This evidence, however,
must not be relied on too heavily. The legislation on the coloni, as
pointed out by Whittaker,¹⁴⁶ provides more information about Roman taxation
and fiscal problems than it does about the condition of the coloni; further-
more, the implication that the colonus was tied to the land does not
prove that there was a manpower shortage.¹⁴⁷ Neither does an apparently
excessive taxation system prove that land must have gone out of production
as a consequence.¹⁴⁸

There are too many variables involved for general conclusions to be made
on taxation, labour and agricultural problems. Within an individual prov-
ince, there could be a high degree of diversity.¹⁴⁹ In addition, oppressive
conditions imposed by one government may have been relieved by the next.

The Archaeological Evidence.

Building - The apparent scarcity of building activity after the 3rd century, the lack of quality of what construction there was, and the decay of the urban centre of the city have all been considered as indicative of a continuously downhill civic, economic and social decline.

Broughton has assembled a collection of epigraphic evidence which testifies to new construction throughout Asia Minor.¹⁵⁰ Some of the building was made possible through grants from central government, but a large part, particularly during the 2nd century, from municipal funds and donations from wealthy benefactors.¹⁵¹ The evidence shows prolific activity under the Flavians and Antonines, an increase up to the time of Marcus Aurelius, followed by an apparent decline in the frequency of building and donations, although by no means a complete standstill. The archaeological evidence does not conflict with these observations.

At many sites, if one discounts the ecclesiastical buildings, there is little evidence, often no evidence, for construction during late Antiquity. If, however, there is a church which is datable, for example, to the 7th century, and the ecclesiastical lists confirm that there was a bishop during the same period, then there must have been a congregation, i.e. that site must have been occupied. How, then, do we interpret the lack of archaeological evidence for new construction? Many of the structures built during the Hellenistic period and under the Principate were designed to withstand centuries of use, as is proved by the survival of many of them to the present day. Often little more than occasional repair would have been necessary. Yet, where there is no evidence for repair, how can we be sure that these buildings did continue in use? And, if not, what were the alternative characteristics of the city, for which no evidence survives?

There is no denying that the scarcity of building activity after the 3rd century and the incomparability of the buildings of early and late Antiquity are very much a reflection of economic conditions. Laws from the 4th century onwards do imply a tightening up of public spending, presumably because the funds of both municipal and central government were not as prolific as they had been, and donations not as generous. A law of Constantine encourages the construction of churches but restricts the erection of any other type of building.¹⁵² A law of AD 365 decrees that columns and other expensive building materials should be removed from smaller cities for use in larger cities.¹⁵³ Another law permits only the construction of stores and stables.¹⁵⁴ Laws encouraging the destruction of pagan temples¹⁵⁵ were probably enforced for economic rather than religious reasons, in order to provide inexpensive masonry for essential new construction. Whilst public ecclesiastical building was encouraged, however, there were laws against the construction of private chapels,¹⁵⁶ perhaps to combat the waste of money which might be more usefully directed to other purposes, for the benefit of the whole community rather than a handful of its members. The fact that new building from the 4th century onwards was mainly ecclesiastical strongly suggests that huge resources were being channelled through the Church which consequently grew wealthy from patronage and from its lands and properties. Between the 4th and the 6th centuries in particular, there was a profusion of new churches and church decoration. Even in the 7th century ecclesiastical building activity did not come to a standstill. The expenditure of the Church was not negligible, but it was probably nowhere near in proportion to the amount of income received. Obviously, the growth of this wealth was at the expense of municipal funds. Benefactions which might once have been made to the city were increasingly being diverted to augment the resources of the Church, thereby restricting the construction and repair of secular monuments. Patronage was dictated not by law but by society.

Even though there was new construction in the 3rd century, there also seems to have been a degree of declining public pride. This is seen in the evidence from various sites in Asia Minor that, with the threat of external danger in the 3rd century, there was no hesitation in tearing down public buildings, some of which had been erected only a generation before, in order to build or repair fortification walls with the masonry. To view the situation realistically, the robbing of these buildings is not in itself entirely a sign of declining civic pride. In retrospect, these actions might be seen as rash and unnecessary; at the time, however, there was no certainty of how much devastation might be caused by the invading armies, and, after more than two centuries of peace, there was quite possibly a tendency to overreact. Security is more important than civic pride; an inadequately fortified city, if attacked, would no doubt suffer some degree of destruction in any case. There is seldom prior warning of invasion in any age, and if, after a long period of complacency, fortifications were in need of repair, one would hardly expect that the work forces would have gone calmly to their quarries and hacked out new material for the construction of defensive systems. It is in that the tearing down of public monuments seems to have been indiscriminate and that the demolished buildings were not repaired that a lack of public pride is detected. Razing of a partially demolished building would show more public pride than leaving it unused but in a delapidated state.

An illustration of decaying public pride in the municipalities but an effort by central government to maintain an appearance of, or to encourage an awareness of, pride is the testimony of the edicts of Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius against the erection of private constructions on streets or against public buildings.¹⁵⁷ These edicts, on the one hand, confirm the archaeological evidence that this was an ongoing practice, and, on the other hand, show that preventative measures were being taken. In addition, in the same title as the prohibition on worship in pagan temples and the orders

for the destruction of pagan temples, are decrees which encourage a respect for pagan temples as monuments of artistic and historical value.¹⁵⁸

In some cases, the destruction and delapidation of buildings might not have been exclusively a symptom of diminishing public pride. Certain decisions may have been dictated by economic difficulties and restrictions on public spending. The law of AD 365 which legislated the removal of columns and expensive building materials from the smaller cities for use in the larger cities implies that there was in fact an effort to maintain an appearance of wealth and civic pride in the larger cities. That this was at the expense of the smaller cities, whose appearance must have suffered as a result if the law was enforced to the letter, was less on account of a lack of civic pride in these cities than on account of a situation conditioned by law and thus out of the hands of the citizens and the municipal authorities. Certainly, an element of diminishing public pride is detectable, but a certain amount of circumspection has to be observed when advocating this.

Procopius' description of the rebuilding of Syrian Antiocheia by Justinian¹⁵⁹ shows that the classical idea of town planning was still alive in the first half of the 6th century and that public buildings were still an important part of the overall aspect of the city. Moreover, the laws in the Theodosian Code would hardly have restricted new construction of secular buildings if adequate and functional buildings did not already exist. These laws were designed to control wastefulness and profligate spending rather than to leave citizens with a shell of a city.

The indications are that the central authorities were keen to retain the basic character of the Graeco-Roman city, even if there may already have been functional changes which precluded the necessity of including some of the buildings of the traditional city in the city of the 6th century. Changes in town planning and evidence for urban decline before

this date can, in general, be seen as the result of decisions made at a municipal level, and sometimes even as an indication of a lack of control by the municipal authorities. These decisions were conditioned for the most part by local circumstances, by local social, economic and political factors, which might, coincidentally, have been universal factors, rather than by legislation, although it is evident that some laws placed restrictions on new construction .

The basic construction of the buildings of later Antiquity little resembles the precise and regular stonework of the Hellenistic and early Roman builders, but rather than considering this merely as a reflection of decline in building traditions and total impoverishment, it might be more realistic to view it, partially at least, as the sensible and economic reuse of available materials. If a building is decorated with marble revetment or plaster, for instance, there is no need for the basic structure to be anything more than functional. Even churches are almost always built of reused masonry but that this might be a reflection of poverty is contradicted by the overwhelming architectural evidence that bears witness both to the affluence of the Church and to the skill of the craftsmen.

A change in building materials might be partly indicative of a shortage of funds, but occasionally it might be a reflection of a development in building methods and techniques. For instance, mortared rubble is not an attractive building medium, yet it not only coped with some of the more difficult engineering problems such as vaulting but also made use of the Roman innovation of concrete. Pebbles and field stones could be collected locally at no expense. Timber may have been a more common building material in districts where it was easily available, but as timber leaves few traces this cannot be verified. Ashlar construction was restricted in Constantinople because of its expense, ¹⁶⁰ but in

regions where it was easily accessible it did continue in use. Sun-dried or mud brick, although it seldom survives the test of time, may have also been used more commonly than supposed, perhaps for domestic structures, partly because of the high costs of ashlar masonry. As shown by the skilled use of mud brick in Mesopotamia and Egypt, for example, this was not necessarily an inferior building material. A perhaps not insignificant observation is that when Cos was hit by an earthquake in the 6th century, it was the solid stone buildings which collapsed and the rough mud brick structures which remained standing. 161

A further point to be considered before assuming that all signs of urban change from, or after, the 3rd century are indicative of decadence is that some of the evidence might be better viewed as a reflection of changing needs and trends. When we eliminate the buildings which may have fallen into disuse for these reasons, what we are left with might reflect accurately the social and administrative needs of the times. The disuse of pagan temples is the most obvious example, reflecting a change in religious trends. Changing religious trends may also have been a fundamental reason behind the demise of the theatre and the agora. The function of the theatre was already undergoing a change in the mid Principate when many of the cities of Asia Minor were adapting their theatres for the games and sports normally associated with the amphitheatres of the Western provinces. From the 4th century, the Church was undermining the importance of the theatre and the agora as meeting places. It might also be considered that the populace was gradually becoming more inclined to favour privacy in everyday life, a basically psychological change which would have had much to do with Christianity and the teachings of the Church. This might explain not only the demise of the theatre and the agora, but also the demise of the public bath-houses, one of whose main functions was as a social gathering place. If people wanted to wash, they could do so just as easily in their own homes. Administrative buildings would still be necessary

in the Christian world, but it is possible that assemblies concerned with municipal matters were held in church buildings. In fact, if the old urban traditions were continued by the Church, this deflates one of the standard arguments for discontinuity.

One cannot argue for urban decay as part of a continuous process of decline until the scale of this decadence is established, until more is known about the social and administrative needs of the city of late Antiquity, and until more is known about the actual character of, and the possibility of different characters of, the settlements of this period. One has also to make a distinction between those settlements at which urban decay, or urban transformation, was the result of a disastrous event such as earthquake or enemy action, and those at which it was a gradual process. One cannot argue for urban decay as a universal phenomenon on the evidence from a handful of sites which may not be representative of the true situation.

When we do eliminate those traditional monuments of the Graeco-Roman city which might have fallen into disuse after they had outlived their function - e.g. pagan temples, theatres, agoras, and even bath-houses, gymnasia, stadia and council chambers - we are left with a handful of necessary amenities, including the houses, the churches, the water supplies, the streets, the shops and the workshops. If it is only those amenities of a city which were no longer essential which fall into disrepair, one can argue only for urban transformation. A element of declining public pride and financial hardship might also be detected, but only when there is evidence for failure to maintain the necessary amenities can one argue for urban decay, and, in some cases, for partial or total abandonment. The evidence that might reflect most accurately any possibility of marked decline, discontinuity or depopulation is that of housing but, unfortunately, houses were seldom substantial enough to survive the rigours of the centuries. Moreover, it is almost impossible to date a domestic structure from plan alone as the plans of houses dating from the 5th century BC to the 10th century AD are virtually indistinguishable.¹⁶²

Russell has neatly summed up the types of archaeological evidence which might be used to infer urban decline - "the closing and partitioning of the porticoes of colonnaded avenues and other public buildings to house a wide variety of domestic, industrial and retail activities; the encroachment of ramshackle buildings of similar purpose into streets and other open public areas; the abandonment of public buildings, especially baths and theatres, the systematic stripping of their furnishings and, in extreme cases, dismantling and burning of their masonry for lime; the dumping of rubbish in the abandoned shells of public buildings and the establishment of new floor levels more suited for new and lowly functions; the subdivision of spacious private residences to accommodate larger numbers of poorer inhabitants; desultory maintenance of public amenities such as city-walls, aqueducts, drains and street surfaces, often reflected in makeshift repairs, followed by complete neglect and disuse; the substitution of wells for aqueducts no longer in working order; the clogging of principal thoroughfares with debris; including collapsed masonry from adjacent buildings allowed to remain uncleared; the random burial of the dead within city limits in places not officially designated as cemeteries." ¹⁶³

These are fairly typical phenomena at sites which have been excavated throughout the Byzantine world. Securely dated contexts show that this picture of the decay of the urban centre as it was known in the Graeco-Roman world is most evident from around the 7th century; also implicit is an element of declining public pride from the 3rd century onwards. However, the number of sites which have been systematically excavated, not merely with a view to retrieving artifacts of artistic value but, more importantly, with the aim of establishing a chronology of occupation and prosperity, are very few; almost all of those in Asia Minor are, if not on or not far from the coast, lowland sites and, not unnaturally, the sites of cities which must have been among the most prosperous under

the Empire. Before it can be assumed confidently that this pattern of urban decline was universal in all cities of the Empire, there needs to be excavation of a cross-section of cities from different geographical environments and of different levels of what might, for want of a more appropriate word, be termed 'importance'. So it would be necessary to excavate highland sites, sites which were not on the main highways through Asia Minor, sites which might have derived their prosperity from alternative sources to those which dealt heavily in commerce, and even the sites of non-city settlements. This is important not only for the question of urban decline but also for the questions of continuing or declining prosperity, of continuity or discontinuity of occupation, and of the extent to which the signs of decline are a reflection of universal or local circumstances. As one of the most significant periods related to the question of continuity and decline is the 7th century and one of the most highly favoured explanations for urban decay, economic instability and demographic change is the influence of the Persian incursions into Asia Minor, it is unrealistic to take a model from a region where a Persian presence is known to have been forceful and apply it to a region which may have been affected only by a feeling of insecurity. This enigmatic problem is applied to Pisidia in the following chapter.

It might be added here that the pattern of urban decline at Anemurium follows fairly closely that of the excavated sites in the west of Asia Minor; marked and sudden decline, together with total or partial abandonment, at the latter sites has been attributed to the depredations of the Persians in the first quarter of the 7th century; only close context dating at Anemurium has provided the evidence that urban life was abruptly arrested by an earthquake which seems to have occurred around AD 580.¹⁶⁴ Without the meticulous excavation which is being observed at Anemurium, inaccurate conclusions may have been reached on the cause of destruction and these in turn may have formed a misguided basis for future speculations

on the fate of other sites. A further point in the case of Anemurium is that, although there is evidence for urban change in the 4th century, which might be interpreted as decadence or as declining civic pride, this was by no means the beginning of a continuous downhill process of decline. Unless the city's appearance belied its level of prosperity, there is evidence that Anemurium was still a flourishing, and apparently not impoverished, city at the beginning of the 6th century, with many of the traditional features of the earlier city still existing. However, Russell marks the significance of the failure to clear up after the damage caused by the earthquake as suggestive as a lack of will, a lack of resources and even a lack of manpower, implying that there must have been an amount of economic inertia before AD 580, and possibly also a degree of depopulation. Although Foss' conclusion that it was the devastating campaigns of the Persians in the second decade of the 7th century which was a crucial factor in the decline of the city, especially in Asia Minor,¹⁶⁵ might be true in the cases of those cities which were in the direct path of the Persians, one might wonder what the evidence for Anemurium would have shown if the city had not been devastated by an earthquake a quarter of a century before the Persians began their onslaught on Asia Minor.

To conclude, the archaeological evidence does suggest a deterioration in the condition of the cities which characterized the Graeco-Roman world. One can argue for impoverishment and a lack of resources, for declining civic pride in the municipalities but an attempt to maintain an appearance of prosperity and the traditional characteristics of the city by the central authorities. One cannot, however, use negative evidence to advocate the decline of the urban centre. There is evidence to imply urban transformation, but in many cases there is no reason to interpret this as a sign of decadence rather than as a reflection of changing needs. One has to strike a balance between the various possible

interpretations of the evidence, but the evidence itself is insufficient to enable an authoritative assessment. Almost every shred of archaeological evidence can be given more than one interpretation. Moreover, it is not at all certain that there was a general pattern of urban decay or of urban transformation. The pattern may have varied from region to region. If economic factors are to be considered responsible for the decline of the city, one has to make a distinction between universal and local economic conditions. If political factors, namely invasion, are to be considered responsible, one has to treat separately those regions where the threat was direct and there may have been actual devastation from those regions which may have been affected by fear and insecurity only. There is a need for excavation of more sites like Anemurium and for highland sites. Surveys of highland sites have produced evidence which more or less fits into the general pattern of decaying public pride, urban stagnation and impoverishment from the 3rd century; the problem with these sites is that excavation is necessary in order to discover the process of transformation, the scale of occupation and the degree of decline after the 3rd century. The evidence from Pisidia is discussed in the following chapter; conclusions, however, are limited by the little amount of intense archaeological work that has been carried out in the district.

Coinage - The use of numismatic evidence to suggest decline is not entirely

166
satisfactory. Negative evidence is never reliable, and coinage as an economic phenomenon may have been succeeded by alternative methods of payment. Municipal mints gradually began to close down through the 3rd century, but minting did not cease after these closures; the Imperial government continued to issue. The city needed coins for the payment of municipal officials; central government needed coins for the wages of government officials and for payment of the army; people needed coins for the payment of taxes, for commercial enterprise and for everyday purchasing of goods. Coinage in its economic capacity, if indeed it ever had a particularly active economic function, may have been supplemented or

replaced at various times by other methods of exchange such as bartering, payment in kind, and the use of tokens or credit notes. Payment in kind seems to have become the norm in the 4th century, which Hopkins considers as a sign of decline.¹⁶⁷

Before the municipal mints closed down, there seems to have been a surge of energetic coining by certain cities. That this was a phenomenon evident in Pisidia may indicate that Pisidia was little influenced by the crises which were affecting other parts of the Empire, or was experiencing a delayed reaction due to her geographical remoteness. Many of the 3rd century issues are military in character, which might partly signify a central government policy to help the war effort. Minting of Pisidian coinage during the 3rd century is discussed further in Chapter IX.¹⁶⁸

The use of coinage to support the theory of urban decline or discontinuity in the 7th century has been brought into question. Many of the excavated sites show a sharp drop in the number of coins issued after AD 658,¹⁶⁹ but by no means can one infer a total breakdown of economic activity or general abandonment of the sites in question on this evidence alone. Hendy offers an alternative explanation for the apparent sudden reduction in the production of copper coins: that it was the consequence of a government reform whereby, in order to avoid a cash crisis, plots of land were given as payment to soldiers who were recalled from the front and settled in Asia Minor.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, unless one can prove that coins were used in a nonexclusive economic capacity at this time, the cessation or the dwindling of coinage cannot be interpreted as a symptom of a breakdown in economic activity. The fact that a smattering of coins dating from between c. AD 658 and the 8th century have turned up at most of the city sites which have been excavated¹⁷¹ inclines one to the opinion that there was no abandonment of the sites in question. The

dangers and the contradictions of assigning a chronology to ceramic wares on the basis of the numismatic evidence by the proponents of the abandonment theory are discussed by Russell.¹⁷² A further illustration of the danger of relating the quantity of coins found at a site, coins of a date after the closure of the municipal mints, to economic conditions is the evidence from Anemurium which shows a marked abundance of coins from two periods, namely the end of the 4th century and the early years of Constans II, periods during which there is evidence for the presence of a military garrison in the city.¹⁷³

Foss has made some interesting speculations, using numismatic evidence, on the wars with the Persians in the first half of the 7th century. He argues that the apparent closure of the Imperial mints at Nicomedia, Cyzicus and Syrian Antiocheia during the reign of Heraclius was due to the disturbances caused by the Persians in Asia Minor.¹⁷⁴ A new mint was opened at Seleuceia in Isauria in AD 616, and when this was apparently closed down two years later, Isaura took over the responsibility. Foss has also convincingly related hoards of coins and treasure to the destruction and insecurity caused by the Persians.¹⁷⁵ Unfortunately, coin hoards are few and far between and the geographical implications cannot yet be fully comprehended.

Demographic change

Demographic change, either depopulation or demographic movement, has come under much discussion but it is a difficult question to assess, with the result that opinions are at variance. The major obstacle to the question of depopulation is the lack of statistical evidence. Population figures do exist from tax records and censuses, but these pertain mainly to Rome and North Africa, and date from the days of the early Empire.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, it is not certain how great a proportion of the population is

represented by these figures, whether only taxable citizens, males, persons over a certain age, or the total number of inhabitants of the area under assessment. Occasionally, population numbers are recorded by ancient authors, but the credibility of their figures is questionable, particularly if they relate to some disaster, such as earthquake, plague, famine or war, resulting in a tendency to exaggerate the number of lives lost. Another problem is that the little information available tends to relate to a particular point in time, but in order to determine a fluctuating population and its long-term impact comparative figures are necessary.

None of the methods used to establish population figures are entirely satisfactory. The evidence for mortality rates calculated from tombstones is subject to so many variables that it must be treated with the greatest

caution.¹⁷⁷ Interesting speculations can be made from the size of theatres but, again, the variables are too great to be sure of realistic estimations. The size of a theatre certainly reflects its expected use and it is often the case that the capacity of a theatre bears some relation to the size of a city, but theatre sizes must also have been subject to the trends of the times, the plans of the architect and the funds available at the time of construction. Moreover, even if a theatre did reflect accurately the population of a city, it would do so only for the date at which the theatre was constructed. It can give no indication of population increase or decrease. Aqueduct capacities have also been used to calculate population figures. The construction of an aqueduct may reflect a growing population, but it may just as well indicate the replacement of old methods of water collection by a more elaborate system, made possible through the abundance of municipal funds or the goodwill of some wealthy benefactor. The maximum capacity of an aqueduct can sometimes be calculated, but an aqueduct is not always used to its full capacity and a piped supply of water was usually

supplemented by wells and rainwater tanks. There is no satisfactory method of relating the water supply of a settlement to its consumption as drinking water, as an immeasurable amount of water was used for public baths. Should the population of a city decrease, the aqueduct will not go out of use as a direct consequence; an available supply of water, whilst it is maintained, will serve a smaller population as readily as a larger one. Even if the date of an aqueduct's demise is known, it is not certain that it reflects a waning population. Maintenance may have proved too expensive and the city reverted to more traditional and less expensive, although more troublesome, methods of water collection. It is thought that when the aqueduct of Valens was damaged by the Arabs in AD 629, the reason there was no urgency to repair it until over a century later was because it was no longer a vital supply for the inhabitants of Constantinople whose numbers were so much smaller than they had been when the aqueduct had been constructed.¹⁷⁸ This is no doubt true, but the demise of the aqueduct gives no clue to the date at which the population had begun to decline. Piped water supplies, however, cannot be used as a method of calculation for the population and relative population numbers of the Pisidian cities. Aqueducts have been found at Antiocheia, Cremna, Sagalassus, Selge and Termessus only.

Estimations of the maximum agricultural potential of a settlement depend on the extent of the territory, the size of the cultivated area, the type of the crops, the quality of the land and the efficiency of agricultural techniques. Calculations based on the size of an urban centre are made unreliable by the varying densities of habitation, different approaches to town planning and, a completely unknown factor, the existence of suburbs and outlying villages and farmsteads.

The shrinkage of the circuits of city walls cannot in itself be taken as indicative of a diminishing population. The inhabitants of a city with

a smaller population than when its walls were first erected would hardly go to the trouble of reducing the circuit of those walls purely because there were less inhabitants, or less habitations, to contain. The only logical explanation for newly constructed walls of a smaller circuit is one of defense policy. A wall of a relatively short total length, surrounding only the essential nucleus of a settlement, an area large enough only to provide refuge for the citizens and dependents of the settlement, is both less expensive to construct and easier to defend in the event of an attack. Frequently, it was the old Hellenistic acropolis of a settlement that was refortified and this was seldom a large enough area to serve as anything more than a place of refuge. That war tends to bring with it a drop in population numbers, and that the population of a city may have decreased already for any reason, is generally incidental to the circuit length of city walls. If a city is destroyed, through war or by an earthquake, for example, only then might the new walls of the rebuilding programme reflect the current size of the population.

Despite the unreliability of all methods of population calculation, resulting in different estimates, they do give the general impression that there was a marked population decline during late Antiquity.¹⁷⁹ Virtually all historians agree that the total population of the Empire decreased by roughly 25% from the 1st to the 3rd century. However, one of the crucial arguments for depopulation, that of manpower shortage,¹⁸⁰ has been brought into question.¹⁸¹

Circumstantial evidence can only corroborate the theories for general depopulation during late Antiquity. War itself played a critical role in the process of depopulation. Numerous campaigns from at least as early as the 4th century resulted in the loss of the lives of countless males, and the Persian and Arab incursions into Asia Minor reduced numbers through the slaughter and capture of innocent non-fighters. One conseq-

uence of war was the settling of barbarian and ethnic groups in Asia Minor, thereby increasing the total population.¹⁸² This was not, however, a new practice in foreign policy, and can not in itself be used as evidence that there was depopulation.

A fairly recurrent misfortune throughout Antiquity was disease. Disease itself, and famine resulting from disease and war, must have taken their toll on total population numbers. The mortality rate during Antiquity was presumably higher than it is today, many illnesses which can now be cured by modern medicine then being fatal. Death in infancy and early childhood must have been common and considered normal in that it was unavoidable. Non-epidemic diseases may have maintained the population equilibrium. Epidemic diseases, however, spread rapidly in the hot Mediterranean climate. The rural population suffered because whole communities and their livestock might be wiped out in a single epidemic of a particularly infectious and fatal disease. Urban communities were susceptible because of unsanitary conditions and the proximity of habitation, particularly crowded in the poorer quarters, and the tendency for people to flee to the cities in times of crisis and panic, perhaps in the hope of medical help or from the imagination that there was safety in numbers. People debilitated by famine and malnutrition, their resistance weakened, were more susceptible to disease.

A number of epidemics are recorded throughout Antiquity. On the one hand, there is the probability that surviving accounts are exaggerated; on the other hand, in a world in which disease was fairly common, it is unlikely that an epidemic of minor proportions would be recorded. Still, one must interpret the sources with an amount of circumspection. For example, according to Zosimus, the plague of the 250s destroyed whatever of the human race had been spared by war; however, again according to Zosimus, less than 10 years later there was a further outbreak, "the likes of which had never before occurred".¹⁸³ The epidemic which coincided with the series

of wars during the reign of Marcus Aurelius was widespread,¹⁸⁴ but recovery was supposedly rapid.¹⁸⁵ Patlagean assesses the evidence for plague and disease during the 4th to the 7th centuries.¹⁸⁶ Perhaps the most disastrous epidemic of late Antiquity was the plague which darkened the reign of Justinian.¹⁸⁷ The initial outbreak in Constantinople in AD 542 was followed by others until the early 7th century. A secondary hazard was smallpox, but perhaps the most disastrous consequences were a general weakening of spirit and the long-term economic effects.¹⁸⁸ Wachter attributes the decline of Roman Britain to epidemic diseases above all other factors,¹⁸⁹ but although disease was doubtless a contributory factor to depopulation, there is insufficient evidence to judge precisely its importance in relation to general decline.¹⁹⁰

Depopulation may be a symptom of decline, but it is not in itself a valid reason for decline. Demographic expansion, especially in an urban environment, resulting in crowded housing, bad sanitation and too many mouths to feed, is more likely to be a contributory factor to decline. One observes that population growth in the developing countries of today is an impediment to economic expansion.

Demographic movement, irrespective of depopulation, is also evident during Antiquity. The reasons are not always known, but it seems logical that the fundamental motive for wholesale relocation of a settlement was the unsuitability of a site which was once ideal. Movement to an easily defensible site at a higher altitude, especially if that site was artificially fortified in addition, must have been as a precaution¹⁹¹ against invasion. Movement to a site at a lower altitude, on the other hand, was probably motivated for the most part by water problems, possibly by climatic factors and perhaps for more favourable commercial contacts. Relocation of a settlement may also have been a consequence of earthquake or silting.

Demographic movement is particularly important in the assessing of the question of continuity. Those scholars who favour the theory of a break in continuity use as part of their argument the evidence which suggests a gradual abandonment of city sites in the 7th century as the population moved into rural areas or built kastra on hilltops.¹⁹² There is evidence for kastra on hilltops, but it is seldom certain if these represent full-scale relocation of a settlement or if these kastra were regarded merely as places of refuge and were occupied only on a temporary basis in times of crisis. Archaeological evidence for rural settlements is exceedingly scarce in any case. There is little to corroborate the possibility that citizens fled gradually or en masse into the countryside or that village communities themselves may have been major followers of a trend of demographic movement.

The evidence is insufficient to be able to sustain an argument for universal abandonment of sites. Even some of the arguments for abandonment of and discontinuity at individual sites are not foolproof. Russell, in his discussion on the difficulties involved in dealing with the abandonment theory, points out that at some sites a trickle of coinage suggests that occupation on some scale must have continued.¹⁹³ Whether this means that a site was almost totally deserted and only a handful of citizens remained, that there was marked depopulation but no actual demographic movement, or there was no significant demographic change at all cannot be determined without additional evidence. The limitations of the use of the numismatic evidence have already been discussed in the previous section.

At many sites, the early Hellenistic acropolis may have served as a place of refuge. By the early Principate, at those sites whose topography permitted it, population expansion and urbanisation had dictated the moving of the nucleus of the settlement from the early acropolis, which often remained an unoccupied part of the site but which, especially if

it was reinforced by fortifications, retained its relative impregnability. Depending on topography, invasion routes and the intensity of insecurity, the urban centre and domestic areas may have been maintained in their established locations and the acropolis regarded merely as a sanctum in case retreat was considered necessary, or the nucleus of the site may have been rebuilt on the acropolis. This latter phenomenon seems to have occurred at Perge and Sillyum at some time in the Byzantine period, At Perge, there is little in the way of standing remains on the acropolis but it does appear that the lower site, although surrounded by a decent wall, was abandoned and the acropolis occupied.¹⁹⁴ At Sillyum, the Roman city had extended to the foot of the hill, but the Byzantine remains are restricted to the heights.¹⁹⁵ There was of course a necessity for security precautions to be taken in Pamphylia, especially in the 9th and 10th centuries when Attaleia in particular was subjected to a number of vicious attacks, and even temporary occupation, by the Arabs. However, although it would not be surprising to learn that citizens deserted low-land sites for the relative safety of the highlands, there is no evidence to prove this.

There was little need to relocate many of the highland sites as a precaution against invasion as the majority of the city sites were already situated on high, easily defensible ground, often reinforced by fortification walls at their weakest points. There is little direct evidence for the relocation of highland sites at more favourable altitudes before the end of Antiquity, but as the sites of Turkish towns and villages which have succeeded the settlements of Antiquity are almost without exception on lower ground some distance away from the original sites, a move must have occurred at some time. There is no need to suppose that a universal policy to change the site of a settlement coincided with the end of the Byzantine Empire and the beginning of Turkish rule. Speculations on demographic movement in Pisidia are

discussed in Chapter IX, following the examination of the evidence from the individual sites for continuity, decline and change.

More common than the movement of a whole community to a new site must have been the movement of individuals, but it is difficult to verify just how significant this was. Besides the movement which is thought to have contributed to the shortage, or the redistribution, of manpower and agricultural labour, individuals may have left rural districts to seek better business prospects in the cities, and highlanders may have moved to the plain where the coastal cities offered opportunities for commercial enterprise.¹⁹⁶ There is, however, no evidence to show that these might have been trends which were followed consistently, or which were significantly more frequent during any particular period of history. One certain contributory cause of demographic change during late Antiquity was conscription, and there is evidence for an increasing tendency for asthetics to opt out of society by joining or setting up a monastic community.¹⁹⁷

Harrison has argued for a movement of craftsmen in late Antiquity, for example to Alakilise in the 5th century.¹⁹⁸ There is no evidence as yet that this was a universal phenomenon, although it does seem to have occurred in Isauria as well as in Lycia.¹⁹⁹ However, even if a monastery, for example, did monopolize the services of an artisan, or of several artisans, and even if it could be proved that these artisans were resident in upland districts, rather than being peripatetic, it is questionable whether this would have been a major contribution to civic or economic decline by affecting the scale and quality of decorative masonry elsewhere. Evidence from lowland sites shows that ecclesiastical architecture was still being turned out on a lavish scale in the 6th century.

Discussion.

Decline - Factors of decline can be proposed, but a true evaluation can be made only from the testimony of the symptoms. Documentary and archaeological evidence can be brought in for support, but seldom for confirmation. The reliability of the documentary evidence is often in question; the archaeological evidence is mostly negative and that it must be treated with a certain amount of circumspection has already been illustrated. Even if the literary sources are taken at face value, without regard for the nature of the genre, the literary climate of the age, the pessimism or the discontentment of the particular author, one still has to be wary of interpreting both generalised and specific accounts as portrayals of typical and Empire-wide circumstances. Laws also must be considered carefully: was a law formulated to deal with commonplace and universal issues, or might it have been prompted by a specific or localised incident?

Decline is a relative term. It is in comparison with the prosperity of the preceeding centuries that decline during late Antiquity is detected. Walbank takes an even broader view of decline. He considers that it had already set in before the time of Alexander, that it was a gradual and irregular process, relieved periodically by the achievements of Alexander and his successors, by Augustus and Hadrian, but as the real cause of decay - social and political disunity, the cultural failure of the Hellenistic age, its low level of technology - were never eradicated, the downward process continued.²⁰⁰ However, it is easy in retrospect to focus on a Golden Age and to view continuous digression as decline rather than as change and development, the picture coloured by the documentary evidence which has survived and which is more prone to recount disasters and adversity rather than regularity and prosperity. Although Walbank's theory might have its values from the viewpoint of a Hellenistic historian, it can hardly

be applied to Asia Minor. The documentary evidence indicates a period of unrivalled political and cultural growth until at least the 2nd century AD, and the archaeological evidence reflects financial prosperity and technological advancement for the same period.

It seems acceptable to conclude that there was an element of decline during late Antiquity. The pattern that emerges is that the troubles of late Antiquity escalated from the domestic crises which came to a head in the 3rd century. The period from the 3rd to at least the 9th century was, in all, one of political and economic dislocation. Certain Emperors did their utmost to regain stability but they were foiled by circumstances beyond their control - incessant battering on all doors of the Empire by foreign powers, domestic troubles such as invasion, banditry and civil war, intermittent periods of disease and famine, and, perhaps, labour and agricultural problems. It seems impossible that even the remotest corner of Asia Minor could have escaped the repercussions of at least one of these afflictions.

Yet there is insufficient unambiguous evidence to be able to define the intensity of the influences and the consequences of the proposed factors of decline, or to favour a judgement of long-term repercussions rather than of short-lived misfortune. Incidents of disease and famine must have weakened morale at the very least, but whether or not they made a significant contribution to decline and depopulation is debatable. Wachter considered that epidemic disease was the major cause behind the decline of Roman Britain, but there is insufficient reason to suggest that this hypothesis should be applied to Asia Minor. Likewise, there is no concrete evidence to support Carpenter's theory that drought was the major cause of decline, although it seems that environmental changes and their effect on settlement patterns and economic conditions should be more thoroughly investigated.

It might be argued that some of the proposed factors of decline were not restricted to late Antiquity. The ambiguities in the case of brigandage have already been put forward. Brigandage, in any case, cannot be considered seriously as a factor of general decline. There is no evidence, apart from the plague during Justinian's reign, that outbreaks of disease and famine were more frequent or more severe during late Antiquity, nor that earthquakes were more common or more devastating. It is not, however, unreasonable to believe that an Empire subjected to warfare, and not always successful warfare at that, would succumb more readily to other debilitating factors, especially if government aid was neither prompt nor generous. By the same token, an Empire enfeebled by disease and famine would have been more susceptible to the ravages of war. On the other hand, one must take into account the probability that certain ills were localised, and the possibility of rapid recovery must not be underestimated.

Despite the appearance of adversity, there were ups as well as downs, periods of relative prosperity as well as periods of excessive misfortune. Under Aurelian, there was a preliminary reform of the monetary system and an improvement of conditions in general.²⁰¹

Administrative reorganisation under both Diocletian and Constantine brought temporary respite from the upheavals of the 3rd century and formed a relatively sound, if oppressive, structure on which further developments could be based.²⁰² Diocletian's reign was relatively peaceful, apart from the religious persecutions instigated by Galerius, and there was little trouble under Constantine. Under Anastasius, there were also extensive administrative reforms but, as with Diocletian's tax reforms, these tended to place a heavier burden on the poorer and agricultural classes.²⁰³ By the time of Anastasius' death, however, the treasury had been enriched by 320,000 pounds of gold.²⁰⁴ During Justinian's reign, there was a general tightening up of administration,

a boosting of morale from his territorial repossessions, an improvement of civic conditions from his building programme - although it might be doubted that this was as extensive or as beneficial as the sources suggest - and an expansion of trade relations with India and China. The smuggling of silk worms into Asia Minor permitted the growth of a silk manufacturing industry within the Empire, owned by the State, and a valuable source of income.²⁰⁵

Under Heraclius, there was a thorough reorganisation of the structure of both the army and the central administrative system.²⁰⁶

Economic fortunes may have fluctuated during wartime and erred on the side of hardship, but the army did create a constant demand for hides and textiles, weapons and horses, which was of little advantage to the small communities, but maintained the livelihood of the industries and the merchants. Cities in which garrisons were set up or through which there was a constant traffic of troops may have suffered to a certain extent from plundering and requisitioning, but the advantages may have outweighed the disadvantages. Nolle has suggested that the concentration of Roman troops on the south coast at the time of the Gothic and Persian invasions were partly responsible for the importance and prosperity of Perge and Side in the second half of the 3rd century.²⁰⁷

The Church - Perhaps the most important and influential factor of change in the Roman world was Christianity. The Church played an important part in political and administrative affairs and was in many ways a major influence on social and economic conditions. As with any factor of change, the initial emergence of Christianity was an unsettling influence. By the 3rd century, although it had not yet been declared the State religion, Christianity was already a powerful force. Pagan religions were still persistent in certain districts and, until Constantine gave complete freedom to the Church, the frequent opposition

to Christianity by some of the Emperors must have both strengthened the tenacity of paganism and created an Empire-wide friction between the Monotheists and the Polytheists. Just how much conflict there was in reality between the two religions is not certain. A relief from as late as the 5th century from Alahan shows Michael and Gabriel stamping on worshippers of Mithras and Cybele.²⁰⁸ At Antiocheia

there cannot have been total harmony, but one might doubt that the degree of animosity was intense enough to provoke the Christians into destroying pagan monuments, an opinion staunchly upheld by Ramsay.²⁰⁹

Although Christianity was officially tolerated during the first three centuries AD, there were sporadic persecutions, but these were generally short-lived and presumably affected Italy, the current nucleus of the Empire, more than the provinces. These three centuries, unsettled in religious terms, culminated in a more wide-spread and violent persecution during Diocletian's reign.²¹⁰ Central Anatolia did not feature prominently in these religious controversies and there is little specific information concerning Pisidia in the literature. According to Lactantius, a whole people and their church were burned in Phrygia during the Diocletianic persecutions,²¹¹ and it was during these years that Valerius Diogenes, first governor of the newly formed Provincia Pisidia, acted against the Christians at Antiocheia. An epitaph records that a member of his staff, M. Iulius Eugenius, was tortured at Diogenes' instigation.²¹² Eugenius later restored church

buildings at Laodiceia when he became bishop of that city. Neon, Nikon and Heliodorus, to whom Ramsay had suggested that the church at Antiocheia was dedicated, were martyred under Diocletian.²¹³ Eusebius records the martyrdom of Zoticus of Conane and Julian of Apameia.²¹⁴ Eustochius, a citizen of Vasada, was martyred under Maximian.²¹⁵

Christianity was admittedly the cause of the decline of paganism, and its increasing influence on politics did in one respect contribute to

disunity and differences of opinion within the government, but it would be ludicrous to consider it as a cause of general decline. On the contrary, because of its intrinsic strength, the Church might be thought to have held the government together in times of crisis, and the wealth of the Church possibly helped to alleviate the financial straits in which the government found itself during late Antiquity. The Church itself shows no signs of decline. It continued to grow in both East and West, apparently oblivious to the strife going on in all parts of the Empire.²¹⁶ There was possibly a period of relative hardship between the 7th and the 10th centuries, when funds probably diminished, channelled voluntarily, or compulsorily, into the war effort. Internal dissension within the Church seems to have intensified its overall strength and that of the opposing factions which survived. The spread of Christianity encouraged closer relationships among the settlements of Asia Minor, keeping the more isolated communities in touch with the affairs of the capital and other provinces, particularly through the synods which must have taken place more frequently than recorded.

Two important economic observations can be made from the surviving ecclesiastical architecture and from the literature, the Imperial edicts in particular. Firstly, the Church furnished wealthy citizens with an alternative outlet for their money. Where they might formerly have given the means to a municipality to construct or repair an aqueduct, fountain house or other public building, there now existed a more attractive beneficiary for their patronage. The Christian promise of afterlife may have had more to offer than the Elysian fields and, now that the power of the Church was in many ways greater than that of the secular administration, a donation to an ecclesiastical body might result in more opportunities for the bestowing of favours and prestige on the patron. An early example of the diversion of wealth is illustrated by the complaints of the artisans at Ephesus that Paul's

teachings were placing the craftsmen associated with the temple of Artemis in danger of bankruptcy.²¹⁷ The second important economic influence of Christianity is that the Church played a great part in the decisions on spending enforced by the Emperor and central government. This point has already been illustrated. The laws in the Theodosian Code which place restrictions on secular construction, in an attempt to control extravagant spending, encourage ecclesiastical building, although economic measures are also legislated.

The wealth of the Church is reflected in the quality of the ecclesiastical architecture. The buildings materials and construction techniques of secular monuments were far superior during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods than during the late Roman and Byzantine periods. However, the architecture of the early centuries reflects little significant difference between the pagan temples and the public buildings. In contrast, there is a marked distinction between the secular and ecclesiastical architecture of late Antiquity. Although reuse of building materials was common practice, the superior construction of the ecclesiastical buildings is borne out by the survival of the ecclesiastical centre of a settlement when there is no sign of any contemporary building. Moreover, despite Fellows' pertinent comment, "How much it is to be regretted that the introduction of a divine religion should have put to flight all the divinity of art!",²¹⁸ the quality of the marble and the carving of the church decoration which survives is clear indication of the affluence of the Church, and the decorative church architecture of the provincial bishoprics rivalled that of the major ecclesiastical centres of Asia Minor.

Most of the dated architectural fragments from all parts of the Eastern Mediterranean are attributable to the 5/6th century and the

11/12th century. There is, however, reason to believe that more survives from the 4th century than previously acknowledged. Clearly, craftsmanship and patronage were prolific during the late Roman/early Byzantine and late Byzantine periods, and for the late period this is amply confirmed by documentary sources and manuscripts. The precise significance of this in relation to the intervening centuries is not absolutely certain. A distinctive style of ecclesiastical architecture belonging to the middle Byzantine period has not been positively identified, although there is now a framework of reference for the 7th century. As some of the styles and motifs of the late Byzantine period had their inspiration in c. 5th century ecclesiastical architecture, it is conceivable that the craftsmanship of the intervening period retained the lines and themes which were common in the preceeding centuries, to which some work of a later period might then have been ascribed. But despite this possibility that there might have been more activity than we realize during the middle Byzantine period, close copying of earlier styles would suggest a certain lack of artistic inspiration. Although the rate of production doubtless did slow down during these centuries of troubles, another point to consider is that the churches built between the 4th and 6th centuries, and even into the 7th, were probably still serviceable and there was no need for new construction or new decoration.

Continuity and Change - Some scholars have argued for decline and discontinuity in that the settlements and institutions which emerged out of the darkness of the 7th to 9th centuries bore little resemblance to those of the early Empire which had been moulded by Hellenism and Romanism. There is no reason, however, to infer from this and the silence of the sources that the life of early Antiquity had suddenly been arrested, chaos ensued and a new order was built out of the ashes.

The major reason for differences of opinion on the question of continuity is because the word has different shades of meaning. One can approach the subject from the angle that if life went on, there was continuity. Alternatively, one can adopt Wachter's approach, "Town life, or life in towns?", and argue that there is little use in proving continuity of occupation unless we can show its nature, i.e. social, economic and administrative continuity.²¹⁹ In the respect that there was a dying out during late Antiquity of trends, traditions, institutions et cetera of the previous age, a degree of discontinuity can be implied; if, however, one considers that these trends, traditions and institutions were replaced by alternatives, and that this was in general a gradual process, as indeed it was throughout Antiquity, continuity can be inferred and the emphasis should be on change. The fact that the process of change during late Antiquity is not always clear is not a valid reason for advocating discontinuity in that there was some sort of breakdown.

It is clear from the history books that the administrative structure of the Empire was already changing during the late Principate.²²⁰

Many of the reforms and administrative changes during late Antiquity were dictated by the general economic and political situation, in particular by the exigencies of war. In this case, there is reason to suspect that during the so-called 'Dark Ages', for which there is often a blank in the history books, there had been a more urgent need for reorganisation and reforms to cope especially with the critical political situation. That many aspects of organisation which emerged in the 10th century were totally different from those of the Principate reflects conformity with the changing times rather than discontinuity.

It is clear that in the 5th and 6th centuries the Church was growing in strength and influence, and the signs that civic organisation was founded on an ecclesiastical system during the Byzantine period shows

not so much that the old civic system had decayed but that the Church was increasingly being used as an instrument of central government, gradually taking over administrative functions formerly performed by secular officials.²²¹ Also an integral part of the new administrative organisation were the officials created by the theme system.²²² This is an aspect of change which was certainly dictated by the political situation. That it is a reform which can be traced to the early 7th century and continued through to the end of the Byzantine era proves that here was at least one aspect of administration which did not break down.

Patlageán has demonstrated the active function of the monasteries in the economic life of late Antiquity, indicating that there was a shift rather than a collapse of certain aspects of economic activity.²²³ Vryonis presents a picture of a Byzantine Empire in the 10/11th century with an increasing population and a healthy economic and religious life.²²⁴ He gives details of trade and commercial ventures and evidence for merchants and craftsmen throughout Asia Minor, which suggests a vigorous working economy. The Church provided a sound foundation for political and social life. Perhaps a reflection of relative financial ease in central government is the separation of the head and the land taxes.²²⁵ These signs of improved conditions might be considered by pessimists to have been merely a lull in a continuous process of decline, and the picture painted by Vryonis may be over-optimistic, but it surely shows that there must have remained a reasonably stable structure on which these elements of relative prosperity could be built.

As far as the archaeological evidence is concerned, it is clearly ambiguous. How much should the changing character of a settlement be interpreted as a sign of social decadence and of economic decline, and how much as a reflection of changing needs and trends, and of sensible precaution against invasion of a country at war, in effect, of

conformity with the times? It is almost impossible to argue for discontinuity of occupation, and even when there is evidence for demographic movement, it cannot be proved that this was a symptom of decline or that demographic movement is synonymous with depopulation.

When considering discontinuity, one must be aware that the evidence for the West is much different from that for the East, and Wachter's model might not in any case be applicable to Asia Minor. The West was more directly at the mercy of barbarian hordes almost continually sweeping across the Western provinces. The evidence from Asia Minor suggests on the whole a process of gradual change and development, dictated by the exigencies of the times. There was an element of decline, but rather than seeing decline as a continuous downhill process or as a leap into an abyss of calamity, it is more realistic to view late Antiquity as a period beset by difficulties, by spells of political and economic hardships and by importune incidents. This element of decline was in itself, moreover, an aspect of a continuous process of transformation, and must be seen in its context, against a background of general change and development.

A closing remark, adapted from Wachter,²²⁶ seems in order: "This chapter has been a great exercise in possibilities".

CHAPTER IX

CONTINUITY, DECLINE AND CHANGE IN PISIDIA

Due to the want of evidence, this chapter, again, is partly an exercise in possibilities. It is, however, attempted here to draw upon the little archaeological evidence in order to discover on what lines the development of Pisidia was conducted during later Antiquity.

Before considering in more detail the evidence for continuity and change, and the extent to which the province was affected by the elements of decline which appear to have been prevalent in general, it would be useful to assess briefly the non-archaeological evidence for the survival of the Pisidian settlements.

The Council lists and Notitiae show that the majority of the cities which had issued coins during the 1st century BC continued to exist and to retain their relative importance, in that they all became bishoprics, into late Antiquity. These include Antiocheia, Sagalassus, Apameia, Termessus, Selge, Etenna, Pednelissus, Adada, Amblada, Isinda, Seleuceia Sidera, Apollonia, Cremna, Ariassus, Conane, Parlais and Malus. All, apart from Malus, coined into the 3rd century AD.¹ Malus' coinage apparently ended in the 1st century AD.²

Of the twelve cities considered important by Artemidorus,³ the survival of ten of these is proved by the ecclesiastical lists. Eight have already been mentioned above among the cities which coined during the 1st century BC - Sagalassus, Termessus, Selge, Pednelissus, Adada, Amblada, Cremna and Ariassus. Of the remaining four - Tityassus, Timbriada, Tarbassus and Anabura - Tityassus and Timbriada issued coins, beginning under Hadrian and continuing well into the 3rd century, and both are attested as bishoprics by the Council lists and Notitiae.⁴

The ecclesiastical lists confirm that Baris, Tymandus and Limenae, in northern Pisidia, survived to the end of Antiquity. Baris coined from Hadrian until the mid 3rd century.⁵ Tymandus and Limenae did not coin, which is not surprising as neither was probably more than

a village in the mid 3rd century when the coinage of most of the Pisidian cities came to a halt.

Of the cities in the Boz Ovası and its surroundings, that is the highland district of Pamphylia Secunda, the following are attested by the ecclesiastical lists - Pogla, Andeda, Verbe, Hadriane, Maximianopolis, Palaïopolis, Codrula, Zorzila, Eudocias and, probably, Sibidunda, in addition to Termessus, Isinda, Cremna, Pednelissus and Ariassus which have already been mentioned. Pogla, Palaïopolis and Codrula began coining under Antoninus Pius, Andeda issued under Marcus Aurelius and Verbe under Commodus.⁶ All continued coining into the 3rd century. Hadriane, Zorzila and, not surprisingly, Maximianopolis issued no coins. Panemoteichus is recorded by the early Council lists of AD 325, 451 and 536, by the Epistola ad Leonem and by Hierocles, but is omitted by the later Council lists and by the Notitiae. Constantine Porphyrogenitus confirms the existence of the settlement in the late Byzantine period.⁷ As neither Council lists nor Notitiae are free from omissions or errors, it is uncertain in a number of cases whether the absence of a name in the Council lists or Notitiae signifies that the city had ceased to be a bishopric. It is possible that Panemoteichus is represented by the Dicenataurus recorded by the Notitiae.⁸ That the name is corrupt and the copyists unsure of the correct version is clear from the fact that the name has six different spellings, or mis-spellings.

Neapolis, Pappa, Sinethandus, Mistea, Vasada and Amblada, in the district to the east and southeast of Lake Beyşehir, are recorded by Council lists and Notitiae. Of these, only Amblada coined in the 1st century BC, as already noted, and, later, from Commodus into the 3rd century.⁹ Pappa issued under Antoninus Pius.¹⁰

Survival and continuity is implied by the preservation of the ancient name of a settlement in the modern Turkish name. Some of the Turkish names have more recently been replaced by new names which bear no resemblance whatsoever to the ancient name, but fortunately the former names of villages are recorded by the travellers and by the official records. Instances of this phenomenon in Pisidia, some identifications more convincing than others, are: Sagalassus - Ağlasun, Cremna - Gırme, Selge - Zerk, Parlais - Barla, Pogla - Fuğla, Andeda - Andiya, Sibidunda - Zivint, Conane - Gönen, Seleuceia - Selef, Agrai - Ağras, Baris - Faris, Bindeus - Findos, Cotenna - Gödene, Erymna - Ormana, Anabura - Enevre, Neapolis - Isnebolu, Minassus - Minasun, Ceraitae - Çere, Sandalium - Sandal Asarı, Colbasa - Kuşbaba.

The preservation of the ancient name is particularly valuable in the cases of settlements for which there is neither archaeological nor documentary evidence for occupation into later Antiquity. Anabura, assuming the settlement was a member of the Cillanian Tetrapolis, is last alluded to in the 3rd century AD.¹¹ Ceraitae is known from autonomous coinage.

of a 1st century BC date, and Dörtlük has noted inscriptions of the 2nd or 3rd century AD found at the site.¹² Sandalium is recorded only in connection with the events of the third quarter of the 1st century BC.¹³ The name of Colbasa is last documented in the 6th century.¹⁴ At none of the above mentioned sites is there archaeological evidence for occupation after the mid Principate. The fate of these settlements is discussed in further detail below.

Continuity of name, however, does not prove completely unbroken occupation of the same site, continuity of city life, or continuity of status.

Continuity in some respects may have been temporarily broken. Devastation by war or earthquake, for example, may have left the essence of a settlement, its people, without homes and without a normal city life

for some time. It apparently took Sardis over 40 years to provide citizens with an urban environment once again after destruction of the city by the Persians,¹⁵ and a similar delay may have occurred at Antiocheia after destruction by the Arabs.¹⁶

It is impossible to discuss a change in settlement status without first being aware of the original status of settlements and this in itself is not easy. The problem arises partly because one cannot categorize ancient settlements in modern terms, as the ancients' conception of what constituted a particular class of settlement does not correspond to modern definitions. The problem is especially difficult for the Hellenistic and early Roman periods as this was a time of reorganisation and development on a large and industrious scale. It is unrealistic and too simplistic to place all settlements and communities into two single categories, 'city' and 'village', or 'city' and 'tribe'. Not all non-city settlements can be grouped together as villages, and not all communities which did not have the organisation of a polis can be considered tribal. Within the tribal system, in itself a difficult concept to define, developments were taking place which defy such a simple categorisation. Seldom can a date be pinpointed for the end of the tribal structure of a community and the beginning of something more akin to the organisation of a city. It seems that a tribe could have a central settlement which was regarded as a city. Such was the case with Selge during early Antiquity. Whilst the Selgians who inhabited the city of Selge conformed to a civic administration and made use of the public amenities normally associated with a city, the communities of Selgians not under the direct jurisdiction of the city may have lived according to tribal rules. The apparent contradictions in the organisation of Etenna and the Etenneis may be explained in the same way.¹⁷ One must be wary of taking the sources at face value, bearing in mind that ancient geographers and historians did not have a personal

acquaintance with the internal politics of the highlands and were inclined to view all outposts of the Empire as totally barbaric, often disregarding the fact that there did exist almost completely Hellenised, if independent, cities among the less advanced communities.

It is difficult to distinguish between a primitive polis and a large tribal centre. A number of settlements existed before the Principate whose status cannot be defined in terms as rigid as 'city' or 'tribal' but whose early history and archaeology implies a reasonably well developed internal organisation. These include Adada, Isinda, Cremna, Pednelissus, Prostanna and Ariassus. They were probably not as advanced constitutionally, in the Greek manner, as the coastal cities of Pamphylia, or even Selge, Sagalassus, Termessus and the Seleucid colonies. Their main line of development was presumably based on their strength as native Pisidian fortresses and their function from early years to provide and maintain an organised stronghold for the communities for which they were a centre, against their Pisidian neighbours and enemies. Of the settlements listed above, Cremna was possibly the one that least resembled a city before her transformation into an Augustan colony, but although she may have been regarded as barbaric and uncivilised, she can by no means be described as essentially tribal or backward.

There was another group of settlements whose development was on yet different lines, again for geographical reasons, and from the fact that their historical circumstances were different. These were the former Seleucid colonies on the northern fringe of Pisidia. They were not strictly highland settlements and their more ready exposure to external influences probably resulted in a development and an organisation more akin to the minor cities of the Pamphylian and Aegean coasts.

The letters from Attalus II to Amblada¹⁸ reveal that Amblada did not have the regular constitution of a Greek city yet is described as a polis. This suggests that the Hellenistic idea of a polis was not as rigid as the Romans' later view of what constituted a city. The mention of Vasada and Mistea in the same letters might imply that they had a similar organisation at this time, but Mistea was probably not given official city status during the Principate until the reign of Claudius.¹⁹

The granting of official city status was usually to a settlement that was already a city in all but name, requiring little more than a few changes in administration. Conversely, a settlement that is never known as anything higher than a demos may have possessed all the trappings of a city, lacking merely the title and a municipal administrative system. The remains of the site of Sia, recorded as a demos by Hierocles and inscriptions, resemble those of a small city.²⁰ Although some demos were independent and had the right of jurisdiction over the surrounding territory, the closest definition one can make is that the term 'city' during the Principate indicated a self-administrative unit and had little connection with size or institutions.

Strabo lists the twelve leading cities of Pisidia of Artemidorus' day,²¹ but it is not entirely certain what this signifies in relation to the level of municipal organisation. Included in the list is Anabura which is not known to have been anything more than a demos.²² Possibly Anabura was not considered worthy of official city status by the Romans, but before the Principate could be described as a polis just as Amblada was in the 2nd century BC. Yet if Anabura was indeed a member of the Cillanian Tetrapolis until at least the 3rd century AD, the settlement presumably had more of a say in local jurisdiction than did a dependent village.

The introduction to each provincial list in Hierocles' Synecdemus professes to enumerate poleis, but includes among these, estates, demoi and other non-city settlements. It is questionable, then, whether some of those names which are unrecorded elsewhere, or not otherwise known to have been of city status, were in fact so. For this reason the status of Sabinae is uncertain.

The Byzantine period allows for little more than classification in ecclesiastical terms, as 'bishopric' and 'non-bishopric', which does not consistently correspond to 'city' and 'non-city', and gives little indication of decline in any respect. An argument can be made for very close correspondence of city to bishopric, and even for decline, but the case is not clearly defined. At the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451 it was decided that cities should be the seats of bishops, a decree more forcefully declared in the 6th century by Justinian, who stated that every city was to have its own bishop.²³ Providing these stipulations were followed to the letter, the logical conclusion is that non-bishopric settlements were not cities. Yet Sozomen records that even villages had their consecrated bishops.²⁴ It seems that later in the Byzantine period the terminology used to denote various settlements was fairly loose,²⁵ but there was a very definite rule that every settlement above a certain size should be a bishopric.²⁶ Can one confidently conclude from this that those settlements which ceased to be bishoprics had been so reduced in size that they were too small to be considered? If so, they must have been quite drastically depopulated. It is unlikely that some of the settlements of the Boz Ovası were ever very highly populated, yet those in very close proximity, namely Pogla, Verbe, Andeda and Sibidunda, retained their positions as bishoprics until the 13th century. With the Church in control of civic administration from at least the 10th century, this would mean that non-bishopric former cities would have lost whatever

elements of their former independent municipal functions that they might have retained after the move towards centralisation of bureaucracy at an earlier date, and have become dependent on neighbouring sees. Can one also associate the multiplication of archbishoprics with city size? If so, one can argue for a high population of Mistea, Neapolis and Selge in the 9th century.

Whilst the appearance of a settlement name in the documentary sources almost certainly confirms its continued existence, even though it may have been a mere shadow of its former self, yet maintaining a church and a bishop, without additional evidence one cannot confidently assume that a city known from the Principate which did not become, or ceased to continue as, a bishopric also ceased to exist or declined. The Notitiae and the Council lists are too incomplete to be relied upon one hundred percent; it is possible that there existed more joint bishoprics than are recorded in the ecclesiastical lists, of which only one element of the joint name has been preserved. In any case there is no reason to assume that the inhabitants of a non-bishopric settlement lived in an inferior environment to those inhabitants of a bishopric settlement.

The significance of coinage in relation to city status is not completely understood. Did a city open a mint as a result of a direct order from central government, or was it a decision at a municipal level? Autonomous coinage up to the 1st century BC, issued not only by cities, suggests the latter, but the situation under the Principate is not so clear-cut. The coining cities of Pisidia and its surroundings are Adada, Amblada, Andeda, Antiocheia, Apollonia, Apameia, Ariassus, Baris, Codrula, Colbasa, Comama, Conane, Cremna, Etenna, Isinda, Lysinia, Malus, Olbasa, Palaiopolis, Panemoteichus, Pappa, Parlais, Pednelissus, Pogla, Prostanna, Sagalassus, Seleuceia Sidera, Selge, Sibidunda, Termessus, Timbriada, Tityassus and Verbe. The

city status of all of these is otherwise known or implied. Of the non-coining settlements, some, including Agrai, Anabura and Cormasa, are not known to have ever been cities. Tymandus certainly, and possibly also Limenae, Sinethandus and Zorzila, did not achieve city status until after the cessation of Pisidian coinage. Hadriane, Mistea, Neapolis, Vasada and, perhaps, Bindeus, cities under the early or mid Principate, are the only settlements which might be expected to have coined but apparently did not. It is remotely possible that they did, perhaps only briefly, but the evidence has not survived. If they did not coin, one can only assume that they used the coins of neighbouring cities, as Pappa, for instance, must have done outside the reign of Antoninus Pius, Lysinia before Caracalla and after Geta, and Malus after the 1st century, but there is little value in questioning the reason why they did not issue when there is no universal agreement on the significance of coinage and coining cities. It is perhaps noteworthy that of the very few cities which one might expect to have coined, Neapolis, Mistea and Vasada were all situated in the same district of eastern Pisidia, leaving Amblada as the only coining city between Antiocheia and Pappa, which issued only briefly, to the north, and Selge and Timbriada to the south and southwest, bearing in mind that Tityassus has not yet been located.

Here follows a discussion on the question of the continuity and decline of the Pisidian settlements, making use of the archaeological evidence wherever possible. For certain settlements there is only the testimony of the ecclesiastical lists that they survived as bishoprics, and no additional evidence to involve them directly in a discussion of continuity and decline. These bishoprics include Codrula, Palaiopolis, Maximianopolis, Limenae, Tityassus, Zorzila, Isinda, Verbe, Hadriane, Baris and Timbriada. Of these, the first six have not been even vaguely located, and therefore no buildings or fragments of the

cities are known. Isinda and Verbe have been approximately located, and inscriptions and fragments attributed to the cities, but their precise sites and standing buildings are unknown. No archaeological material pertaining to later Antiquity has been recorded at the sites of Hadriane, Baris and Timbriada.

Darsa is an enigma. The settlement captured by Manlius in the early 2nd century BC ²⁷ either never developed into a city or is to be identified under a different name. One possibility is that the name changed to Baris, or that Darsa was a mis-spelling of Baris. The Darenos of the Tekmoreian inscriptions, ²⁸ usually thought to refer to Sabinae, may in fact be the ethnic of Baris. Baris' existence during the early Principate is proved by Pliny and Ptolemy, and by inscriptions, coins and fragments from the site near Kılıç. ²⁹ The coinage begins under Hadrian and the inscriptions appear to date from the same time. The location of Baris, however, does not accord with Livy's implication that Darsa was a neighbour of Cormasa and was captured before Manlius had passed the lake. Another possible later form of Livy's Darsa is Zorzila which first appears in the Council list of AD 325. An intermediary version of the name may have been Dyrzela, which is recorded by Ptolemy. ³⁰ If Darsa did become a city under the Principate, the name may have changed completely and Darsa is to be identified with some other named or unnamed city in the vicinity of Lake Burdur. Even Hadriane might be considered. There is, however, little virtue in questioning the survival of Darsa as the significance of this depends largely on its status, which is not clearly defined by Livy, nor known from other sources. If the appearance of Darsa in Livy's account was merely because of the coincidence of its position on Manlius' route and it was little more than a village, there is no reason to expect it to have been recorded again. Ramsay once suggested that Darsa may have been a fictitious name invented by Livy. ³¹ Too little is known about

the patterns of development of rural settlement to discuss the continuity or decline of a settlement of unknown status which is mentioned only once in the history books.

Tarbassus, known only from Strabo as one of the twelve Pisidian cities considered important by Artemidorus,³² is otherwise obscure. It may be the corrupt version of another name or have later been replaced by another name. Alternatively, the spelling is correct and the importance bestowed on the settlement by Artemidorus dwindled during the Principate. Apart from Tarbassus, Anabura is the only city listed by Strabo which neither coined nor became a bishopric. Yet Anabura is never known to have been anything more than a demos, which brings into question the status bestowed on Anabura, and Tarbassus, by Artemidorus. Providing Anabura was a member of the Cillanian Tetrapolis, she existed into the 3rd century AD.³³ It has already been noted that Anabura cannot have been replaced by Neapolis.³⁴ Of course it is quite possible that Anabura declined during the early Principate, but there is no reason to suppose that Neapolis had any bearing on this. If Enevre is derived from the ancient name, continuity is implied.

Cretopolis is known, from Diodorus and Polybius, to have existed in the Hellenistic period.³⁵ The settlement was a stopping place on Antigonus' march to Termessus and back to central Anatolia. The name is later recorded by Ptolemy³⁶ and the Ravenna geographer.³⁷ As the site has not been located, there is no evidence to indicate survival. It has been suggested that Cretopolis is to be identified with Ceraitae,³⁸ but it is more plausible that the site was further to the west. An inscription from Yureğil near Comama records the name of Cretopolis³⁹. All of the evidence points to a location on or nearby a major route through the highlands. It is futile to try to find a possible later name for Cretopolis as the status of the settlement is in question.

The element '-polis' may have been retained from Hellenistic times and have no bearing on Cretopolis' status during the Principate. As the Ravenna geographer seems to have used Ptolemy as a major source, there is no certainty that Cretopolis in fact existed after the 2nd century AD. Still, it might be proposed that Cretopolis retained her importance as a station on a major road through the highlands for as long as that road remained in use.

The same situation might be argued, with greater confidence, for Cormasa. Cormasa, first mentioned by Livy and Polybius⁴⁰, is later recorded by Ptolemy,⁴¹ the Peutinger Table⁴² and the Ravenna geographer.⁴³ She never coined, nor had city status, as far as we know, although the inscription concerning requisitional transport found near Sagalassus implies that Cormasa had jurisdiction over independent territory.⁴⁴ The precise site of Cormasa is unknown, but it was certainly on the main road from Laodiceia to Pamphylia. Hall has quite reasonably suggested that the early site was near Boğaziçi and the later site is represented by the remains at Gavur Ören, near Karacaören.⁴⁵ Again, it might be proposed that Cormasa's importance as a station on this road ensured her continued existence for as long as the road remained in use.

Sandalium is mentioned by Strabo in connection with Amyntas' efforts to subdue the highlands of Pisidia.⁴⁶ The recording of the name by Stephanus Byzantinus cannot in itself be used as evidence for continuity, as Stephanus Byzantinus was using Strabo as a source.⁴⁷ According to Strabo's account, Sandalium was an impregnable fortress in the 1st century BC since Amyntas, with a good record of success, failed in his attempt to capture it. The inhabitants of Sandalium must have eventually chosen to accept the Pax Romana. Had they maintained the hostilities shown by their ancestors to Amyntas, the

task of subduing them would surely have merited a reference in the history books. Sandalium has recently been identified with the ruins at Sandal Asari, near Harmancık to the northwest of Cremna⁴⁸. The situation of the site confirms Strabo's assertion of Sandalium's impregnability, but there is no archaeological evidence to suggest that occupation continued very far into the Principate. As Sandalium perhaps came under the jurisdiction of Cremna, or possibly of Sagalassus, the settlement presumably never received the impetus or the opportunity to develop into a city. That occupation continued on at least a small scale is indicated by the survival of the ancient name.

The fate of Ceraitae was perhaps similar. Inscriptions found at the site are of a 3rd century date at the latest, but most of the remains appear to date from an earlier period.⁴⁹ Joint coinage with Cremna might be suggested as a sign of the settlement's demise, but this argument depends on the purpose of the alliance coins. It might be proposed that the proximity of Cremna was a contributory cause to the apparent decline, or the stagnation, of Ceraitae. The local government of Cremna would not have tolerated easily the proximity of a city on territory which would otherwise have come under the jurisdiction of Cremna. However, the original status of Ceraitae is in question. The remains at the site and the coinage imply a fairly high level of organisation, but autonomous coinage cannot in itself be used as evidence for city status during the Principate. Continuity is implied if the modern name of the site, Çere, preserves the ancient name, but, as with Sandalium, occupation was probably on a small scale and the eventual status of Ceraitae was no doubt as a village on the territory of Cremna.

Prostanna is a settlement which was definitely of city status, but which

seems to have disappeared completely during the later Empire, both archaeologically and from documentary sources. Prostanna was a former Pisidian stronghold, judging from its name, situation (Pl. 56) and pre-Roman remains.⁵⁰ The city coined into the second half of the 3rd century⁵¹, and is last recorded as a bishopric among the entries of the Council of Constantinople in AD 381. Her fate is mysterious. There are no late Roman or Byzantine monuments or traces of construction at the site to suggest that Prostanna might have survived at the same site under a different name. Although negative evidence cannot be used as an argument for discontinuity of occupation, there is in any case no convenient name which appears in the ecclesiastical lists after the 4th century and which might be proposed as a replacement name for Prostanna, with no implication of decline of the city. It is possible that Eudoxiopolis or Theodosiopolis was a temporary name for Prostanna, but the fate of the city after the 6th century still remains in question.

The evidence does point to a decline of Prostanna, but why the city should decline is uncertain. As with any city located at a high altitude, there may have been problems with water collection, but even if the site was relocated as a result of water problems, this can be interpreted only as decline of the suitability of the former site, which has no bearing on decline in status.

Ramsay's theory that Prostanna merged with Limenae⁵² is unconvincing, particularly as there is more evidence, albeit circumstantial, to suggest that Limenae was situated around the northern confines of Lake Eğridir.⁵³ Calder and Bean's suggestion that Atenia was the later name of Prostanna⁵⁴ can only be considered if there is no connection between Atenia and the ager Agerensis and if Atenia is not represented by the Tenia of the Tekmoreian inscriptions.⁵⁵

Perhaps the most acceptable interpretation, in the absence of further

evidence, is that Prostanna merely dwindled during late Antiquity for a reason which will probably never be known. One must, however, review the possibility of a connection between Prostanna and Bindeus, in view of their proximity. Were it not for the fact that epigraphic evidence from Findos, less than 10 kilometres west of Eğridir, shows that Bindeus was a city during the mid Principate,⁵⁶ it might be considered that Bindeus was the later name of Prostanna, relocated at a more favourable altitude during the later Principate. Bindeus is first recorded in Notitia IX. Either the name was omitted in the early Notitiae or Bindeus became a bishopric at a late date. Bindeus does not appear in Hierocles either; it might be represented by the enigmatic Eudoxiopolis. It is conceivable in any case that the city of Prostanna was amalgamated with that of Bindeus, the latter increasing in size, and possibly also in status, from an influx of inhabitants from the old Prostanna, and taking over Prostanna's former territory. Possibly the two cities functioned as a joint bishopric, with only the name of Prostanna recorded in the 4th century, and only the name of Bindeus recorded thereafter. A temporary name in the 5th century, and possibly also in the 6th, may have been Theodosiopolis. If this was the case, then an argument for the total decline or the disappearance of Prostanna is somewhat invalidated.

The possibilities are limitless. Prostanna may have been relocated at Eğridir, the site obscured by more recent construction in the modern town. Relocation may have coincided with the disappearance of the original name of the city. The church and monastery on Yeşil Adası⁵⁷ may have been associated with the Byzantine settlement of Bindeus, if not of Prostanna. The Seljuk fortress at Eğridir (Pl. 57) seems to have been built on the foundations of a Byzantine castle which was conceivably the Byzantine stronghold of Bindeus.

Without further evidence, this is all complete speculation. All that can be said is that there does appear to have been a demise of the city of Prostanna in some respect, and that there was possibly some connection between Prostanna and Bindeus, whether or not they had any bearing on each other's fate.

Besides Prostanna, other former city settlements which might seem to have declined in status during late Antiquity are Olbasa, Lysinia, Comama and Colbasa. These are all situated in the vicinity of the Boz Ovası, i.e. the ancient Milyas. All four coined and all are recorded by Hierocles. Olbasa is nowhere recorded as a bishopric, yet there is evidence for a church at the site.⁵⁸ A coin of AD 612/3 and coins of the 10th and 11th centuries found at the site⁵⁹ indicate that there was occupation at these dates. They do not, however, give any indication of the scale of this occupation or of Olbasa's status during late Antiquity. Neither the date of construction of the building that might have been a church nor its length of use, which might give a clue to the fate of Olbasa, are determinable. The brief description by Duchesne of the church door lintel found at the site⁶⁰ suggests a date no later than the 6th century, when the city name was recorded by Hierocles. It is not necessary to suggest that Olbasa might have taken another name after the 6th century. There is no reason to suppose that Olbasa was a bishopric on the evidence of the church, and no reason to expect the name of a settlement which was not a bishopric to have been recorded after the 6th century. Levick does not discount the possibility that the site may have been destroyed or abandoned and the inhabitants incorporated into a neighbouring see.⁶¹ The possibility of abandonment or marked depopulation is briefly and tentatively put forward below, but there is really no evidence to suggest discontinuity in the case of Olbasa. Moreover, unless one can sustain an argument for a direct correlation between city and bishopric, there

is no reason to suggest marked decline of the former city. Olbasa was perhaps always in the see of another bishopric, possibly Hadriane or Pogla, or, conceivably, the name was the unrecorded element of a joint bishopric.

Comama and Lysinia are recorded by the Epistola ad Leonem of AD 458 and by Hierocles, and Colbasa by Hierocles and the records of the Council of AD 536. There is no sign that any of these sites suffered any damage that might have caused their abandonment. As opposed to the case of Olbasa, it is the fact that these three cities are recorded as bishoprics that gives a reason to propose decline in some respect.

If one had to supply a reason for the demise of Pogla, Andeda, Verbe or Sibidunda, the explanation might lie in the fact that these four cities are particularly clustered, their territories were consequently restricted and their agricultural lands could have supported a limited population. The region is not well irrigated and, as the modern name suggests ('boz' is the Turkish word for 'grey'), the ground is fairly barren. However, it may not always have been so. Pogla sent grain to Alexandria in the (?)2nd century AD.⁶² The lakes of Yureğil, Anhaban and Kestel have only recently dried up and natural irrigation of the plain must have been better prior to this, although we have no idea of the state of productivity during late Antiquity, apart from the knowledge that, from the mid 8th century, climatic conditions apparently changed, with the result that precipitation was higher but seasons of drought were not uncommon due to short-term fluctuations. Pogla, Andeda, Verbe and, probably, Sibidunda, however, survived as bishoprics. Olbasa, Colbasa and Lysinia are too far away from this cluster of cities for unproductivity of the land, exacerbated by crowding, to be considered as a factor of decline. Comama is close enough for the possibility to be entertained, but this is still not a satisfactory explanation

for the apparent demise of the settlement.

A more plausible reason is that, although invading armies are not known to have penetrated this district, they might have come perilously close enough to cause such insecurity that certain sites were severely depopulated or abandoned. Some crisis, decline or depopulation in the 7th century, brought about by the Persian incursions into Asia Minor, might explain the disappearance of Colbasa from the bishop lists, but, if this theory has any merits, one has to look for a possible cause of decline at an earlier date in the cases of Comama and Lysinia. It is conceivable that a demise of all of these cities began as a result of the insecurity felt throughout Asia Minor in the second half of the 3rd century, and was thereafter a gradual process. There is evidence for insecurity in the 3rd century even in districts where there was no direct threat. Comama was on a major road, the site itself was on a low hummock in the plain and apparently unfortified, and there are no nearby hills or mountains in which refuge could be taken in the event of an invasion of the district. A monument of a late Roman or early Byzantine date and a coin of Michael IV can be attributed to Comama,⁶³ but these do not explain the fate of the settlement during the mid Byzantine period. The site was obviously abandoned at some date, as the nearest modern settlement is some distance away. An interesting, and puzzling, detail is that the summit of the hummock seems to have been used as a graveyard at some time. Fairly recent excavations by local villagers have turned up a quantity of bones. Analysis might reveal that these bones relate to the period of Turkish rule, or even that they might be animal bones, but it would be significant if they are found to date to Antiquity.

If the site at Kaynar Kalesi is to be identified with Cretopolis⁶⁴, a major road very close to Colbasa is implied. The proximity of the modern settlement of Kuşbaba and the implication that the name of Colbasa has survived to modern day suggest continuity, but the site is not very

well fortified, apart from its Hellenistic acropolis, and it might be considered that insecurity was the cause of a depopulation marked enough to strike the name of Colbasa from the bishop lists.

If one is to apply this theory to Lysinia and, with less reason, to Olbasa, similar observations can be made. Both Lysinia and Olbasa were exposed sites in that they were on fairly major roads, they were on the fringes of Pisidia and not protected by the high mountain ranges which characterize Pisidia proper, and, although they were not unfortified, they were certainly not fortress-like settlements. Yet Hadriane, a settlement between Lysinia and Olbasa with not dissimilar characteristics, survived as a bishopric. Balbura, Oenoanda and Cibyra, however, did go to lengths to erect new fortifications, all of which may have been erected in the 3rd century and no doubt contributed to a minimizing of a feeling of insecurity in later centuries.⁶⁵

Of course, any one, or all, of these settlements may have survived with no significant change in status, suffering from depopulation or decline to no greater degree than the average settlement of Antiquity. They might be found in the ecclesiastical lists under different names, although the choice of alternative names is limited, or, as suggested above with reference to Olbasa, the names might have been the unrecorded elements of joint bishoprics. As it might be wondered whether some of the bishops who signed the Epistola ad Leonem might not have been self-styled, rather than officially recognised bishops, there might in fact be no reason to consider that Comama and Lysinia suffered any significantly marked decline at some date after the mid 5th century.

Pogla, Andeda, Verbe and Sibidunda, assuming that the Sibidunda listed in the Notitiae among the bishoprics of Phrygia Salutaris is misplaced, all survived as bishoprics. Their proximity and their consequently restricted territory probably ensured that none of them had the potential

to develop into anything more than a minor city of Pamphylia Secunda. There is, however, no evidence for decline, although the fact that Pogla is recorded by Hierocles as a demos has been taken as indicative of Pogla's fallen status during the 6th century.⁶⁶ Pogla was never a very important city, although she may have been the leading settlement of the district.⁶⁷ She is recorded as a bishopric in the Council lists of AD 451 and 787, in the Epistola ad Leonem and in the Notitiae, sources both pre-dating and post-dating Hierocles. It is unlikely that a settlement should lose its city status, even temporarily, and yet retain its position as a bishopric. It is more likely that the qualification 'demos' in Hierocles was a mistake. Pogla is listed in the Synecdemus immediately after the entry for demos Mendeneo (Perminoundeis), and the duplication of 'demos' would be an understandable copyist's error. The name of Pogla is preserved in Fuğla, the former name of the modern village of Çomaklı (Pl. 58 and 59).

Among a number of ecclesiastical fragments of uncertain date found in Yavuz was a slab, which was possibly part of an altar, bearing a dedication to Constantine and Helena,⁶⁸ confirming the evidence from the ecclesiastical lists that Andeda survived into the late Byzantine period. Continuity of occupation to the present day is proved by the preservation of the ancient name in Andiya, the former name of Yavuz.

There is still an element of doubt that Sibidunda retained the city status she had held under the Principate, confirmed by inscriptions,⁶⁹ and became a bishopric, but it is not implausible that Hierocles' Sindaunda, or Sindaunda Myodia, is a conflation of the names of Andeda and Sibidunda,⁷⁰ and that the name was listed erroneously in the Notitiae among the bishoprics of Phrygia Salutaris.⁷¹ Continuity is shown by the preservation of the ancient name in the name of the modern

village Zivint, more recently called Bozova.

As already noted, Panemoteichus is recorded by the early Council lists, by the Epistola ad Leonem and by Hierocles, but the name does not appear as a bishopric after the mid 6th century. The existence of Panemoteichus in the late Byzantine period is, however, confirmed by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.⁷² It is possible that Panemoteichus is represented in the Notitiae by the corrupt Dicenataurus.⁷³ It is unlikely that a settlement which had dwindled to the size and the status of a village would be recorded by Constantine Porphyrogenitus merely because of the coincidence of its location in relation to the Cibyrraeotic theme. Panemoteichus might be identified with either the site noted near Dağ or that noted near Döşemealtı. Each of these sites was in a critical location, the first at the north end of the pass through which a paved road led to the Pamphylian plain, the second towards the foot of the same pass.⁷⁴ At the site near Dağ were noted remains of 'Antiquity and the Middle Ages';⁷⁵ at the site near Döşemealtı were recorded two basilicas and what appears to have been a late Roman or Byzantine garrison.⁷⁶

The fate of Termessus is puzzling. This powerful Pisidian fortress continued to flourish under the Principate. The monuments on the site and building inscriptions prove that new construction was relatively prolific during the 2nd and early 3rd centuries.⁷⁷ The city coined into the reign of Gallienus.⁷⁸ The Notitiae confirm the existence of the see into the 13th century.⁷⁹ There are, however, reasons for considering the possibility of decline in the case of Termessus. At the Council of AD 431 Termessus was represented as a joint bishopric with Eudocias,⁸⁰ and at the Council of AD 448 Termessus, Eudocias and Jovia were represented by a single bishop.⁸¹ In the Epistola ad Leonem and the Notitiae, Eudocias and Termessus are listed separately, although consecutively. The hierarchical order of the Notitiae implies that the status of Eudocias,

in ecclesiastical terms, was higher than that of Termessus. Termessus is recorded by no Council list after AD 448. Only Eudocias sent a bishop to the Councils of AD 692 and 787.⁸² Hierocles records first Jovia, followed by Termessus and Eudocias as a single entry,⁸³ but in this case Eudocias was probably a gloss, having initially been omitted. Jovia does not feature elsewhere.

The names Jovia and Eudocias suggest foundations or renaming of already existing settlements, possibly accompanied by official recognition of city status, under Diocletian and Theodosius II respectively.⁸⁴ Their sites have not been precisely located, but they were no doubt situated at a lower altitude than Termessus and more directly on communication routes, thus being in more climatically and commercially favourable locations. There is no epigraphic confirmation, but it is not unlikely that Eudocias is to be identified with the site at Evdir Hanı. This site is situated above the Antalya plain, but at a much lower altitude than Termessus.⁸⁵ Jovia and Eudocias may have originally been settlements on Termessus' territory, and subject to Termessus; if the identification of Eudocias with the site at Evdir Hanı is correct, this is confirmed by inscriptions.⁸⁶ Later, probably during the late 4th or early 5th century, Eudocias, and possibly also Jovia, may have gained independence from subjection to Termessus and granted jurisdiction of some of this territory in their own right. The remains at Evdir Hanı imply that the settlement was urbanised at a relatively late date. The churches, of which there are at least three, are constructed of small stones and mortar.

Whether or not the emergence of Eudocias and Jovia contributed in some way to a decline of Termessus is not certain, but it does appear as if these two developing cities, Eudocias in particular, must have taken away some of the prestige of the formerly powerful Termessus, at least in

ecclesiastical circles. If a joint bishopric implies a division of ecclesiastical authority, one would expect that had Termessus' power and prosperity remained as great as it had been during the Hellenistic period and under the Principate, she would not have shared ecclesiastical functions with any city.

It cannot even be ascertained if the site was occupied throughout Antiquity. There is some evidence for activity at some late date. Christian monograms, etched in white paint, have been noted to the north of the urban centre,⁸⁷ but these are undatable. The north wall of the odeon which stands at the southeast corner of the agora was at some date extended to the west, the new wall skirting much of the southern side of the agora (Pl. 60 and 61). The wall is characteristic of construction of late Antiquity, reusing worked stone blocks and broken columns. Unfortunately, as is usual in such cases, the date of the wall cannot be determined; it might have been erected at any time during the late Roman or Byzantine period. The wall was explained by Spratt and Forbes as being part of a monastery complex whose cells surrounded the agora.⁸⁸ No evidence survives to show whether or not this might have been the correct interpretation. Other traces of construction of a relatively late date stand in the upper part of the city, between the city centre and the necropoleis at the west and southwest limits of the site. There are also traces of a fortification wall of a late date at this extremity of the site.

Whether or not these signs of late construction at the site represent continued occupation is uncertain. The problem of dating is all too obvious at Termessus. Although the site has not been systematically excavated, it has been well investigated, but no church has been discovered. The possibility of demographic movement might be considered. The inhabitants of Termessus may have rebuilt the city at a different site, presumably at a more favourable lower altitude, whose remains have

not yet been discovered. The little evidence for relatively late activity might then be attributed to a date prior to the abandonment of the site. Alternatively, it might represent occupation by a minority, or reinhabitation at a later date. The invasion of Asia Minor by Persians and Arabs must have created insecurity even in those regions where there was no direct threat, and it would have seemed safer to inhabitants of low-lying settlements to take refuge, either temporarily or permanently, in a more isolated or defensible place. In the 9th and 10th centuries, Pamphylia was under almost constant attack by the Arabs who succeeded on more than one occasion in taking Attaleia. Why the city might have been abandoned is uncertain. Termessus must have been highly populated at one time, as suggested by the large number of wells and cisterns in the various parts of the city.⁸⁹ The total capacity of these must have been more than adequate to sustain the inhabitants of Byzantine Termessus, unless springs dried up or there was a persistent drought severe enough to interfere with winter rainfall. The question is unanswerable and will remain so unless the site is cleared and excavated, or a second site is discovered elsewhere.

The most extreme solution to the question of the fate of Termessus is that the site was virtually abandoned, the city of Termessus ceased to exist and the diocese merely retained the title of the old see. The opposite extreme is that there was no abandonment of the site and no significant decline. The true explanation may be any one of a number of possibilities between these two extremes. The question of decline rests on the linking of the name of Termessus with those of Jovia and Eudocias, and the significance of joint bishoprics. The speculations on demographic movement rest almost entirely on the absence of evidence for ecclesiastical activity at the site. A point worth noting here is that, until the recent survey of Cremna, only three 'certain' churches, and one 'possible', had been identified. It is true that this first survey

of Cremna, by Lanckoroński et al., was restricted in that the full team was not present,⁹⁰ and that there has been no particular interest in the site as a whole until the 1980s, but the additional churches which have been discovered, making a total of eight, are hardly recognisable as such. In fact, not a single apse out of the total number of eight churches is clearly distinguishable and ecclesiastical fragments are scarce. The vegetation at Termessus is taller and more dense than at any site in the highlands; simply clearance of the site, in particular the area to the southwest of the agora, might reveal signs of ecclesiastical activity.

Tymandus apparently retained the city status she had received under Diocletian.⁹¹ The Council list of AD 448 and the Notitiae confirm that Tymandus became the seat of a bishop, yet she perhaps always retained a degree of her former dependence on Apollonia-Sozopolis. Neither the continued existence of Sabinae after the 6th century⁹², nor her status, are ascertainable. Atenia is first recorded for certain by Hierocles, and subsequently by Notitiae VIII and IX, but not by the later Notitiae or the Council lists, which might suggest that she was a bishopric only briefly. Agrai is recorded only by Notitiae X and XIII as a joint bishopric with Seleuceia Sidera.⁹³ Her earlier existence is unconfirmed by documentary sources and there is no certainty that inscriptions and fragments of the Roman period in Atabey belong to Agrai rather than to Seleuceia. It is not unlikely that Agrai was originally a village on the territory of Seleuceia, but whether or not she ever received city status, or even independent territory, is unknown. As the significance of joint bishoprics is not absolutely certain - did each settlement have its own bishop, or did they share a bishop? - the implications of the relationship between the two settlements are obscure. Rott observed that the mosque at Islam was constructed on the foundations of a Byzantine church.⁹⁴ There are three possible interpretations

of this - firstly, that the site of Agrai was at Islam but the ancient name was retained not by Islam but by Ağras, the former name of Atabey, a village situated only 4 kilometres to the north; secondly, that the church was an outlying church of Seleuceia; thirdly, that the site of Seleuceia was relocated at Islam at some date before the end of Antiquity. This third possibility is dubious if Rott's further, but less convincing, observation that the mosque at Bayat was built on the foundations of a Byzantine church is correct.⁹⁵ The name of Seleuceia is preserved in Selef, the name of the ancient site near Bayat.

Less than 15 kilometres to the northwest of Seleuceia was Conane. The site has not been precisely located, but it was certainly at or near Gönen. The modern village name preserves the ancient name, confirming the continuity implied by the ecclesiastical lists. Again, Rott suggested that the mosque at Gönen was built on the foundations of a Byzantine church.⁹⁶

Sinethandus is recorded by Council lists from the mid 5th century and by the later Notitiae. Possibly, as suggested by Ramsay, Sinethandus and Pappa initially formed a joint bishopric, alternately sending bishops to the Council meetings, and only the element Pappa is recorded by the early Notitiae.⁹⁷ Sinethandus may have gained recognition in her own right at a later date. The location of the site, at the mouth of the pass through which led a major road from Iconium to Antiocheia, was strategic. The strength of the fortress at Asar Kalesi,⁹⁸ perhaps the Byzantine stronghold of the site, must have aided the survival of Sinethandus, particularly in the early 8th century when the Arabs were in the district and no doubt passed by this road. Signs of a church or a chapel in the fortress indicate that it was more than just a temporary refuge. Apart from traces of a church, which is undatable, but presumably pre-8th century, and a rock-cut chapel, which is also undatable

and may not in any case have been directly associated with the main settlement,⁹⁹ there is no sign that the city site was occupied continuously. At least the administrative centre of Sinethandus may have been moved permanently to Asar Kalesi at some time in the Byzantine period.

The settlements discussed in the following pages were all recorded fairly regularly in the ecclesiastical lists from the 4th century onwards and there is no reason from this source to suggest decline or change in status, apart from in the cases of Mistea, Neapolis and Selge, which were all made autocephalous archbishoprics, probably at the beginning of the 9th century.

If Mistea was located at Beyşehir, as seems to have been the case,¹⁰⁰ occupation of the same site continued to present day. This occupation may have been temporarily or sporadically broken, particularly in the early 8th century when the castle of Mistea, on Kale Dağı, some kilometres to the east of Beyşehir, was no doubt regarded as more secure than the exposed city site by the lake shore. At some time, probably at the beginning of the 9th century, Mistea received the dignity of autocephalous archbishopric, in the metropolis of Lycaonia.¹⁰¹ If Ramsay's suggestion that Neapolis was made the seat of an archbishop because of the destruction caused to Antiocheia is correct,¹⁰² perhaps a similar reason can be attributed to the ecclesiastical rise of Mistea. Iconium had been attacked by the Arabs in AD 724,¹⁰³ Yet the castle of Mistea had also been attacked.¹⁰⁴ Alternatively, the new archbishoprics bore no direct relation to the political situation, and were merely the reflection of an independent decision of the Church, dictated by some unknown factor. The location of both Neapolis and Mistea on a major artery of communication perhaps ensured their relative prestige and prosperity. If Neapolis is to be located near Kiyakdede, the name is preserved by the name of the mound Isnebolu.¹⁰⁵

Before looking at the evidence for the fates of Selge, Pednelissus, Adada, Ariassus, Sagalassus, Cremna, Sozopolis and Antiocheia, it would be as well to deal with Amblada, Vasada, Malus and Parlais. There is little to say about these sites, but each of them merits a few words.

The site of Amblada was on a hillock rising out of the plain, with a clear view of the territory on all sides (Pl. 13). The site is now unoccupied, but it is not certain when it was abandoned. It possibly extended into the plain below the hillock at some time, but the abundance of pottery sherds turned up by ploughing of the fields on the north side may have originated from the summit and the slopes of the hillock itself. The walls at the site are late Hellenistic or early Roman. There is no evidence for Byzantine fortifications. Two churches have been observed at the site;¹⁰⁶ ecclesiastical fragments around the church whose foundations can still be distinguished are of simple design and most probably of an early date. Sterrett observed burnt tiles all over the site which he took as suggestive that the city had been devastated by the Arabs.¹⁰⁷ This, however, would require further investigation. It is unlikely that Amblada was relocated in the plain before the end of Antiquity. Even if the settlement had not been attacked by the Arabs, the threat in the 8th century would have been too close for comfort - the castle of Mistea was not far away - and continued hostilities with foreign powers until the end of the Byzantine era would have made unwise any wholesale move from a hilltop site to an open plain, unless the reasons were environmental.

The location of the city of Vasada was ideal in that it was situated high on the spur of a mountainside, with a clear prospect of the plain below. The site was provided with excellent fortifications, both natural and artificial.¹⁰⁸ No sign of late occupation of the main city site has,

however, been recorded. It is possible that, with excavation, the evidence might be revealed. The site was partially excavated in the early 1970s, but the excavated areas were filled in before the work was completed.¹⁰⁹ Very little construction remains above ground, and it appears that further excavation is the only solution to the question of occupation, chronology and the possibility of refortification. Large quantities of rubble, tile and pottery in the vicinity of the small theatre (Pl. 62) imply that the domestic area of the city extended outside the walls at some period. A church was unearthed by villagers a century ago, between the city site and the village of Bostandere.¹¹⁰ Rather than that this indicates that the city was moved towards the site of the modern village during late Antiquity, it is more plausible that this was an extra-mural church. The village is in a more agreeable situation in the plain, a few hundred metres from the ancient site, but it is unlikely, for the same reasons given above in the account of Amblada, that the fortified site would have been relinquished before the end of Antiquity.

The site of Malus has recently been identified with ruins at Sariidris, 18 kms. northeast of the southern tip of Lake Eğridir. A fragmentary inscription records the polis of Malus; the inscription is a dedication to Constantine or one of his sons, of a post AD 324 date.¹¹¹ The site seems to have been concentrated around a rocky spur and the slope of an adjoining mountain. Little survives apart from an abundance of pottery and tile, and traces of fortifications. On the south side of the spur are sections of a fortification wall built of irregular ashlar, of uncertain date. On the west side of the spur are the remains of a tower, c. 5.60 m. square, of a later date; the walls of the tower are 1.11 m. thick, constructed of mortared rubble, with reused ashlar at the corner.¹¹² On the slope of the mountain to the west is an ancient gateway. The rocky spur may have been the original acropolis of the site whose defensive system was reinforced at some time during late Antiquity. The date of reconstruction, however, cannot be determined.

There may have been occupation of Barla from prehistoric times,¹¹³ perhaps even continuous until Parlais was made the site of an Augustan colony. Continuity to the present day is shown by the preservation of the ancient name in the modern village name. Little evidence remains to indicate the precise location of the Roman colony. A residential area may have occupied the slopes below the Greek church, and the public buildings may have been at the same site as the modern village (Pl. 63). The Greek church on the hillside above the village may have been constructed on the foundations of a Byzantine church.¹¹⁴ Many of the inscriptions which have been found at the site are datable to the 3rd century or later, and the majority of these are Christian.¹¹⁵ Byzantine bronze attests to occupation in the 7th, 8th, 10th and 11th centuries,¹¹⁶ and a bishop of Parlais attended Council meetings in the 5th, 7th and 9th centuries. Parlais is recorded as a bishopric until the 13th century, last attested by Notitia X. Parlais does not appear in Hierocles, however, and Levick has suggested that the citizens perhaps moved into the hills in the first half of the 6th century due to the general insecurity caused by the highland brigands around this time.¹¹⁷ This might be so. Parlais was not represented at any of the Council meetings between AD 451 and 692. On the other hand, out of total of over 30 bishoprics in the Pisidian highlands, only Antiocheia, Sozopolis, Malus, Amblada, Vasada, Colbasa, Isinda and Panemoteichus apparently sent representatives to any of the 6th century Councils. Does this indicate that all the other bishoprics, about 25 in number, were similarly affected by insecurity, and, if so, why are these nevertheless recorded by Hierocles? In any case, if Hierocles was relying on information compiled at an earlier date, one might have to assign this proposed insecurity and demographic movement to the mid 5th century; a bishop of Parlais attended the Council of AD 451. The absence of Parlais in Hierocles may signify only that he was influenced by the confusion shown by Ptolemy and some of the surviving versions of the Council lists which attribute Parlais to Lycaonia.¹¹⁸

Selge was raised to the position of autocephalous archbishopric, probably at the same time as Misteia and Neapolis.¹¹⁹ Selge was under the metropolis of Side, and there is no reason to suppose that the qualification of the city as an archbishopric in Lycaonia¹²⁰ was anything more than an error, understandable now that the old provincial administrative units had been replaced by the theme system. If one has to find a reason for the promotion of Selge and for her continued status as autocephalous archbishopric, there may be some connection with the troubles suffered by Side from the 9th century onwards.¹²¹

The archaeology of the site reflects the usual pattern shown at those settlements at which continuity was not arrested by an abrupt disaster. The site is rich in Hellenistic and Roman remains. An inscription recording a legacy made to the city for the maintaining of its fine appearance suggests that civic pride was still an important consideration at Selge around the early 3rd century AD.¹²² There is evidence for urban transformation, for the demise of public buildings which had outlived their function, and also for an element of declining public pride in that, at some date during late Antiquity, there was a disregard for some of the monuments which had been important features of the early city. The demise of some structures is indicated by the erection of ecclesiastical buildings. Basilica 'A', on the hill above the upper agora, was built on the site of a more ancient complex, parts of which may have been retained as outbuildings and as the forecourt of the basilica. A podium temple of L. Aelius Caesar was incorporated into the south side of the narthex of basilica 'D'. The temples on the Kesbedion hill had already outlived their function at the time of the conversion of one of them, the temple of Zeus, into basilica 'C'. Basilica 'B' represents the third phase in the existence of a rectangular building which adjoined the stoa along the southeast side of the upper agora. The building's initial function seems to have been as a bouleterion, or ecclesiasterion,

which was constructed in the Hellenistic period. An inscription reused in the apse of the basilica shows that it was turned into an odeon in the 2nd century AD. At a later date, by the addition of the apse and internal colonnades, the odeon was transformed into a basilica.¹²³

The Hellenistic city seems to have been concentrated in the southwest part of the site, around the Kesbedion, the upper agora and the hill on which stands basilica 'A'. In the Principate, the northern part of the site was more densely built up. At this time, the domestic areas covered much of the slopes within the walls. During late Antiquity, some of the houses on the upper terraces were occupied, but there was also construction of new houses which encroached onto the streets, notably along the edges of the colonnaded street which led northwards from the upper agora. The latest recognisable phase of occupation was concentrated once again around the Kesbedion, the hill on which stands basilica 'A' and in the vicinity of the upper agora.¹²⁴

The site was not short of water. Even though the aqueducts might have been abandoned during late Antiquity, there were numerous cisterns and springs of excellent water within the walls of the city. In late Antiquity an elaborate cistern was newly built, of reused materials, at the north end of the colonnaded street. The date of construction of a second cistern by the side of the street is uncertain as access is prevented by blockage.¹²⁵

Selge does not feature prominently in the history books apart from the reference to the overtures of friendship made by the Selgians to Alexander and the story of the unsuccessful attacking of the city in the late 3rd century BC by Achaeus and his general Garsyeris, following the besieging of Pednelissus by the Selgians.¹²⁶ Over six centuries later, the Selgians successfully repulsed Trebigildus and his band of Goths.¹²⁷ Apart from this incident, Selge is not known to have been in any particular danger from organised banditry or foreign invaders. The original Hellenistic

walls, which must have served their purpose against Achaeus' army, were, however, partially rebuilt, using reused masonry, at some date during late Antiquity.¹²⁸ There seem to have been two major phases of reconstruction. The first, which mainly constitutes repairs of the existing wall, might be attributed to the late Roman period, perhaps the mid 3rd century. The second phase, whereby the wall was not only substantially rebuilt, but reinforced and fitted with additional towers, has been attributed to the 7th century by Machatschek and Schwarz.¹²⁹ The date is not confirmed, but comparison with the 7th century inner fortification walls at Side (Pl. 64) shows that this is not an implausible assumption. There is no evidence that the city suffered from any direct harassment from the Arabs but defensive precautions would, nevertheless, have been considered wise. The two phases of reconstruction are discernable at the north corner of the Kesbedion. This acropolis was completely enclosed by the original Hellenistic walls; later repairs were made only on the northwest and northeast sides which were incorporated into the larger circuit of fortifications. A tower at the north corner of the Kesbedion was substantially rebuilt, with reused material, presumably at a late Roman date; at an even later date, a door was inserted into the tower and a turret erected above it.¹³⁰ Additional defences were set up by the approach road to the city, guarding the bridge over the Eurymedon.¹³¹

There is no reason to suggest excessive decline in the case of Selge. However, the archaeology of the site is interesting, more so if it reflects a typical pattern in the highlands. Survey has shown that at the site of a city which was fairly prosperous and which apparently suffered from no drastic disasters during late Antiquity, there was urban transformation, there was an element of civic decline in that the important and characteristic monuments of the early city were neglected, and there was some shrinkage of the once-extensive occupied area of the site. Further information on the chronology and the dates of this process of change

would be desirable, but this might be revealed only by excavation.

Although Selge did suffer from demise in some respects, in that the grandeur and the expansive layout of the early city was not maintained and the later reduction of the occupied area quite probably implies population shrinkage, there is no reason to suggest that there was a break in continuity. Continuity of occupation to the present day is attested by the preservation of the city name in the name Zerk, the former name of the modern village of Altinkaya whose houses and fields now occupy much of the area of the ancient city.

Like Selge, the site of Pednelissus was off the beaten track, and the fortifications of the city were a legacy from the years when there was much inter-fighting between the settlements of the highlands. The upper part of the city, located around the acropolis, was defended partially by the impregnable mass of the mountain on whose saddle the acropolis was situated, and partially by a double line of fortifications. The lower city was also surrounded by a fortification wall. The fortifications were studied in detail by members of the Italian expedition, who were of the opinion that the whole circuit, complete with gates and towers, was constructed in Hellenistic times.¹³² No signs of restoration or rebuilding were noted in the extant sections of wall. One must conclude, then, that the original walls were solid enough to serve their purpose throughout Antiquity and that maintenance was constant enough to necessitate few substantial repairs, or that a further survey is in order, with the aim of looking for traces of later repair or reconstruction which might have been overlooked 65 years ago.

The character of the few structures which survive at the site suggest that there was expansion into the lower city during Roman times but that the acropolis was occupied throughout. Again, there is no reason to believe that there was a break in continuity before the end of

Antiquity, nor any sign that there was a significantly marked decline during Antiquity. There is, however, not a great deal of evidence for occupation during later Antiquity apart from the churches, but this is a lacuna which might be filled by further intensive examination of the site. The agora, in the upper part of the city, seems to have undergone a degree of transformation at some date, notably by the modifications made to the rectangular building which bordered its east side.¹³³

The original building was thought by the Italians to have been a temple, perhaps; they more confidently identified the second phase as a temple of c. 2nd century date. In any case, the final stage of transformation, by which the building became a Christian basilica, was doubtless the conversion of a building which had outlived its function and cannot be used as evidence for decline of prosperity or of civic pride. The only evidence for decadence in some respect is that the column bases reused in the basilica suggest that the late Roman building (? 3rd century) from which they originated was not as carefully constructed as the Hellenistic and early Roman buildings on the site.

The modern village of Karadiken is some distance away from the site of Adada. A move must have occurred at some time, but there is no reason to suppose that the settlement was relocated here before the end of the Byzantine era. There is, however, reason to believe that the nucleus of the city was relocated a few hundred metres distant from the Hellenistic and Roman city centre during late Antiquity. The main public and domestic centre of the early city was in a flat open area between low hills. At one end of this area was the theatre; at the other end, below the Hellenistic acropolis, was a forum, possibly of a late 2nd or early 3rd century date; beside the forum are the remains of a number of public buildings of Hellenistic and Roman date; in the more exposed part of the site are temples to the Imperial cult and the remains of a housing area. The latest sign of activity in this part of the site is the forum; a close

examination of the houses, however, might reveal that they were reconstructed at some late date.

To the southeast of this area is a defile through which ran the road to the Pamphylian plain. Roughly halfway up the high hill on the west side of the defile are extensive signs of activity, much of which can be attributed to later Antiquity. As with most construction of a 'late' date, these cannot be accurately dated. The construction material is, for the most part, a combination of field stones, mortar and some reused ashlar. Many of the buildings are obscured by dense vegetation and are of unidentifiable purpose, but domestic structures might be recognised. Sherds of pottery are also abundant in this area. These appear to be of a late date, but expert analysis would be necessary to confirm this. A wall of mortared field stones runs alongside the modern path (Pl. 65). A drain which can be traced running parallel to the wall, and the fact that there is no other easy method of communication between the two occupation areas, suggests that this was the line of the ancient street. The wall was perhaps constructed to provide safety from the steep drop to the east.

There is evidence for earlier activity in this area above the defile, i.e. the structure from which the church described in Chapter VII¹³⁴ appears to have been converted, and the series of broad steps directly to the south, but these had obviously fallen into disuse by the date at which the church was built. There is no reason to suppose that this area was anything more than a kind of suburb of the city during early Antiquity, and the evidence for a cemetery below and to the south of the church suggest that the area was outside the city limits. The sarcophagi are too weathered to give a clear indication of their date, but it would not be unreasonable to propose that this church was a cemetery church constructed nearby the site of an already existing cemetery. The date

of this church is not absolutely certain, but it might be proposed that it was an extra-mural church built at a date before the nucleus of the city appears to have been relocated.. If so, the addition of the chamber to the north side of the church might be interpreted, tentatively, as a feature representing a change in function when this area was extensively occupied.

The ambiguities of the dates and the chronology of the activity in this area have already been pointed out in Chapter VII. Although it is first necessary to establish just how extensive this later occupation area was, it can fairly confidently be proposed that it is unlikely that this was, and always had been, in effect just a suburb of the city. That it might represent expansion is also out of the question; in the first place, the early occupation area was extensive enough to have contained all the essential buildings of a regular city and was, in addition, a much more agreeable locale; in the second place, the notion of urban expansion during late Antiquity is unthinkable; thirdly, it is highly implausible, in spite of any restrictions posed by the topography of the site, that there would have been expansion beyond the limits marked by a cemetery. The only logical interpretation, in the absence of further evidence, is that the early urban centre was abandoned in favour of the area above the defile. Either the presence of the cemetery was disregarded because the relocation of the site had been considered imperative, or the cemetery was still in effect on the periphery of the settlement, this time at the northern extremity of the site.

One must consider why the nucleus of the settlement might have been relocated. The only logical explanation is that it was a decision motivated by insecurity. The early city centre was surrounded on all sides by low hills and would have been vulnerable in the event of unexpected attack. The summit of the rocky acropolis above the forum was fortified, but this was extremely small in extent and would have been virtually

useless as a place of refuge for the whole citizen body, particularly if there was a prolonged siege. There is no evidence for fortification walls surrounding the whole settlement, but such walls would have been ineffectual in a defensive capacity in any case, because of the topography of the site. Although the area above the defile was also enclosed in a sense, there was a clear view of the road below, the entrance to this area from the earlier occupation area was relatively narrow and could be defended easily from above, and the only vulnerable point was the range of high hills immediately above to the west. It is difficult to imagine that what seems to have been wholesale movement of a settlement to an area which could only have been considered to have been a better location for defensive purposes, only a few hundred metres away, would have been the result of local problems such as brigandage, despite the fact that there may have been almost continuous trouble from organised groups of brigands in the highlands between the 3rd and the 5th centuries. Perhaps the best explanation at present is that general insecurity in the highlands, caused both by local conditions and by the threat and the eventuality of invasions of central Asia Minor, was greater than the evidence might otherwise show. In modern terms Adada is off the beaten track, but in ancient times the road via the Aksu was a major route through the highlands. If the above speculations are correct, a c. 7th century date seems to be the most plausible. In this case, the cemetery church would probably have existed by the time of the relocation and it may have undergone modifications, and possibly also a change in function, as a consequence of the move. That this might have become the civic church of the settlement is no doubt an untenable notion, particularly as at least one more church has been noted in the vicinity. The church recorded by Ramsay and Hogarth¹³⁵ is a much more likely candidate for the civic basilica of the later settlement. If their dating is correct and if this church was constructed before the site was relocated, this might

also have been constructed originally as an extra-mural church. An alternative possibility to be considered is that the churches were built after the relocation of the site and that the move might have occurred as early as the late 3rd century.

As already pointed out in Chapter VII, the dates, the functions and the possibility of changed function of the churches depends very much on the date at which the nucleus of the site was relocated, and the date of the relocation depends partly on the dates and the functions of the churches. Before the above speculations can be refuted or confirmed, the whole site, in particular the area above the defile, has to be thoroughly investigated. It is clear that, of all of the sites in the highlands, Adada is probably the one which is in most need of a systematic survey. It is seldom that so much material from later Antiquity survives. A thorough examination of the wealth of material from all periods, although it would not satisfy an art historian, would result in a better understanding of the site as a whole.

There is an equal scarcity of ornamented architecture and inscriptions from the site of Ariassus, but this is another site which would repay systematic investigation. There are a number of monuments which testify to occupation during early Antiquity, in addition to evidence for later activity which, as is usually the case, is undatable. Because expansion was restricted by the steep drop to the south of the site, just beyond the necropolis, by the city gate to the north of the site, dominating the only entrance (Pl. 66-7), and by the high hill on both east and west sides of the defile in which the urban centre and the domestic areas were situated, a survey would no doubt reveal evidence for urban transformation.

The evidence for late activity at the site includes the apsed structure

which was proposed tentatively as a church in Chapter VII.¹³⁶ If the wall which runs along the length of the proposed church is not to be associated with the apse, the apse may represent a nymphaeum. The construction of the apse, mortared rubble with pieces of broken brick (Pl. 46), suggests a late 3rd century date at the earliest, whatever the function of the structure. A wall constructed of field stones (Pl. 68) runs the length of the westerly of the two hills which enclose the site. The date of the wall is uncertain, but it is later than a second wall (? early Roman) which runs along the same hillside at a higher level. The purpose of both of these walls was probably to support terracing for the buildings which seem to have been densely packed on this slope, both above and below the two walls. Many of the buildings on the hillside are identifiable as houses. Several of the extant walls have a late character; their construction is of heavily mortared rubble with a smattering of broken brick, and some reused ashlar. Most of these walls may represent houses of a late date. One particular house was built on the hillside just above the city gate (Pl. 69). This building appears to have been reconstructed or repaired more than once.

Not far from the summit of the hill is a section of wall constructed of mortared rubble which appears to be too solid and too long to have been part of a domestic building. The thickness of the wall is about a metre and its extant length is over ten metres. Less than two metres below is a short section of a parallel wall of the same construction. It is conceivable that this was part of a defensive system with a double line which enclosed the western hill. The longer, upper wall is incomplete at its north end, but its south end is finished off with ashlar blocks which are very weathered but which were obviously reused. The ashlars form a corner whereby the wall turned westwards, towards the hillside, at right angles to its length. If this was part of a

fortification wall, the corner might be explained by the unevenness of the hillside, by the position of earlier structures or by the possibility that the wall was strongly reinforced and studded with turrets or towers. There is no evidence that the summit of the hill served as the nucleus of the settlement during late Antiquity, but it is plausible that it was regarded as a place of refuge.

It is clear that only summary investigation of the site has been conducted so far and that survey, if not excavation, is necessary in order to understand the nature of the buildings and the sequence of their construction. One important objective would be to investigate the summit of the western hill and to try to establish whether or not this was enclosed by a fortification wall at some date during late Antiquity. Another aim would be to examine the public buildings at the foot of this hill where they border the street which ran the length of the city. Here there are also fragmentary sections of walls of a late character, and a cursory inspection suggests that the clean lines of the street may have been interfered with at some late date. A further aim would be to make a positive identification of an ecclesiastical building.

Sagalassus had styled herself first city of Pisidia, a position from which she was obliged to step down when Antiocheia was made metropolitan archbishopric of Pisidia. Sagalassus seems to have been the third bishopric of Pisidia, listed after Antiocheia and Philomelium in Notitiae VII, VIII and IX; Philomelium's omission from the later Notitiae may have been an oversight. As a result of a recent survey, the site, in particular its Hellenistic buildings, and the sequence of construction in the upper part of the city, can be better understood and its importance in the urban and architectural development of Pisidia has been demonstrated. ¹³⁷

The early city was concentrated around the upper agora. The agora itself

was originally Hellenistic, but it underwent a series of modifications in the Imperial period. A small monument of Julio-Claudian date which stands on the south side of the agora must have been one of the earliest Roman buildings of the city. The construction of the buildings situated around the lower agora, which are arranged on a more regular plan than those of the upper part of the city, implies that the development of the lower city began at a date no earlier than the reign of Augustus. The structures in this part of the site seem to date entirely from the 1st and 2nd centuries AD, apart from the basilica which was constructed on the site of a 2nd century Ionic temple.¹³⁸ A huge gate which blocks the intersection of a street running north-south down the east side of the upper agora and the main axis of the city which leads east-west between the upper and lower city areas, is perhaps of Severan date; or possibly slightly later. This is the latest known public monument of the Roman city. The only identified buildings securely attributable to a later date are the three basilicas which have been discussed in Chapter VII.¹³⁹ The 'Ionic' basilica and the transept basilica are probably to be dated to the 5th century.

There are no circuit walls which show that the city might have been fortified in the Hellenistic period. It would, however, be surprising if such a powerful settlement were not fortified during its earliest existence. Possibly the upper part of the city, the nucleus of the early settlement, was protected by defences but these have been obscured by later construction in the vicinity of the upper agora, perhaps dismantled when the Pax Romana was complete in Pisidia. Two Hellenistic towers have been identified some distance away from the urban centre. One of these dominates an approach road on the east side of the site. The second is on a peak of the mountain to the north of the city, overlooking the city territory.

At some date during late Antiquity, a defensive system was erected around the nucleus of the city. This seems to constitute stretches of curtain which defended the urban centre but excluded the residential areas of the city. There is no evidence that there was urban transformation and decadence to the extent that there was shrinkage of the city limits and encroachment of domestic quarters into the public areas of the city, and one must conclude that the fortifications defined what in effect served as a place of refuge.

The most substantial sections of the wall can be seen around the lower agora (Pl. 70) which already had good natural defences on its east and west sides in particular, the rocky east side almost perpendicular in places. The wall is built of reused masonry, mostly ashlar, well constructed and reinforced by buttressing. In some sections can be seen reused broken columns. A section of the wall is built up against the platform on which stands the 'Ionic' basilica, on the west side of the agora. (Pl. 29). There are also sections of wall around the east and south sides of the agora (Pl. 71). Towards the southeast corner appear to have been triangular and squared projections.

Another section of wall, identical to that to the west of the 'Ionic' basilica, can be seen near the Doric temple to the west of the upper agora (Pl. 72). Masonry from another small temple in the vicinity was reused in its construction. The bouleterion near the upper agora was also partly dismantled to provide material for the fortifications. There are traces of a wall of the same construction above the upper agora, and a demolished rubble wall running north-south between the upper agora and the theatre may have been part of the same system.

To the west of the temple of Antoninus Pius at the southeastern extreme of the site, on the line of the street which ran from north to south through the lower agora, is also evidence for late activity. The construction

at this point is again of reused ashlar, and incorporates a broken column and a reused inscription datable to the second quarter of the third century at the earliest (Pl. 73). Here there seem to be two small squarish chambers, one on either side of a deep and narrow passageway. This perhaps represents a tower of some sort, part of an inner line of fortifications to make sure of protection of the gently sloping terrain to the west of the agora. Alternatively, this was not part of the defensive system and represents vernacular construction in the lower agora, possibly at a late 3rd century date.

The walls were, for the most part, sections of unconnected curtain, not actually forming a complete circuit around a defined area. The walls were thick and fairly solid. The masonry, although reused, was well fitted and there is no trace of mortar. The date, however, cannot be determined. One might propose a mid to late 3rd century date, but a 7th century date is also plausible. The 7th century seems to have been the most common period for the construction of completely new defences which protected only the nucleus of a site, but there is also evidence, although not always securely dated, for this being a practice in the 3rd century when there was insecurity caused by the Goths and the Persians. Parallels attributed to the 3rd century can be found for the buttressed sections of wall, and as Sagalassus appears to have been one of those sites without a relatively impregnable Hellenistic acropolis, the inhabitants may well have felt the need for the security of defences in the mid/late 3rd century. If, however, it can be proved that there was a colonnaded front to the forecourt of the 'Ionic' basilica and that this was not a legacy of the temple of Apollo Clarius, a case might be made out for a post 5th century date. In the absence of further evidence, a earlier, rather than a later, date might be tentatively proposed. The slightly different character of some parts of the walls, namely the section around the southeast corner of the lower agora, might imply that

the defences were repaired or added to at a later date. In this case, the 'tower' to the west of the temple of Antoninus Pius can be explained as representing the original southern extent of the defensive system, which is more logical than interpreting it as a tower within the defences. If there was indeed later modification, this may have constituted the connecting of some of the isolated sections of curtain. If the major part of the construction was carried out in the 3rd century, this is important in that it implies premature dismantling of some of the public buildings of the city.

Sagalassus appears to have suffered drastically from seismic damage. The present state of the site may have been the result of an earthquake which occurred after the city had been abandoned, but at least one earthquake occurred during Antiquity. The bouleterion near the upper agora was apparently remodelled after earthquake damage. This earthquake must have occurred at some date after the 2nd century BC, when the bouleterion is thought to have been constructed, and a date not far into the Principate if it retained its original function after the rebuilding; if, however, the bouleterion was remodelled for use as an odeon, for example, the terminus antequem for the date of the earthquake might be later. If the tremors of the same earthquake which appears to have caused extensive damage to the early buildings at Cremna in the early 2nd century AD were also felt strongly at Sagalassus, there must have been major rebuilding. Some of the alterations in the upper agora and some of the motivation for construction in the lower agora may have been the result of seismic damage. The signs of earthquake damage are most obvious from the ruins of the theatre (Pl. 54). This damage must have occurred at a date after the late 2nd century AD when the theatre is thought to have been constructed. The 'Ionic' basilica also seems to have been destroyed by an earthquake which, in this case, must have occurred after the 5th century AD. These buildings may have been damaged by an earthquake which occurred after the end of Antiquity,

but, as the region is prone to seismic movement, it must be considered that the buildings might have been destroyed at some date before the site was abandoned. That seismic damage might have been the cause of abandonment of the site whilst there was still insecurity in Asia Minor is unlikely, but the consequences of devastation by earthquake during late Antiquity, especially at a post 6th century date, would have been severe. This was a period when central government could not afford to be generous with financial assistance, when municipal funds were not prolific, and when there was a tendency for citizens to show less concern for the standards of their environment than they had done so at least up to the end of the 2nd century AD. If the site was damaged by an earthquake during late Antiquity, Sagalassus might never have completely recovered the relative prosperity that she had enjoyed under the Principate. This might explain why Sagalassus was apparently passed over in favour of Neapolis as autocephalous archbishopric of Pisidia around the early 9th century and, possibly, why Sozopolis was selected as metropolis of Pisidia when the position fell empty in the mid 14th century. If the chancel screen posts in the upper agora originated from one of the two transept basilicas, they may indicate no more than that the basilica in question was rededicated, but they might conceivably represent the construction of a church here from necessity because the basilicas were no longer functional.¹⁴⁰

Concurrent with the recent investigation of the site of Sagalassus was a survey of Cremna as a result of which our knowledge of the archaeology and the history of the site has improved immensely.¹⁴¹ One of the most important outcomes of the survey was the discovery of evidence for the siege of the city by Probus' forces in the late 270s AD, an episode which is recounted by Zosimus.¹⁴² The Isaurian brigand, Lydius, who had apparently been causing havoc throughout the highlands, seems to have chosen the well-fortified site of Cremna to safeguard himself and his forces and to make what was in the event his last stand against the Romans.

Cremna was besieged by the army of Probus in order to try to rout the brigands. Outside the city walls on the west side of the site have been noted the two lines of the siege walls, the first of which incorporates several towers. A siege mound over 25 metres high stretched for 140 metres from the outer line of the blockading wall towards the city wall. Broken artillery missiles have been found both inside and outside the city walls. What seems to have been the headquarters of the Roman forces has been identified behind the siege walls; here was discovered a Latin inscription dedicated to Probus which provides a precise date of AD 278 for the siege. There is evidence that the brigand forces within the city walls blocked the west gate and constructed a counter-mound just inside the walls. There are also indications that the defenders used heavy missiles to ward off the Roman forces.

The siege was successful. The defeat of Lydius and his forces was facilitated by the betrayal of the knowledge of a weak point in the brigands' defences by one of Lydius' artillery men. The damage to the city, however, was not insignificant. There is evidence for extensive destruction of the central part of the city walls and it appears that the city's aqueduct must have been destroyed on the orders of Probus. The line of the aqueduct, which was the product of highly skilled engineering, cannot be traced beyond the outer line of the Roman siege walls. A second aqueduct has been noted which may have been the late 3rd century replacement for the first. Financial aid for the repair of the damage and for the construction of the new aqueduct may have been supplied by Probus, but there was little the Emperor could do to restore the lives lost during the course of the siege. With the diminishing of supplies within the city, Lydius apparently ordered the flinging of citizens from the heights of the city walls.

The events of the siege furnish an explanation for some of the signs of remodelling and repair made to the city walls. The sequence of constr-

uction and restoration of the walls can be fairly reasonably established. The site was surrounded on north, east and south by excellent natural defences, virtually perpendicular cliffs from the heights of which there is a clear view of the surrounding territory (Pl. 16). The more gently sloping west side of the site was fortified by a strong wall which was perhaps constructed originally in the late Hellenistic period, at a date before this powerful Pisidian fortress was captured by Amyntas and obliged to yield to Rome's authority. The fine ashlar construction of the south gate (Pl. 74) and the northernmost tower of the west wall might be attributed to this earliest phase of construction. These early defences may have been damaged when Amyntas attacked the city but, in any case, there was extensive rebuilding after Cremna had been made a Roman colony. Much of the fortifications as they stand can be dated to the early Principate. It is not known how many towers there were originally but, as a result of the rebuilding programme, the wall was characterized by 12 close-set square towers. These were constructed of large blocks of roughly finished but neatly coursed ashlar. The masonry of the stretches of wall between the towers, especially in the central part of the wall, was very much demolished during the siege. However, it appears as if the walls were first repaired at a date prior to the siege, no doubt at the time of the Gothic and Persian invasions of Asia Minor. The towers needed little repair work, but the intervening stretches of wall seem to have been quite substantially rebuilt by the facing of a mortared rubble core with reused material from the public buildings of the city. There are signs of hasty repair, some of which might have been the result of Lydius' efforts to maintain the strength of his position. There is, however, no evidence that points to extensive rebuilding and strengthening of the wall around the 7th century when there was an understandable tendency to make quite sure of the security of defensive systems.

Within the city walls there is no evidence for the character of the

Hellenistic city. A three-sided agora which is situated in the east part of the site might conceivably be late Hellenistic, but is more likely to date to the 1st century BC. In any case, this is the earliest building yet recognised at the site. This agora underwent considerable modification in the Imperial period. There are several structures at the site which are datable to the 1st century AD, including the bath-house and the forum and basilica complex in the city centre (Pl. 75). Many of the 1st century buildings may have been destroyed by an earthquake which must have occurred in the early 2nd century, at the latest by the end of the reign of Hadrian. Probably as a result of the damage, the civic centre was virtually rebuilt. Between the reign of Hadrian and the end of the 2nd century there was a profusion of new building, most of which is characterized by decoration of the Corinthian order. Monuments datable to this period include a number of temples in the vicinity of the agora, the propylon which leads to a paved square above the vaulted cistern complex and a colonnaded street which connected the civic centre to the west part of the site. The earliest houses in the residential area to the north of the colonnaded street probably date to the 2nd century.

The chronology of the evidence for remodelling and repairs to the forum and basilica complex and the bath-house is interesting, mainly because it throws some light on civic conditions in the 3rd century. It has been established that the forum and the attached basilica were probably erected in the 1st century AD, perhaps in the middle years of this century, and that the Hadrianic inscription which has previously been interpreted as a reference to the original construction of the complex actually records restoration work in the forum and the upper part of the basilica, made necessary because of earthquake damage. The exedra attached to the west end of the basilica was built of a different style of masonry and must have been of an even later date as it obscures

a view of the propylon to the northwest of the basilica, which was erected during the reign of Antoninus Pius. This was perhaps a mid 3rd century addition. The conversion of the basilica into a Christian church, perhaps in the 4th century, has already been discussed in Chapter VII.¹⁴³

The bath-house was also substantially remodelled at two different periods. The first phase of reconstruction was perhaps contemporary with the Hadrianic restoration of the forum and basilica complex. The most important modifications entailed the provision of a tepidarium and a caldarium by the installation of heating systems. Roughly a century later, perhaps during the Severan period, these heating systems were ripped out, the rooms were faced with marble revetment and the former tepidarium was equipped with a series of statues on inscribed bases. The bases were almost all composites of earlier reused material. One of them incorporated a reused inscription referring to restoration work by L. Fabricius Longus, who had been responsible for the Hadrianic modifications to the forum and basilica. It is uncertain if the bath-house retained its former function. Bathing in a bath-house without a caldarium would not have been a pleasant prospect. There is no evidence for a second bath-house at the site. A lone hypercaust tile found outside the city walls on the west side, to the north of basilica 'B', presumably originated from elsewhere, possibly hurled as a missile by Lydius' forces. Whether or not the bath-house retained its original function, it became a show place to honour certain members of the community. That the statues were not set up elsewhere, that a new monument was not erected specifically for the purpose and that the statue bases were not uniform in shape, shows that public credit had been advertised on a low budget. The implication of the damage to the forum implies, moreover, that there was little regard for the appearance of one of the most centrally-placed monuments of the city.

Discounting the evidence for the siege, the latest evidence for pre-Constantinian activity at the site, and a further indication of diminishing public pride, is the dismantling of buildings in the city centre in order to repair the city walls around the mid 3rd century. The evidence for post-3rd century occupation of the site is of an ecclesiastical and a domestic nature. The residential area to the north of the colonnaded street seems to have been established around the 2nd century AD, but there is evidence for repair and modification up to the 6/7th century. The more substantial structural elements of the houses, namely the doors and the outer walls, remained basically unchanged, but there are signs of continual repair and modification using poor quality mortared rubble. That some of the houses were inhabited by dedicated Christians is shown by crosses carved on door jambs.¹⁴⁴ From the 4th century onwards, the character of the city was changed by the erection of a number of churches.¹⁴⁵ The earliest of these was doubtless basilica 'A' which was converted from the secular basilica attached to the forum, probably in the 4th century, and which almost certainly would have been the civic basilica. Basilicas 'B' and 'C' were possibly next in the sequence of ecclesiastical construction. Basilica 'B' was an extra-mural cemetery church which perhaps served also as a martyrion. Basilica 'C', which must have been a very imposing and lavishly decorated building, seems to have been built on the edge of a residential area and its construction perhaps resulted in the dismantling of a couple of houses. Basilica 'E', which is located in the eastern part of the residential area just to the west of the civic centre, is enclosed on at least three sides by houses and must itself have been built on the site of at least one former house. Basilica 'F', situated at the western part of the site not far from the city wall, possibly also supplanted a domestic structure. The situations of basilicas 'D', 'G' and 'H' suggest that they may have replaced former temple buildings. Basilica 'H' is on a small elevated platform to the north of the civic centre; Basilica 'G' is built against a rocky outcrop

near the northwest corner of the site; the colonnade along its south side may suggest that this was the legacy of a small temple. Basilica 'D' was constructed on a slightly raised platform on the highest part of the site, clearly visible from, and overlooking, the civic centre below and to the west. Most of these churches cannot be accurately dated, but it is highly improbable that any of them were constructed after the 7th century. As is usually the case, there is no evidence to show for how long the churches might have remained functional. Cremna sent a bishop to the Council of AD 787 and the see is recorded in the Notitiae up to the 13th century. At some date, the inhabitants moved from the security of the fortified city to the site of the modern village of Çamlık, which is located a few hundred metres to the west. It is unlikely that the move occurred before the end of Antiquity. The continuity indicated by the ecclesiastical lists is confirmed by the survival of the ancient name in Gırme, the former name of the modern village.

The name of Apollonia was changed to Sozopolis at some date between the reign of Gallienus, when Apollonia issued her last coins,¹⁴⁶ and AD 381, when the name Sozopolis appears in the records of the Council of Constantinople. It might be considered that the change in name was accompanied by a change in site. The Byzantine city was situated on a prominent acropolis above and to the east of the modern town of Uluborlu, overlooking the extensive plain below (Pl. 76 and 11). There is, however, no sign that this site was occupied at a Hellenistic or Imperial date, although the remains are not prolific in any case. It is highly improbable that the Seleucid colony was situated at Olukman, towards the north of the plain of Uluborlu, as suggested by Ramsay.¹⁴⁷ It is possible, however, that the Hellenistic city was first located in the plain immediately below the Byzantine site, or even in the gentle foothills of Kapı Dağı where the modern town now stands. If this was the case, the Byzantine site may originally have been the native Pisidian acropolis.

Reported foundations of buildings of Roman date on the slopes between the fortress and the modern town¹⁴⁸ might suggest that, wherever the Hellenistic city might have been situated, the city of the Empire was concentrated outside the line of the later fortifications. This location was not entirely secure, and one might tentatively consider that the city was moved to the acropolis not long after the reign of Gallienus as a consequence of the feeling of insecurity awakened by the Gothic and Persian incursions into Asia Minor in the 250s and 260s. The direct impact of these invasions on the settlements of the interior has not been clearly established, but the evidence for hasty repair of fortifications and the erection of new defences during this century shows that there was certainly a period of panic and unrest throughout Asia Minor. Whether or not this was a decisive factor, and whether or not the change of site did coincide with the change in name, relocation of a relatively exposed settlement to a site at a higher altitude, with excellent natural defences, would have been a wise move at any time from the mid 3rd century onwards.

Within the fortress walls there is little evidence for construction apart from traces of the ground plan of a large Christian basilica.¹⁴⁹ The site is scattered with pottery sherds, many of which can be given a Byzantine date. Others clearly date from the years of Turkish occupation when the fortress was inhabited by a community of Greeks. There is no sign of the Hellenistic foundations of the fortress wall recorded by Hamilton,¹⁵⁰ which suggests that he was merely noting the reuse of Hellenistic masonry. The fortifications as they stand may have been built on the line of earlier walls, possibly late Roman, but, if so, these must have been almost entirely demolished to make way for the massive fortifications which were erected at some time in the early Byzantine period. Parallels seem to indicate a c. 7th century date.

On the north, east and south sides of the site are precipitous cliffs. The gentle incline on the west side, however, was vulnerable to attack and it is here that a substantial section of the fortification wall still survives to a considerable height (Pl. 77).¹⁵¹ The construction of the wall is of reused blocks of varying sizes which encase a strong mortared rubble core; the rubble of the core is coursed. The wall is about 3 metres thick. Two gates and three towers are visible in the surviving stretch. The towers, both squared and polygonal, are solid, with no internal chambers. The main gate is situated towards the lower, south end of the wall (Pl. 78). Its opening consists of a central passageway with a large arched niche on either side. Its superstructure, presumably a simple tower, was supported on groin vaults. The vaulting was composed of mortared brick and stone. Timber poles, some of which still protrude from the walls, must have been used to help in the construction of the superstructure and to give additional reinforcement. The second gateway, which is situated towards the northern end of the wall, is very much delapidated but appears to have constituted no more than a simple arched opening in the wall.

The west wall must have continued down the slope to the south, where there survives a short section of curtain of the same construction as the rest of the wall, with a solid polygonal tower at its south end. Ballance noted traces of a wall leading eastwards from the south gate.¹⁵² This may have been a terrace wall to prevent subsidence of the sloping ground, but a toppled tower on the line of a conjectured south wall implies that the site was at least partly fortified on its south side. At the northeast corner of the site is the base of what seems to have been a small round tower. This is preserved to a very low height. The surviving portion is solid, but the form of the upper part is unknown. The construction consists of a heavily mortared rubble core with a stone facing. This may have been an isolated watch-tower, but traces of a

rubble wall leading westwards imply that the north side of the site was fortified. Although many sections of the cliff are unscalable, the whole site was probably completely enclosed. Perhaps the reason there is almost no trace of the defences on the more precipitous parts of the site is because they had not needed to be as substantial as the west wall.

Signs of restoration and repair, and the different styles of the towers, indicate conscientious upkeep. Some foundations just to the south of the central surviving, polygonal, tower of the west wall might be the remains of an earlier square tower. Also at this point, foundations below the curtain wall of a wall running at right angles to the east may be a remnant of earlier construction.¹⁵³ A short section of wall, 3 metres thick, which protrudes westwards from the west wall may have been a later addition, perhaps providing extra protection for the gateways.

Sozopolis is important as one of the few examples of deliberately planned fortresses in Asia Minor. On the eve of the Turkish invasions, this must have been the most powerfully fortified settlement of Pisidia. Towards the end of the reign of John Comnenus, Sozopolis was besieged by Turkish forces but their efforts must have been unsuccessful as they eventually retreated.¹⁵⁴ An inscription datable to the year AD 1069/70 was found reused outside the south gate of the fortress.¹⁵⁵ The inscription is fragmentary, but it appears to commemorate some repairs or improvements made under Romanus Diogenes. These may conceivably have been restorations made to the fortress walls following the siege roughly 30 years earlier. In the mid 14th century Sozopolis was elevated to the position of metropolitan archbishopric of Pisidia after the post had been vacated by Antiocheia.¹⁵⁶ After the Turkish conquest, the Seljuks occupied the saddle between the Byzantine site

and the modern town, but a Greek community continued to live within the fortress walls until 1923.¹⁵⁷

From the beginning of the Principate, Antiocheia enjoyed the privileges of being the most important of Augustus' Pisidian colonies. The evidence for building at the site is very scanty, but it dates entirely from the Imperial period.¹⁵⁸ At the end of the 3rd century, Antiocheia was made metropolis of the newly formed province of Pisidia and the seat of a praeses.¹⁵⁹ The city must have benefited from this promotion. There is evidence for a fresh surge of prosperity, in particular the construction of new buildings and the repair of old. The water supply of the city was improved¹⁶⁰ and, besides evidence for energetic ecclesiastical activity in the latter half of the 4th century,¹⁶¹ there exist many secular architectural fragments and inscriptions datable to the 4th century.¹⁶² In the 3rd century there had been a revival of the coinage of Antiocheia,¹⁶³ but it is uncertain how much this is a sign of civic and economic prosperity and how much a reflection of central government policy.

However, if Antiocheia had not been greatly affected by the general adversity of the late Roman period, she certainly suffered a blow in the early 8th century. In AD 712/3 the city was destroyed by Arab forces.¹⁶⁴ The site was reasonably well defended, the only weak point being the gently sloping west side where the city wall seems to have been most substantial. If Theophanes' brief account is to be taken at face value, the immediate setbacks, notably destruction of buildings and depopulation, were obviously serious, but the long-term repercussions may have been more damaging. However, the city sent a bishop to the Council meeting of AD 787, and the quality and quantity of ecclesiastical architecture in the museum at Yalvaç shows that the Church had suffered no long-lasting disastrous consequences. Antiocheia remained metropolitan

archbishopric of Pisidia, but the elevation of Neapolis may have been partially because Antiocheia took time to re-establish her former supremacy.

The evidence for activity at the site during late Antiquity includes the later basilica and traces of houses or workshops behind the apse of the church (Pl. 79). These houses, or workshops, were constructed of heavily mortared rubble and some reused masonry, but their date of construction cannot be determined from construction technique alone. As they obstruct the street which led to the Tiberia and Augusta Plateae, obviously this street was no longer used in its former capacity when these structures were built, but encroachment of domestic and industrial buildings onto public thoroughfares was a phenomenon which began under the late Empire. Among the reused material is a fragment of a Doric column, recut as a grinding stone, which probably originated from the semi-circular portico behind the temple of Augustus. There are three possible interpretations; the first is that these structures are of a pre-8th century date, and that town planning was already being conducted along different lines from the urban organisation of the Principate before the Arabs attacked the city; the second possibility is that, perhaps after a break in continuity of occupation following the Arab attack, the city was relocated at the main site; the third possibility is that the nucleus of the city was never relocated at the former site after the early 8th century, and these structures represent occupation, or reoccupation, by a minority.

The date of the later basilica has already been discussed in Chapter VII.¹⁶⁵ Its plan suggests that it was constructed at a date prior to the 8th century. A case can be made out for a post-8th century date if the early basilica was destroyed by the Arabs and its replacement was a conscientious copy of the original, not constructed according to mid or late Byzantine building trends. However, even if the later

basilica had been built, or was still functional, at a date following the Arab attack, this does not provide a conclusive argument for occupation of the main site after the 8th century. If there was demographic movement, the two most likely locations for the new site of Antiocheia are Yalvaç itself and the sanctuary site, both of which are close enough for the basilica to have still been used. The site of Yalvaç is only a kilometre away from the main site, and the citizens of Antiocheia must have quite happily trekked along the Sacred Way to the sanctuary site in order to venerate first Men and, later, God, in former times. However, if Antiocheia was relocated at the sanctuary site, the principal reason would have been one of security and it would have been more sensible for the citizens to have worshipped within the confines of the new settlement.

There is in fact evidence for occupation of the sanctuary site at some time in the Byzantine period. Some of the former sanctuary buildings were converted and there are signs of activity in the vicinity of the church. This activity might be interpreted as occupation by a group of ascetics, whether or not there was an actual monastery at the site. Alternatively, and more plausibly, it can be implied that citizens retreated to the relative safety of this isolated spot, either as a precaution against, or as a consequence of, the Arab invasion. The existence of the font which lies outside the church¹⁶⁶ strongly suggests that, whatever its original function, the church was used as a civic basilica at some time. The logical conclusion is that the sanctuary site was occupied not merely on a temporary basis, and it is reasonable to attribute this occupation to the 8th century. Besides the provision of the font, the church may have been remodelled to suit its new purpose. Scattered about flattened areas to the north and northwest of the church are plentiful sherds of pottery. The pottery would have to be dated before this activity can be attributed with confidence to later Antiquity. The amount of pottery, however, would be best explained

by full-scale occupation of the site rather than by the limited occupation which might have been continuous from pre-Roman times.

The only known source of water at the sanctuary site is the spring to the southwest of the church, above the area which is scattered with pottery. The spring has now dried up, but was still running in 1912.¹⁶⁷

An argument that the spring would have provided an inadequate supply of water for the supporting of the whole citizen body depends, of course, on its capacity during the 8th century and on the size of the population. Perhaps, with eventual re-expansion of the population, full-scale occupation of the sanctuary site would have been unfeasible. It is unlikely that this site was continually occupied until the 13th century on the basis that, had it been so, one would expect to find some traces of late Byzantine ecclesiastical activity among the many decorative fragments from both the sanctuary and the church which have escaped robbing because of the isolation of the site. There are numerous fragments of church architecture dating to the 11/12th century in the museum and reused in the buildings of the modern town of Yalvaç. The provenance of none of these, however, is known to have been either the sanctuary site or the main site.

At some date, the inhabitants of Antiocheia moved to Yalvaç. Levick¹⁶⁸ provides justifiable arguments for attributing the death of Antiocheia and the birth of Yalvaç to the late 13th century. The archbishopric is last attested by name in Notitia X which was compiled in the third quarter of the 13th century by Michael VIII Palaeologus. In 1315 the position of metropolitan archbishopric was vacant.¹⁶⁹ In Notitia XI and its revised version, Notitia XII, which were compiled during the reign of Andronicus II Palaeologus, only the name of the province is recorded in the list of metropolitan archbishoprics. In the 14th century, Yalvaç was one of the six great cities of the Seljuk principality of Hamid.¹⁷⁰

The 'death' of Antiocheia was in effect the taking away of the status of archbishopric in the late 13th century or at the beginning of the 14th. This may have been because loyalties to the Seljuks were stronger than loyalties to the Church at this time. Georgius Pachymetes in fact writes that the metropolitan of Pisidia had fallen foul of the authorities for fraternizing with the Sultan of Konya.¹⁷¹ One is inclined to believe that the decision was out of the hands of the authorities as, if the abolition of Antiocheia as metropolitan archbishopric of Pisidia had been a matter of discretion, one would expect that a replacement had already been lined up, when in fact the position seems to have been empty for some time. There is, however, no reason to suppose that there was wholesale conversion of all the Christians of Antiocheia in the late 13th century, that the Church as an institution was relinquished, and that the abolition of the archbishopric of Antiocheia and the change of name to Yalvaç coincided with, or was the result of, the relocation of the settlement.

One might consider that Antiocheia was relocated at the site of Yalvaç before the late 13th century. A strong argument against a wholesale move to Yalvaç in the 8th century is that this site would have been insecure while the threat of invasion prevailed. As illustrated above, however, it appears that it was the sanctuary site which was occupied in the 8th century. It is not inconceivable that the city was moved directly to Yalvaç from the sanctuary site at some date around the late 10/11th century when insecurity was not as intense as it had been during the 8th.. There is, however, evidence neither for extensive occupation of the early city site after the 8th century, nor for full-scale demographic movement to Yalvaç before the 14th century.

The strength of any decision on whether the main site was reoccupied or whether there was a direct move to Yalvaç rests partially on the

seriousness of the destruction caused by the Arabs. One important question might be whether or not the aqueduct was destroyed. If, as is usual in the attacking of a reasonably well defended site, a preliminary tactic was siege, interference with the water supply would have been one of the most important considerations. However, temporary cutting to create an immediate shortage and total destruction are two completely different issues. The expense and the bother of repair would have been less in the first instance. Long-term abandonment of the site, if the Arabs had not wrought the same destruction in a single blow, would have resulted in the delapidation of buildings and, most probably, the disrepair of the aqueduct. There is no sign of major repair to the aqueduct in the sections that survive. On the other hand, there is no certainty that the aqueduct was still functional at the time of the Arab attack, in which case the question of whether or not it was destroyed by the Arabs is irrelevant to this discussion. There are no springs at the site, but rainwater tanks and the River Anthius, which flows through the valley to the southeast and well below the site, would have sustained a population during late Antiquity just as it must have done before the aqueduct was constructed, but collection of water from the river would have been troublesome, and also insecure as the river flows outside the city walls. A concentration of pottery sherds at the southeast side of the site indicates that this was a residential area. There are signs that the steep slope down to the river may have been used as a bucket-run, but, even if this were the case, there is no certainty that it implies occupation of the site at a date after the 8th century.

If the possibility that the main city site was reoccupied is considered seriously, one has to wonder how the urban centre was rebuilt. There is no evidence, unless the houses or workshops are of a post AD 713 century date and, then, suggest that the street to the Plateae was no longer in use, or had at least been reduced in width. The remains are

not prolific in any case, robbing presumably having been a major culprit. No structure at the site which might still have served a purpose during later Antiquity - the bath-house, the nymphaeum, the church, the basilica, the city walls, besides the aqueduct - survives to a sufficient height to indicate either the extent of the damage or the possibility of repair. As the nymphaeum was situated at the point where the aqueduct entered the site, its continued use would have depended on that of the aqueduct. The bath-house, too, would only have been operational if there was a piped supply of water at the site. If the graves noted in the basilica¹⁷² are an instance of the not unknown practice of burial within disused churches, this might indicate that the basilica was nonfunctional during later Antiquity.

The situation is unclear. In the absence of further evidence, perhaps the most plausible explanation of the sequence of occupation is that the sanctuary site was occupied on more than a temporary basis in the 8th century and that, perhaps at some time around the late 10th/11th century, the city was once again relocated, this time at Yalvaç. Reoccupation of the main site after destruction and a not insignificant period of abandonment would no doubt have involved a major, if not total, rebuilding programme. The plentiful and accessible supply of water which flows through Yalvaç may well have been the deciding factor. One has, however, to bear in mind that a new wave of invasions followed the end of hostilities with the Arabs, and it was not until the 13th century that the Antiocheians were showing friendliness towards the Sultan of Konya. On the other hand, the security of the sanctuary site was always there if refuge was considered necessary and it had already been proved in the 8th century that the original city site was not in fact such a safe place.

Discussion.

The evidence presented above shows that continuity of existence, often to the present day, can be proved for many of the settlements which were cities under the Principate. Speculations can be made on the discontinuity or decline of those cities which were not made bishoprics or which were bishoprics apparently for a short period. These include Prostanna, Lysinia, Comama, Colbasa and Olbasa. Termessus may also be included in this list. However, as the correlation of city to bishopric is not clearly definable, as the ecclesiastical lists are notoriously deficient, as not every bishopric would have sent a representative to every Council meeting, as there may have been joint bishoprics of which a single name is preserved in the ecclesiastical lists, as the significance of joint bishoprics is uncertain, as the names of settlements may have been changed, and as the status of bishopric or non-bishopric may have borne no relation to general prosperity - the list could go on - these speculations must be treated with reservation. Numismatic evidence indicates that the site of Olbasa was occupied in the early 7th and the 10/11th centuries and that Comama was occupied in the 11th century. Onomastic evidence indicates that Colbasa continued to exist. As far as settlements such as Ceraitae, Cretopolis and Cormasa are concerned, their status under the Principate is not even certain.

The documentary evidence implies the rise in status of Tymandus, Limenae, Bindeus, Eudocias and Sinethandus during the mid or late Principate, and the temporary rise of Atenia, but this evidence, too, must be treated with caution. Only in the cases of Tymandus and Eudocias, if the identification of the latter city with the site at Evdir Hanı is correct, does epigraphic evidence confirm that there was an actual rise in status. In the case of Bindeus, on the contrary, epigraphic evidence suggests that the settlement was a city during the Principate, although the name

does not appear in the bishop lists until the end of the 7th century.

Even when continuity of existence can be implied, the nature of this existence is seldom clear. To understand the environment in which the inhabitants of the Pisidian settlements lived one has to rely on the archaeological evidence which, as has been exemplified, is not prolific and has not been sufficiently investigated. The results of surveys at Sagalassus, Cremna, Selge and Antiocheia have added greatly to our knowledge, but it will be necessary to carry out similar research at other sites, especially those of minor cities, before a clear pattern emerges.

There is little evidence for the character of Pisidian settlements before the process of urbanisation began, apart from fortifications around an acropolis or around a larger area which often corresponded to the later city limits. With urbanisation came the development of the civic centre, a response to both social and administrative needs. Town planning in some cities was conducted upon lines which had already been mapped out during the Hellenistic period. The scale of urban development at Sagalassus, the high standard of the architecture and the quality of the craftsmanship during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC shows that urbanisation had penetrated Pisidia long before the Principate. The same scale of urbanisation can be seen at Termessus and Selge. Even without the archaeological evidence, one can envisage similar developments at the sites of other settlements which had been open to Pergamene influences and those for which epigraphic evidence testifies to a high level of organisation before the Principate. Antiocheia, Apollonia, Seleuceia Sidera, Neapolis, Adada and Pednelissus might be considered to have been in the forefront of urban developments in Pisidia. If one presumes that Artemidorus would only consider as important in the 1st century BC those cities which had the aspect of a Greek polis, one can add to the list Amblada, Cremna, Ariassus, Tityassus, Timbriada,

Anabura and Tarbassus. One might also include those settlements which issued autonomous coinage before the Principate, i.e. Etenna, Malus, Prostanna, Comama, Parlais, Ceraitae and Conane. Although there is no hope of confirming the scale of urbanisation before the Principate at some of these sites, more thorough investigation of the sites of Adada, Ariassus, Prostanna and Etenna, for example, might reveal evidence to show how closely the less prominent settlements followed on the heels of Termessus, Sagalassus and Selge. It is not too rash to assume that all cities possessed the monuments necessary for total assimilation into the social and political structure of the Empire during the early Principate. Even in those cities which are not thought to have achieved their city status until well into the Principate, there is little doubt that the physical characteristics of a regular city were already present, and the same degree of urbanisation can be seen at settlements which are not known ever to have received city status. Sia has already been cited as an example.

Still the character of the city was forever changing with the erection of new buildings throughout the Principate. If these are not attested by extant remains, they are indicated by building inscriptions. Excavation is the only way of discovering whether new buildings which were constructed in the city centre at a date well into the Principate were built on the sites of earlier structures. At many sites there was outward expansion, and the demolishing of earlier monuments was not essential to the process of urbanisation during the Principate. At Sagalassus, for example, the Hellenistic centre was concentrated around the upper agora; urban expansion in the 2nd century AD was met by the construction of new buildings on the lower terrace, below the upper agora. At Pednelissus there was the common phenomenon of the creating of an 'upper' and a 'lower' city; the 'lower' city was often the result of expansion outside the security of the early Hellenistic walls and was frequently a part of the

city which was abandoned during later Antiquity. At a site such as Ariassus, however, where urban expansion was restricted by the topography of the site, new construction may well have necessitated the demolishing of earlier buildings. Even at Cremna, where the total area of the site is not insignificant, the civic centre was not extensive and the fact that many of the public monuments can be dated to the 2nd century AD might indicate that a number of earlier structures were dismantled in order to make way for the new buildings, an operation which was probably motivated by the earthquake which seems to have occurred in the early 2nd century. However, apart from a few instances where a great amount of material from an earlier building was reused in a later structure, such as in the 'Ionic' basilica at Sagalassus, a demolished building can seldom be reconstructed.

From the 4th century in particular, the need for ecclesiastical buildings brought about a permanent change in the character of the city. Assuming that urban centres were already thoroughly built up, the construction of a church, especially of a civic basilica, often meant the demolishing or the conversion of an older, presumably nonfunctional, building. These were also practices encouraged by law. The phenomenon is borne out by the evidence from cities whose reasonably well preserved remains have been investigated.- the construction of the 'Ionic' basilica at Sagalassus on the site of a temple of Apollo Clarius, the conversion of basilica 'A' at Cremna from the secular basilica attached to the forum and the demolishing of domestic structures to make way for basilica 'E' at least, the transformation of a 2nd century (?) temple at Podnolissus into a basilica, the conversion of the odeon at Selge into basilica 'D' and of the temple of Zeus into basilica 'C'. Conversion from, or the use of the sites of, pagan temples can be explained by the fact that such monuments were becoming increasingly nonfunctional and they often occupied the choice spots in a city.

Apart from ecclesiastical buildings, there is little evidence for new construction during late Antiquity, and this can seldom be dated in any case. In Pisidia one finds evidence for urban transformation by the common practice of the encroaching of structures, domestic or industrial, onto major thoroughfares. This is evident at Antiocheia and Selge, and survey of the site of Ariassus may reveal the same phenomenon. Reuse of material for the repair or construction of city walls also indicates urban transformation in that there was dismantling of the monuments whose masonry was reused. This phenomenon can be seen at Cremna, Sagalassus, Selge, Termessus and Sozopolis. Only at Cremna is it certain that the repair of the walls implies marked urban transformation in the mid 3rd century. New fortifications would have changed the character of a city, but in Pisidia this was often a feature which had been inherited from the early fortress-type settlement. At Sagalassus and Sozopolis, the character of the city was changed quite markedly by the erection of defensive walls during late Antiquity. The same may be true in the cases of Selge, Malus and, possibly, Ariassus, although in some instances the new walls of late Antiquity may have replaced earlier defences and it was the character of the fortifications that changed, rather than that the addition of new fortifications changed the character of the settlement.

If Sozopolis was indeed relocated at the fortress site from a previous situation then the character of the city would have changed completely; unfortunately, no monuments, apart from the fortifications and the ground plan of the basilica, survive to indicate the layout or the aspect of Sozopolis in any case. A complete rebuilding programme would have been necessary if Prostanna was relocated around the 5th century, but this is a possibility which is open to question. If Antiocheia was relocated at the sanctuary site in the 8th century, the character of the city would have changed, and there would have been a further

rebuilding programme if the city was relocated at Yalvaç, or once again at the main site, at a later date. There is reason to believe that Adada underwent transformation in character as a result of demographic movement during late Antiquity.

Archaeological evidence for post-7th century occupation of the majority of sites is almost entirely negative. Only in the case of Antiocheia can the archaeological evidence for occupation of the sanctuary site be attributed fairly confidently to the 8th century. Ecclesiastical fragments of 11/12th century date are abundant in the museum, but the buildings which these must have adorned have not been identified. If there was relocation of the site of Adada in the 7th century, the construction in the area above the defile can be given a terminus postquem, but the date at which the area was inhabited is in question. Demographic movement may have begun as early as the late 3rd century. In the case of Cremna, none of the churches appear to have been of a post-7th century date and there is no evidence to show for how long they may have remained functional. The evidence for the repair and remodelling of the houses has been given a 7th century date as a terminus antequem. If this date is not to be extended several centuries, one has to conclude that further remodelling was so minimal that it cannot be detected, that the citizens moved to a different site around the 7th century, which is unlikely, that there was depopulation to the extent that the small number of citizens have left no mark on the site, or that the inhabitants constructed new homes, perhaps of timber or mud brick, which have left no trace. Evidence for repair to domestic structures at Selge has been attributed to the late Byzantine period. The remodelling and scaling down of three of the basilicas has been attributed to the 11th to 13th centuries.

The survival of many monuments to the present day at those sites whose remains are relatively prolific in any case, suggests that the physical

character of the city changed very little during late Antiquity. What we do not often know is if these structures continued to be functional, if they stood unused for any period of time, or if they were converted to serve a different purpose than that for which they were originally built. The basic shell of a building, denuded of its furnishings, tells us little. Seldom can signs of minor repair or remodelling be dated, and seldom can they be interpreted as evidence for a change in purpose, for temporary abandonment or for continuous use.

To conclude, the archaeological evidence is too limited to show clearly how the character of Pisidian settlements changed during late Antiquity or to what extent there was transformation of the urban centre. Just as the character of each city was individual during the Principate, so it may have been so during later Antiquity. This individuality of character is best illustrated by the Hellenistic and early Roman buildings of Sagalassus. The same is true in the cases of Termessus, Selge and Adada, for example. A more varied combination of influences - Hellenistic, Roman and indigenous, political, economic and cultural - were at work in Pisidia to mould the character of the city than there were, say, in the coastal regions of Asia Minor. There was also a more varied time element involved. Although it can be shown that some of the cities of Pisidia had an advanced organisation, both constitutionally and in terms of urbanisation and architectural development, at an early date, this was a process which extended gradually to the minor cities, more so to those which resisted early attempts to bring them under the sway of Pergamene and Roman authority. There is no common element which displays a distinctive 'Pisidian' quality, apart from the fortress-like aspect of the true highland settlements, a feature of their character which they retained throughout Antiquity. The confusion of the planning types of the churches illustrates that Pisidia was open to influence from both

the plateau and the coast, but the result was not the creation of a distinctive Pisidian type of church.

That the character of low-lying settlements may have significantly differed from that of the true highland settlements is indeterminable, as robbing and ploughing have removed the evidence. It was suggested above that thorough investigation of the sites of Adada and Ariassus would be profitable. There seems to be more evidence at each of these sites for non-ecclesiastical activity during later Antiquity than at any other site, perhaps excepting Selge, in the highlands. Yet even if much information were to be obtained from intensive survey or excavation, this might be valuable only in a limited capacity as each of these sites may have been atypical of the general situation, if indeed a general situation can be defined, in Pisidia. The question of the prosperity of Adada and Ariassus during early Antiquity is ambiguous. Both sites are reasonably well intact and a number of well constructed monuments survive. There is, however, little sign of prosperity in the form of decorative architecture, very little marble, and no indication in either case that this has been robbed for use elsewhere.

As with any other region of Asia Minor, we are faced with the question of whether or not the lack of evidence for construction during later Antiquity reflects that existence was significantly inferior to what it had been under the early and mid Principate. In Pisidia, there is evidence for the phenomena noted at other sites which have been interpreted as signs of urban decay. At Antiocheia and Selge, and possibly also Ariassus, there is evidence for the encroachment of domestic, or industrial, structures onto main streets through the cities. If the structures at Antiocheia represent full-scale occupation of the site at a date prior to the Arab attack, which seems most plausible, it can be concluded that the Plateae did not rate the same importance as they had done so during the early Principate and that there was an element

of urban decadence. The reuse of material from the stoa behind the temple suggests in any case that there was little respect for this monument as an important part of the history of the settlement, even if it may have outlived its function. At Selge, besides the encroaching of the houses onto the street, the concentration of the activity which can be attributed to later Antiquity in the vicinity of the Kesbedion and the upper agora might be interpreted both as a sign of population shrinkage and as a sign that former pride in the neat and open layout of the early city no longer existed. At Cremna, Sagalassus, Selge and Sozopolis there is evidence for the tearing down of public buildings to build or replug defensive systems. At Cremna, this activity can be attributed to the mid 3rd century. At Sagalassus, a 3rd century date is plausible. For Selge, a 7th century date has been suggested, although this rebuilding might be earlier. At Sozopolis, if the building of the fortifications coincided with a relocation of the settlement, the reused material would have been taken from structures which were no longer functional.

Further evidence for a decay in civic pride has already been demonstrated in the robbing of the forum at Cremna in order to provide material for the remodelling of the bath-house, and the rather beggarly, if ostentatious, result. The disuse of the forum in the early 3rd century is possibly implied, in which case a degree of declining public pride can be seen in the leaving of a partially dismantled structure in the centre of the city. This shows more disregard for the appearance of the city than if the forum had been totally razed. If the forum was still functional, the stripping of its finery might also imply a lack of civic pride, despite the fact that there was public ostentation in the bath-house. Also significant is that a degree of impoverishment can be seen in the 3rd century, a date before the reuse of material is known to have been stipulated by law. How much this might have been conditioned

by purely local circumstances and how much by the general political and economic situation is uncertain. If the date of the remodelling of the bath-house at Cremna is Severan, rather than post-Severan, the former is implied. The reuse of material for the refortifying of settlements only a few decades later was, on the other hand, very much conditioned by the political situation, which dictated a sense of urgency. A further point, taking into account political conditions and the 4th century laws on restrictions in public spending, is that the earlier the date of new construction which reuses material from older buildings, the more validity there is in arguing for a decline in public pride, in that the dismantling of monuments which had stood for a relatively short period is indicated. That some of these monuments may have completely outlived their function must also be borne in mind.

Urban transformation during early Antiquity was almost entirely a question of expansion and improvement, and usually a reflection of general prosperity. On the other hand, circumstances imply that the evidence for urban change after the 3rd century can seldom be interpreted as a sign of general prosperity. The affluence of the Church is not in question. In Pisidia, as in any other region, there is evidence for active ecclesiastical construction between the 4th and the 7th centuries. The Church may have suffered a period of hardship between the 7th and the 10th centuries, but the quality of the ecclesiastical architecture which both pre-dates and post-dates this intervening period indicates that the Church was hardly impoverished. A study of the ecclesiastical fragments in the museum at Yalvaç shows that the church decoration datable to the 11/12th century was quite plausibly of superior quality to that of the earlier period, even though there is no sign of a building to which these fragments may have belonged.

In some cases, both expansion and prosperity during late Antiquity might be implied, but one must be wary of assuming from this that a particular city was wealthy as a whole. Cremna, for example, had the means to construct a second aqueduct after the demise of the first in the late 3rd century, if this interpretation is correct.

That the construction of this second aqueduct might be an indication of a sufficiency of municipal funds is belied by the evidence illustrated above for cuts in public spending. The means for the construction of the second aqueduct may well have been provided by central government since the first aqueduct was no doubt destroyed by Imperial command.

It might be suggested that the construction of the bath-house in the outer part of the city of Side is a sign of re-expansion and prosperity in the 5th century. This interpretation, however, depends on the source of the financial means. If the bath-house was constructed from municipal funds, general prosperity is implied, particularly as there were already at least two bath-houses in the city. If, however, the means were provided by a wealthy individual, perhaps one who resided in this part of the city, the construction of the bath-house is not a reflection of municipal prosperity. The date of the private houses which were built across the street from the bath-house is uncertain. A 5th century date would not be improbable, but, again, these houses reflect the affluence of a number of individuals rather than of the city as a whole. If these houses were occupied in the 5th century, there is more reason to incline towards the theory that the bath-house was in fact constructed through the patronage of a wealthy resident, or a group of residents.

Cautionary remarks have already been made in Chapter VIII on the interpretation of urban transformation as a reflection of civic decay

rather than of changing needs, and the fact that it is only when those amenities of a city which are still essential or without which a settlement would function with difficulty are seen to fall into disuse that an element of decline can be detected. The most essential amenities during late Antiquity were the churches, the houses and the water supplies. The difficulties in the identification of domestic structures datable to later Antiquity have already been illustrated. At many sites, no actual houses dating to any period of history survive. At Sagalassus, extensive residential areas can be identified. In the area below and to the west of the lower agora, little more than a number of door jambs and a few traces of walls survive; the residential area in the vicinity of the theatre is characterized by nothing more than a handful of door jambs and a vast expanse of pottery sherds. Even if some of this pottery could be given a late date, this does not prove that houses which were occupied during Imperial times might have continued to be inhabited until the end of Antiquity. Only at Selge, Adada and Ariassus is there the possibility that domestic structures built out of stone were occupied until well into later Antiquity. The same may have been the case at Cremna. However, at Cremna as well as at many other sites we are faced with the possibility that timber or mud brick construction might have been common during later Antiquity. Circumstantial evidence suggests that such construction can be partially interpreted as a reflection of decline, but one has to bear in mind that timber and mud brick buildings are not necessarily inferior to buildings of stone. In addition, in a region which is prone to seismic movement, there may have seemed no point in going to the trouble to repair and reconstruct stone buildings which might only be demolished at any time by an earthquake.

At the city sites, little evidence for ecclesiastical construction of a post-7th century date exists. There is the possibility that the cemetery church at Adada was remodelled at a post-7th century date. Three of the

Selgian basilicas appear to have been remodelled at a late Byzantine date. It is possible that the mosques at Bayat and Islamköy were converted from churches belonging to the see of Seleuceia Sidera (and Agrai), of a post-7th century date. Where, however, there exist ecclesiastical fragments datable to the 11/12th century, do we conclude that the pre-7th century churches were remodelled and redecorated in the late Byzantine period, that new churches were erected of which there remains no trace, or that there was demographic movement around or before the 11/12th century and that the post-Byzantine structures characteristic of a Turkish town have obscured the evidence for ecclesiastical activity? In the cases of Antiocheia and Seleuceia, there may have been demographic movement to the site of a later Turkish town at a date before the end of Antiquity. An argument that remodelling of earlier churches, or the construction of new churches which might not have been substantial enough to have survived, reflects decline, decay or impoverishment is somewhat tempered by the quality of the surviving church decoration.

The evidence for decline and decadence from ecclesiastical and domestic structures is, then, ambiguous. The evidence from the third most important amenity of a 'civilised' settlement, that of the water supply, is perhaps more elucidatory, and would be more so if the dates of the demise of the aqueducts could be established.

Initial siting of settlements would have taken into account a nearby and adequate source of water, but water supplies set up to serve a population during early Antiquity may later have become inadequate due to population expansion. A piped supply of water was also an essential characteristic of a civilised and urbanised city. The evidence that individual houses in residential quarters were supplied with running water, e.g. at Selge,¹⁷³ and the evidence for major construction of bath buildings from the beginning of the Principate, shows that a great quantity of water was necessary in order to maintain these aspects of a

civilised existence. These needs were usually met by the construction of one or more aqueduct . In fact, it was during the 1st and 2nd centuries AD that the majority of the standing examples of aqueducts were constructed.

Aqueducts have been identified at five city sites in Pisidia.- Selge, Antiocheia, Sagalassus, Cremna and Termessus. The fairly substantial aqueducts at Antiocheia and Selge have been known about for some time. The less substantial aqueducts at Termessus were recorded about a century ago. The aqueducts at Sagalassus and Cremna have been discovered, after some amount of searching, during the recent surveys of the sites. It is therefore to be hoped that further aqueducts will be revealed by intensive survey of other sites. The majority of Pisidian settlements were built on high ground where water sources were often nonexistent or inadequate, and an aqueduct would certainly have been essential in order to cope with population expansion and urban developments under the Principate. Often, skillful engineering would have been necessary to convey water from a source outside the city to the hilltop settlements. At Termessus and Sagalassus, the source in each case was above the altitude of the city, and a simple non-pressurized system, whereby the water was transported by gravity flow through rock-cut channels, seems to have been adequate.¹⁷⁴ Cuttings for a lid were observed at one point on the section of the Sagalassian aqueduct that has been traced. With a lid to keep out the dust, maintenance of a simple aqueduct based on gravity flow, which is less prone to leakage than a pressure system, would entail only periodical cleaning and the control of seepage. The aqueducts at Selge were also non-pressurized systems, the water conveyed through U-shaped channels, which were perhaps covered.¹⁷⁵ The course of the aqueduct with the most distant source traversed a valley and, in order to maintain the gravity flow, the channel was supported on a stone-built wall, 7 metres high in places, with a single

arch at the point where the aqueduct crossed a small stream. The two aqueducts joined and carried the water to the collection point, a mortared stone reservoir near the Kesbedion hill. From here, the water was distributed throughout the site by gravity flow, via the colonnaded street and the bath-house, and terminating at the nymphaeum. Despite the gravity flow, the water system was quite sophisticated. Upkeep of the stone wall would have been necessary, although, if this aqueduct failed, the second would still have been operational.

The aqueducts of Antiocheia and Cremna were even more sophisticated.¹⁷⁶ Both were pressure systems, the water carried in closed pipes. The aqueduct at Antiocheia was transported from the source to the northern side of the site across a series of tall stone-built arches. In order for the water to be distributed to all quarters of the site, there would have to have been a hydraulic lifting system, perhaps incorporated into the nymphaeum, which seems to have been the collection point. The aqueduct at Cremna was carried on a stone wall for much of its course, with arches used in order to cross intervening valleys. Traces of water towers outside the city walls suggest that the water was raised, by pumps or animal-driven power, to a sufficient height for the supply to be able to reach all parts of the site by gravity flow. The low elevation of the later aqueduct implies that this supply could have delivered water to the southwestern part of the site only.

If one considers the alternative sources of water at these sites, it can be seen that Selge would not have suffered drastically if the aqueduct was nonfunctional. There are a number of springs within the confines of the site. The only difficulty would have been in piping the water to critical points of the city. However, collection of rain-water in the numerous cisterns and tanks at strategic high parts of the site, such as around the Kesbedion hill, on the hill on which stands

basilica 'A' and in the vicinity of basilica 'D', would have meant that a piped supply of water could have been maintained. A stone-cut channel leading along the south side of basilica 'A' suggests that the water from the nearby tank was, in fact, transported down to the vicinity of the upper agora and the colonnaded street. This area of the site was also supplied by water from a spring at the south side of the same hill. At least one of the cisterns along the colonnaded street, however, is of a late date and might indicate that the alternative sources of water during later Antiquity were inadequate, or that the water was not transported through channels or pipes to the colonnaded street where the houses of the city of late Antiquity were concentrated.

The early aqueduct at Cremna presumably conveyed water to the series of 16 vaulted cisterns which are situated just to the north of the city centre and from where water was distributed to the public buildings and the residential areas. Following the demise of this aqueduct in the late 3rd century, it seems that a replacement aqueduct was constructed but that this supply could not reach the urban centre. Even though it is conceivable that many of the public buildings remained in a state of disrepair after the siege and that the bath-house may no longer have functioned in this capacity from as early as the Severan period, it would have been necessary for the city centre to have been supplied by water from the few small springs around the site and from the rainwater stored in the cistern complex, which was no longer a collection point for the aqueduct. If the bath-house was still functional after its remodelling, it might be considered that it had to be forfeited towards the end of the 3rd century.

At Sagalassus and Antiocheia, no sources of water have been noted within the confines of the settlements. The relative simplicity of the Sagalassian aqueduct may have ensured that it continued to be maintained until the site was abandoned, but the sophistication of the aqueduct at

Antiocheia would have required constant upkeep. If the Arabs destroyed the aqueduct, or if it fell into disrepair after abandonment of the site, this might be used as an argument for the unlikelihood that the main site was once again occupied after the 8th century. As already pointed out, the alternative sources of water at Antiocheia are inconvenient. It is unlikely that a metropolis would have endured such inconvenience at any time, but only if it can be shown that the aqueduct was nonfunctional at a pre-8th century date can one argue for an element of urban decay. The bath-house could certainly not be supplied if the aqueduct was out of use.

In the case of Termessus, rainwater and snow-melt collected in the large number of cisterns and tanks, and water supplied by a couple of springs within the confines of the settlement, would presumably have sustained the population if the aqueducts fell into disrepair.

If one considers that a piped water supply, which could often be realised only by the construction of an aqueduct, was an essential feature of an urbanised and civilised city, one can argue that the demise of an aqueduct was a sign of decline. In the case of Cremna, the demise of the early aqueduct and the fact that the later aqueduct could not be used to supply the city centre can certainly be viewed as a sign of urban decay in the late 3rd century, even without the evidence which suggests that, doubtless as a result of the siege, public buildings were already falling into disrepair. The evidence from Selge points to the demise of the aqueducts and the piped water supply of the city before the end of Antiquity. The date at which this occurred, however, is unknown, and it seems that the Selgians coped quite successfully with the situation, making sure of a source of water in the vicinity of the occupation area, rather than relying

totally on the more distant springs, whose capacity today indicates that they might quite adequately have sustained a population during Antiquity.

The aqueduct as a monumental arched structure built of stone was a Roman innovation. The principle of the aqueduct, of both open and closed systems, was known from much earlier times, as was the principle of the pump. There is, however, no evidence that water was piped from a distance to any of the hilltop sites before the early Principate.

The earliest of the monumental aqueducts in Pisidia was probably that at Selge. Comparison with the Vespasianic aqueduct at Balbura,¹⁷⁷ suggests a late 1st century BC or early 1st century AD date. Before the construction of the aqueducts, if there were no adequate sources of water within the confines of a settlement, primitive and laborious methods of water collection would have been used. This would have been the case at Antiocheia where, although there is a nearby source of water, the River Anthius, this flows outside the site, at the foot of a steep slope at some altitude below that of the site itself. If the construction of an aqueduct is to be associated exclusively with population expansion, then it can be proposed that the demise of an aqueduct was not important because depopulation during late Antiquity would have lessened the pressure on the water supply and the settlement could have reverted to the water supplies which had been adequate and functional, if inconvenient, before the construction of the aqueduct. Moreover, if the estimates which indicate that population expansion was at its most vigorous during the 1st century AD are correct, one has to assume that the scanty water supplies within the confines of Side and Aspendus, for example, were adequate before the 2nd century, unless these aqueducts replaced earlier, simpler systems. The aqueduct, then, seems to have been very much a reflection of civic pride and sufficiency of funds, and the demise of an aqueduct, especially of a monumental

structure, can certainly be viewed as a sign of urban decline and declining prosperity.

It is, however, difficult to use the demise of an aqueduct as an argument for demographic change. Taking Antiocheia as a hypothetical example, if the aqueduct fell into disrepair whilst the site was still occupied, the alternative sources of water were not convenient, but these were the same sources which were used before the construction of the aqueduct. What we do not know is, would the citizens have been content to revert to more primitive methods of water collection rather than to relocate their site at a well-watered spot? Another crucial question is whether or not there were springs at some of the sites where today there is no evidence for sources of water within the confines of the settlement. The lack of water within the confines or in the near vicinity of many sites makes it difficult to imagine how even a small population could have existed in minor comfort. One has also to consider the possibility of the changing of the water table and the drying-up of springs and small streams due to natural causes or human interference. Increased precipitation from the 8th century would have eased the pressure on the collection of rainwater, but the incidence of droughts during this period might have created a serious water problem. There is little evidence to suggest that there may have been more springs at a site during Antiquity or that water supplies might have dried up at any particular date, and this would be a difficult phenomenon to establish. The spring at the sanctuary site near Antiocheia, however, has dried up for no explicable reason within the last three quarters of a century. If this had occurred whilst the site was occupied, provision of water would have been an excessively laborious task.

There is, however, little evidence to show that settlements were reloc-

ated before the end of Antiquity. The question of water supplies, however, must be considered as a possible influence on demographic change in Pisidia. The majority of sites which were situated on high ground during Antiquity have since been relocated at lower altitudes. Many of these may have been relocated when Turkish rule had been firmly established and there was no necessity to remain, for security reasons, at a site which was unsheltered and to which the provision of water required, in many cases, a skillfully engineered system or laborious manual transportation. When considering whether this move may have occurred before the end of Antiquity, one has to weigh the question of security against that of water. However, as pointed out in the discussion of Antiocheia, the relative security of the former site was still there if refuge was necessary. As the fundamental evidence, i.e. the archaeological evidence, does not exist, until we know more about environmental conditions and fluctuations during Antiquity, especially during later Antiquity, the question of whether or not demographic movement may have been motivated by water problems before the end of Antiquity remains unanswered.

The above discussion more or less considers local conditions in Pisidia. Some of the signs of civic decline may have been results of universal political, economic and social factors. It is now proposed to inquire how Pisidia was affected by the general political and economic situation discussed in the preceeding chapter.

Until the Arabs attacked Antiocheia and the castle of Mistea, invasion routes seem to have by-passed Pisidia. Invading armies tended to keep to major routes; travelling was thus more speedy and comfortable for both infantry and cavalry, roads often followed water courses, and it was the cities on the main routes from which loot and provisions could be most easily acquired. Of course, there were major routes through Pisidia, and there were cities in the province which might be relieved

of their wealth to the advantage of the looters, but, from what we know or can guess of the actual invasion routes, the starting points and the objectives, it is almost certain that a march through Pisidia would have constituted an unnecessary detour. Besides which, the existence of brigands in the highlands might have presented a risk which was not considered worth taking. Whatever the reasons, it might be proposed that the region of Pisidia which lay within the 'Pisidian triangle', cut off from the plateau by the ranges of the Sultan Dağları and Karakuş Dağı and extending to the Taurus districts of northern Pamphylia, were, in the event, protected from direct invasion by their topographical features and their geographical situation.

Although in retrospect this seems to have been the case, the outcome of any invasion is not known at the time, and there was no doubt widespread panic throughout Asia Minor, beginning in the mid 3rd century with the Gothic and Persian incursions into Asia Minor, in the first half of the 7th century in particular with the Persian invasions, and from the late 7th century with the Arab threat. In the 250s and 260s, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Lycaonia and Galatia are known to have been in the path of the Gothic and Persian invaders. Even if they by-passed Pisidia, they came close enough to instil an element of fear in the highlanders.

Many of the Pisidian cities were already situated on high ground, with excellent natural defences. There would have been little reason to relocate a site as a precaution against attack. Additional protection was provided by fortification walls which were usually an inherent feature of the typical Pisidian fortress, sometimes only around a small acropolis, sometimes around an area large enough to contain the whole site. These walls had served their purpose during the centuries before the beginning of the Principate, against invasions from the Hellenes and the Romans, against the client kings such as Amyntas, against hostilities from fellow highland cities and against raids by brigands.

During the two centuries of peace which followed Augustus' accession to power, the only need for the maintenance of fortifications would have been as a precaution against brigand raids. Whilst fortifications could provide security for the citizens and the civic centre, however, they were no protection against raids on agricultural lands, villages and farmsteads. There is in any case no evidence to suggest that brigand groups were greatly interested in attacking the cities themselves during these two centuries; this would have been a risky venture in view of their apparently small numbers and lack of organisation. Even Lydius' occupation of Cremna during the years when bands of brigands seem to have been greater in numbers and better organised was not the result of an objective against the city itself, but rather a manoeuvre motivated by a desire for self-preservation. Another reason for the conscientious upkeep of fortifications during the first two and a half centuries AD might have been from a sense of civic pride. There is, however, evidence from cities throughout Asia Minor to suggest that, during the 3rd century, fortifications were either repaired or newly erected, often very hastily, which implies that maintenance for security reasons, or from a sense of civic pride, had not been considered essential during the preceeding two centuries.

In Pisidia, there are few instances of repair to fortification walls, or of newly constructed walls, and, of these, only the signs of repair to the walls of Cremna can be dated securely to the mid 3rd century. Restoration work in the west wall, which clearly pre-dated the damage caused during the siege, must have been motivated by the Gothic and Persian invasions of Asia Minor. The date of the walls around the nucleus of the city of Sagalassus can less confidently be attributed to this period, although the style of construction indicates a date closer to the 3rd century than to the 7th. The initial construction of the extant walls at Sozopolis was perhaps 7th century, which

would coincide with the more vigorously renewed hostilities from the Persians. It is, however, conceivable that these walls replaced earlier fortifications whose construction, if the apparent relocation of the city from a more exposed situation to the security of the acropolis coincided with the change in name, was perhaps motivated by the insecurity felt in the mid 3rd century. Repairs to the Hellenistic walls of Selge might be dated to the 3rd century; more major reconstruction at a later date is more likely to have occurred in the 7th century. There is evidence for defensive precautions at Malus at some date during late Antiquity. No sign of repair to the meagre traces of the early walls has been recorded, but at least one tower was erected, presumably as part of a defensive system around what seems to have been the acropolis of the site. At Ariassus, there may have been a fortification wall constructed around the western hill above the city centre during late Antiquity, but this needs further investigation. Defensive precautions at Adada are implied by the moving of the nucleus of the settlement to a more secure location. The Hellenistic acropolis of the site may have been refortified, but there is no evidence for a date at which these precautions were taken.

After the 3rd century, there was no direct threat to Asia Minor for almost three centuries, but hostilities continued on the frontiers and there must always have been a general uneasiness in the provinces. If the Pisidian settlements had not replugged their defences in the 3rd century and maintained these security systems, they surely must have done so in the 7th. There seems to have been wider devastation from the Persians than is indicated by the documentary sources. There is no comparative evidence from the highlands; excavation and close dating of signs of 7th century activity, a fairly hopeless prospect, would be necessary for this. Among the cities cited by Foss is Aphrodisias and, although it is unknown if the Persians ventured any further westwards along this road, the possibility that Apameia might

have been in the path of the Persians must be considered. The proximity of Sozopolis to the Meander valley route, separated by a mountain range, but one softened by gentle breaks and passes, including the main road via Çapalı, might have been the stimulus for the erection of the fortifications, or at least for repair if they had already been constructed. Again, it might be proposed that Pisidia was protected by her geographical situation from direct invasion in the 7th century, although the Persians did come perilously close and must have instilled wide-spread fear.

In western Asia Minor, new fortifications were a common feature of the 7th to 15th centuries.¹⁷⁸ In Pamphylia, too, there is evidence for defensive precautions. At Side, defence was tightened by the construction of a massive fortification wall built of reused masonry which incorporated the stage building of the theatre and was studded with squared towers (Pl. 64).¹⁷⁹ The sea walls were also substantially repaired or newly constructed. At Attaleia, which was the object of attack by the Arabs in the 9th and 10th centuries in particular, the original Hellenistic fortification wall was repaired and remodelled during Roman times and, in the 10th century, it was reinforced by a second wall.¹⁸⁰ The extensive rebuilding of the fortifications at Selge may have been contemporary with the walls of Side. The settlement near Döşemealtı, which is possibly to be identified with Panemoteichus, was in a strategic position at the foot of the paved road from the Pamphylian plain through the highlands. There are indications that a late Roman or Byzantine garrison was stationed here on more than a temporary basis.¹⁸¹ If this settlement does indeed represent Panemoteichus, it might be suggested that the initial stationing of the garrison is to be dated to the reign of Heraclius, as Panemoteichus appears to have been a frontier post of the Cibyrraeotic theme.

In the early 8th century, the need for security measures in Pisidia

was proved by the invasion of the province by the Arabs. Antiocheia was apparently devastated, and the castle of Mistea was attacked.¹⁸² There is no certainty of how much further the Arabs advanced into the highlands and no certain evidence that other cities were attacked, despite Sterrett's assigning of burnt tiles at the site of Amblada to destruction by the Arabs.¹⁸³ Mistea and Sinethandus (perhaps jointly with Pappa) had safeguarded themselves with fortresses some distance away from the city site. The sites of Mistea, Sinethandus and Pappa were all exposed. Although the castle of Mistea was attacked, this shows that there had been a need for defensive precautions. Asar Kalesi seems to have escaped a similar fate. The hill of St. Philip, on the same road from Iconium to the Cillanian plain, was likewise fortified.¹⁸⁴ Although these mountains provided a strong barrier against invasion, the road was perhaps seen to be a weak point before the Arabs eventually got through. A tunnel system at Çonya, in the foothills of the mountains just east of the road from Mistea to Iconium via Pappa and Sinethandus, was perhaps excavated to serve as a place of refuge from the Arabs.¹⁸⁵ If the sanctuary site near Antiocheia was indeed occupied on more than a temporary basis following the Arab attack of the city, the continuity of this occupation was doubtless motivated by a lingering fear. Byzantine foundations of the Seljuk fortress at Eğridir (Pl. 57) might conceivably be of an 8th century date, but it is perhaps more likely that they represent a later phase of defensive policies, against the Seljuk Turks.

Late Roman and Byzantine fortifications and repairs to existing walls have been found at sites which have been investigated with this as part of the objective. It is possibly that the same signs might be found at other sites which have so far been examined with a view to understanding the early history and architecture only. The evidence implies, however, that, although the highlands were influenced by general fear and insecurity, they were left well alone by invaders, whose prime targets were elsewhere. Not until the destruction of Antiocheia by

the Arabs did eastern Pisidia fall in the path of invasion routes. After the early 8th century, there is no record of further invasion of Pisidia until the province featured quite prominently in the hostilities between the Byzantines and the Turks from the 12th century. Another perhaps not insignificant point is that disease, a fairly common ill throughout Antiquity, was often carried and spread by armies, and a district which did not feature regularly on campaign routes would run less risk of being affected by the general adversity and depopulation which accompanies epidemic disease. The underlying factor behind the relative security of the highlands was geographical.

Geographical differences were not always to the advantage of the highlands, however. Although it might be argued that brigandage was not a contributory factor to decline, that it was a condition which the highland communities could take in their stride, even a condition in which they indulged, and that organised brigandage was more of a threat to Imperial authority than it was to the municipalities, it was still a harassment. Apart from a few isolated incidents such as Lydius' occupation of Cremna, brigandage does not seem to have posed a direct threat to the cities themselves, but it must have been a constant headache to rural communities and farmsteads.

There is no evidence that levels of productivity were reduced below the levels of requirement during any period of Antiquity. One can make speculations, but there is insufficient research on the subject to be able to propose low productivity as an adverse influence on the ancient world as a whole during any period, let alone to try to evaluate regional conditions and varying degrees of susceptibility on the evidence, or the lack of the evidence, for local climatic variations. All that can be said is that the evidence for increased precipitation from the 8th century would have relieved any problems concerning irrigation and water collection during this period, but the situation is

complicated by the tendency towards drought during this period. The theoretical consequences have already been discussed in the preceeding chapter; these theories cannot be applied until we know more about the frequency and the duration of seasons of drought. In agricultural terms, drought might have had more adverse consequences in plateau regions, which tend to be arid in any case, and in isolated highland districts, where agricultural yields would have to have been regular if there was to be no dependence on outside aid, than in coastal plains where, although the rainy season is shorter, water carried by the large rivers is fairly constant. However, regional comparisons cannot be made until we know to what extent drought would have been a localised or a universal phenomenon.

It was proposed in Chapter VI that, for geographical reasons, there always remained an economic contrast between the mountains and the plain.¹⁸⁶ That this might have significantly affected the relative prosperity of the highland and lowland settlements is contradicted by the archaeological evidence, but it is not unlikely that commercial ventures were more diversified, if not more profitable, in the plain. The financial advantages of ship-building and merchant sea traffic were available to the cities of the coastlands, but not to the cities of the interior, unless they profited from the provision of timber in their territory or from the export of goods and produce. The point is that the highland cities probably relied to a greater extent on localised commerce and they had to preserve a certain element of the self-sufficiency that they had possessed as a prerequisite for survival from the earliest times. If one considers the difficulties of reaching Selge before the modern road was built as far as Beşkonak and a rough winding road was provided between Beşkonak and Selge, it is not unrealistic to imagine that self-sufficiency, reliance on the hinterland and the planting of a variety of crops was observed to a greater extent in the highlands than it was in the plains. The journey to

Selge now takes a total of 2 to 3 hours by car; formerly, it took 4 hours by landrover or tractor as far as Beşkonak, and a further 6 hours by mule from Beşkonak to Selge; this was a virtually impossible undertaking in the winter months, and unreliable in the spring due to snow melt. Even today, the inhabitants of Altinkaya (Selge) and Syrtköy (Etenna) seldom venture down to the plain except to purchase vegetables for a more varied diet, or to find casual work. In the littoral plains, the mild winter weather meant that commercial ventures were not totally restricted, sowing and harvesting seasons were longer, and settlements were not so completely cut off from their neighbours in the event of the necessity of economic aid.

Besides the cities of the coastlands, those inland cities which were located on major lines of communication also relied heavily on commerce and grew to be at the mercy of more universal fluctuations of fortune. Apameia might be cited as an example. There is no hard evidence, but it is thought, and not unreasonably so, that Apameia lost a certain amount of the prestige and prosperity that she had attained during the high Empire as an entrepôt for goods passing along the Meander valley route. Apameia was not a true highland city in the sense that Selge, Cremna, Pednelissus, Timbriada and Adada, for example, were. If an economic contrast based on topographical differences is to be accepted, however, it is difficult to decide in which category the cities of the former region of Phrygia Paroreios should be placed.

An economic contrast, however minimal, must have resulted in different reactions in times of crisis. War and financial hardship in central government must have endangered the general economy in that government aid to the provinces would have been limited and the prosperity of all cities would have been affected to some extent, apart from, in one respect, those which profited from the stationing of troops in the vicinity and those which could provide merchandise to the army, unless

this was commissioned without reimbursement. Invasion was a threat to trade routes, and, even though campaigns tended to be seasonal, they were conducted during the very months which were most opportune for commercial traffic. Commercial disasters were more devastating to those cities which depended heavily on commerce and trade. Those settlements and regions which were practised in relying on their own resources, however, must have retained a relatively prosperity, or at least a relative stability in that they would not have had to cope with the necessity of changing long-standing economic practices in times of economic upheaval.

The persistence of the Pisidian coinage well after the closure of municipal mints in other parts of the Empire might imply that Pisidia was relatively economically stable, at least sufficiently so to be able to turn out a steady supply of coins. That many of the issues are military in character and that the evidence suggests that the cities took turns in issuing during the 3rd century does imply, however, that this may have been a government decision, despite the fact that it seems incredible that a government which was being ruled by a series of Emperors who held office for very short periods, which was continually being broken up by strife and civil war, and which also had to cope with the problem of invasion, would, first of all have given such thoughtful consideration to the question of coinage and, secondly, have maintained this policy throughout the perpetually changing reigns. Even if there are no significant economic implications, and even if much of the impetus and, perhaps, financial assistance came from central government, this surely cannot mean that the Pisidian cities, collectively, had been singled out at random to perform this function. At least there is reason to suggest that Pisidia was considered to be a relatively stable district at a time when Asia Minor was being overrun by Goths and Persians. A tentative proposal that might be worth investigating

is that the lack of die links between the Pisidian cities in the 3rd century might indicate that the late issue of 3rd century coinage was a task well within the capabilities of the municipalities. Alternatively, this may imply a lack of inter-dependency in the 3rd century, or may be completely insignificant.

A large number of Pisidian cities issued during the reigns of Gordian III and Philip especially. At Antiocheia, at least 32 new types appeared under Gordian III, but there was a deterioration towards the reign of Gallienus, and the last issues were made during the reign of Claudius Gothicus.¹⁸⁷ The fact that the coins issued during the reigns of these last two Emperors were generally struck on earlier pieces implies that the mint of Antiocheia was becoming short of bronze.¹⁸⁸

Amblada, Sibidunda and Verbe issued their last coins during the reign of Philip.¹⁸⁹ Tilyassus continued coining into the reign of Trajan Decius.¹⁹⁰ Apollonia, Conane, Pogla, Adada, Panemoteichus, Ariassus, Pednelissus and Termessus all coined into the reign of Gallienus.¹⁹¹

Andeda, Colbasa, Olbasa, Comama, Codrula and Baris were still coining under the Gallic Emperors.¹⁹² At Sagalassus, Seleuceia Sidera and Prostanna, there was a profusion of coins from the reign of Claudius Gothicus.¹⁹³ Prostanna produced over half her total coinage at this

time, and Seleuceia approximately two-thirds. Sagalassus was still minting large bronze coins under Aurelian,¹⁹⁴ and Cremna, after a an apparent lapse under Claudius Gothicus, issued surprisingly energetically under Aurelian.¹⁹⁵ Selge also issued into the reign of

Aurelian.¹⁹⁶ In the Pamphylian plain, Perge issued a few coins connected with a festival during the reign of Tacitus.¹⁹⁷

It might be proposed that Pisidia suffered a delayed reaction to external influences and a minimal reaction to external crises. Broughton comments on the early 3rd century inscriptions from Termessus which record build-

ings and foundations: "The dates of these indicate for Termessus also what seems to be general in Pisidia, that it gained compensation for its late development by keeping its prosperity for a while after other regions had begun to decline seriously."¹⁹⁸

It has already been pointed out that the development of certain cities such as Selge, Sagalassus and Termessus was not slow, either architecturally, or in terms of urbanisation or prosperity. Hellenistic buildings at these cities prove that urbanisation had begun in the district long before the Principate, and that craftsmanship in the region rivalled that of the coastal cities, which were much more open to architectural innovations and influences from the Hellenistic world. In constitutional terms, the situation is not so clear. As outlined in Chapter V,¹⁹⁹ nothing is known about the early organisation of Sagalassus, but there is reason to believe that Selge's constitution was on a par with that of the cities of the Pamphylian plain, and that Termessus was not far behind. Although it can be assumed, with reason, that, by the beginning of the Principate, many of the Pisidian settlements which emerged as cities were also fully urbanised and had regular civic constitutions, there is little evidence to prove that these developments had spread to all but a handful of Pisidian cities in the late Hellenistic period.

If one considers the coinage of the Pisidian cities, it can be seen that only Selge and Etenna issued in the early Hellenistic period. Selge's earliest coins can be dated to the 5th century BC,²⁰⁰ and Etenna's to the 4th century BC.²⁰¹ This suggests strong influence from the Hellenised cities of the Pamphylian plain. Apameia and Isinda issued in the 2nd century BC,²⁰² Cremna and Termessus produced their first coins in 100 BC,²⁰³ and a number of other cities issued autonomous coinage in the 1st century BC - Antiocheia, Conane, Parlais,

Comama, Pednelissus, Adada, Amblada, Malus, Andeda, Ceraitae and, possibly, Apollonia and Seleuceia Sidera.²⁰⁴ Sagalassus' first coins were issued under Amyntas.²⁰⁵ The majority of these cities, however, broke off coining before the beginning of the Principate and did not resume again until the 2nd century AD, when the cities which had not coined in the 1st century BC began to issue. Only Sagalassus, Antiocheia, Apollonia, Cremna, Comama, Ariassus, Isinda and Apameia coined during the reign of Augustus.

Autonomous coinage during the Hellenistic period and under the Republic can be seen as a sign of civic pride, emulation and, possibly, prosperity, but, from the beginning of the Principate, coinage seems to have been very much a reflection of central government fiscal pressure. How, then, do we interpret the apparently small number of coining cities in Pisidia during the 1st century AD? Does it mean that Pisidia was not considered ready or fully developed enough to cope with such an obligation? If so, it can be proposed that the abundance of coining cities in the 2nd and early 3rd centuries indicates that this was Pisidia's best period in all respects. The archaeological evidence would support this theory. The same, however, can be said for the Pamphylian cities, and although it is obvious that the 2nd century was a prosperous period for Pamphylia, this had no bearing on any tardiness in the 1st century. The development of Pamphylia as a whole had been fully realised by the 1st century AD. Still, it might be believed that, although many of the Pisidian cities were fully developed by the beginning of the Principate, and the development of others followed soon afterwards, it took time for Augustus' efforts to bring the district as a whole into line with the rest of the Empire.

Whether or not Pisidia retained its prosperity until a later date than that at which other regions are thought to have begun declining is also open to question, but there is no reason to suppose that this was any-

thing to do with a late development. The persistence of the Pisidian coinage well past the middle of the 3rd century cannot be taken as evidence for prolonged prosperity, but it does appear to indicate relative stability. A case, albeit hypothetical, has already been made out for relative economic stability in the highlands on the grounds that practised self-sufficiency, and its regularity, would have made the highland settlements less susceptible to general fluctuations in economic fortune, in particular to adverse changes in commercial prosperity. That Pisidia endured only isolated incidents of actual invasion in the 8th century and, as far as we know, was influenced only by fear and a feeling of insecurity at times when much of the rest of Asia Minor was being overrun by foreign armies, strengthens the theory of relative stability.

There is evidence for civic decline in the 3rd century, no more so than from the site of Cremna, but Cremna is atypical in that much of this decay can be assigned to a single episode, the siege of AD 278, which was out of the hands of the citizens. As there is no evidence for renovation, for extensive repair to whatever damage might have been caused during the course of the siege, however, it might be concluded that Cremna had lost much of the impetus for building that she had possessed during the 2nd and early 3rd century AD - that the first ecclesiastical building at Cremna was a converted structure might be significant. Also, municipal finances might have been low and government aid to rectify the damage might not have been excessive. The remodelling of the bath-house, despite the fact that it is a reflection of public ostentation, does, however, imply an element of decline at a date some 50 years before the siege, more so if the city had been relieved of its bath-house. Even if there was another bath-house in the city, which is highly plausible, the fact that this has left no recognisable trace shows that the remodelled bath-house must have been the finest in the

city, This element of decadence, however, cannot have been a deep-rooted or problematic condition, as Cremna was deemed capable of coining into the reign of Aurelian. Survey of more Pisidian sites might help to clarify the picture. Archaeological evidence from Termessus and Selge does not suggest any significant decline in the 3rd century, and epigraphic evidence from Antiocheia implies prosperity in the 4th century.

A further theory worth investigating is that urbanisation, in some respects, was an artificial imposition on the highlands, or that it was an aspect of civilisation which was adopted by some of the highland communities against their intrinsic nature, and that total assimilation of Pisidia into the Empire was never completely effected. There is insufficient evidence for confirmation, but circumstantial evidence suggests that the theory ought to be investigated more thoroughly.

Despite the improved conditions offered by new roads and commercial connections under the Principate, the highlands always remained geographically isolated from the rest of Asia Minor. This was a feature of Isauria, Lycia, and parts of Cilicia and Caria, as well as of much of Pisidia, and it is clear that Isauria in particular was far from being totally urbanised, and never became totally assimilated into the Empire. Cities in Isauria were few and far between, and the desire of the Isaurians for a separatist State as late as the 5th century indicates that they had never accepted Roman authority and regulations.

During the Hellenistic period, the development of the early Pisidian cities was conducted partially on individual lines. It is, of course, clear from the archaeology that some cities, such as Selge, Termessus and Sagalassus, aspired to the benefits of Hellenistic culture. The

desire of these cities to maintain their independence, however, is clear from the fact that many of the attempts to bring the highlands under control were antagonistic and military, successes often achieved only after resistance had been overcome. The claims of the cities to Greek origins and noble founders were made at a time when assimilation into the Empire seemed inevitable and virtually complete. A secondary reason for the establishment of the Augustan colonies may have been to bring completely under control not only the disruptive highland tribes, apparently Augustus' prime motive, but also the comparatively civilised settlements which, although they were not openly hostile, had generally been indifferent to the Roman cause. Cremna and Sandalium are two examples of highland settlements which were in fact still hostile during the second half of the 1st century BC. Cremna was in effect forced to accept Roman supremacy and, although later generations would have accepted this as a matter of course, there is still a case to be made out for the typical Pisidian fortress settlement to be more suited to the independent characteristics which it displayed before Roman rules and regulations were firmly established. The attempts to effect control of the highlands from the mid Principate by municipal and military police forces suggest that certain elements of Pisidian society had never conformed to Roman supremacy. This is supported by the edict of Justinian which orders the forceful repression of subversive activities because Pisidia possessed men who were just as brave as the Isaurians.²⁰⁶ If there is no evidence to be found at Cremna, apart from that of an ecclesiastical nature, for a post-AD 278 city with a similar degree of urbanisation as the former city, this might partly reflect that these elements of urbanisation were no longer considered necessary at Cremna. If the ecclesiastical lists are not deficient in their recording of the bishopric of Cremna, it may be significant that Cremna sent only one bishop to a Council meeting, in AD 787.

It is obvious that this hypothesis cannot be based on the ambiguous evidence from a single city site which may have been atypical of the general situation in Pisidia, and that the argument can certainly not be stretched to all settlements of Pisidia, but, as there does not seem to have been a 'general situation' and as the pattern of development and the topography within Pisidia is so varied, it is not necessary to abandon the theory merely for the reason that it cannot apply to all settlements in the district. If the theory has any merits, the decline of certain settlements in Pisidia should be given a different emphasis; there was decline in the respect that the urban splendour of the typical Graeco-Roman city was extinguished, but there was reversion to a character to which these settlements were more suited. It might then be argued that, when there was a general breakdown, or transformation, of the Roman urban centre, those settlements whose geographical circumstances precluded urbanisation as a completely natural phenomenon might more easily revert to a type of organisation for which they were more suited, affected relatively little by any adverse consequences that this might bring.

Cities to which this theory might not apply include Sagalassus, Selge, Antiocheia, Apollonia-Sozopolis and Apameia. The early importance and prosperity of these cities might have been partly a result of historical circumstances, partly a result of their early consolidation but also partly a result of their natural aptitude for adopting the essential aspects of an urbanised Graeco-Roman city. The same factors might have been responsible for the continued prestige of these cities which is indicated by their holding of the highest places in the hierarchy of bishoprics.

To conclude, it is obvious that the pattern of development in Pisidia was not synchronized, either within the district or with the rate of

development in other regions. Pisidia, like any other region of Asia Minor, shows signs of impoverishment and urban change during later Antiquity, but, as already pointed out in the preceeding chapter, there is seldom sufficient evidence to interpret urban transformation as a reflection of decadence exclusive of other factors, and insufficient evidence to indicate whether aspects of change were the result of external pressures or of local factors. It is obvious that a great deal of archaeological work has yet to be carried out in Pisidia, but, despite the limitations and the ambiguities of the archaeological evidence and the lack of documentary evidence, it is possible to sustain a theory for a delayed reaction to external influences and a minimal reaction to external crises, more so if we can accept that, during late Antiquity, there was a return to a primarily agrarian system, a decline in dependence on government aid, an appearance of smaller fortified settlements, a pattern of demographic movement from city to countryside and from lowlands to uplands, and a breakdown in urbanisation as it was known in the Graeco-Roman period. The underlying factor behind the probability of different reactions and of different lines of development was geographical.