

## The Roman Army in Pamphylia: From the Third to Sixth Centuries A.D.

Fatih ONUR\*

The Roman Army in Pamphylia between the third and sixth centuries has never been a single topic for any research so far, though it was certainly referred in part by several works, as will be mentioned below. The scarcity of specific military researches in Asia Minor was recently emphasized by Bennett, who wrote on the Roman Army in Lycia and Pamphylia in imperial times<sup>1</sup>. In the introduction to this paper, he rightly points out the lack of our knowledge on the Roman army relating to the eastern provinces, and this is due to the lack of a systematic research on this issue. This was also the case of Late Antiquity for Pamphylia. Materials related to military and administrative organization spread in various publications are collected in this paper which aims to see how the Roman Army acted in Pamphylia following the third century crisis, when Roman authority was challenged by economic, administrative and military instabilities until the reign of Anastasius (A.D. 491–518), who was finally able to create the peace by rejuvenating the army and imperial stability. Pamphylia has been selected as the region of focus, not only because the traces of the later Roman army can widely be found and many of the late Roman military operations in Asia Minor occurred in and around Pamphylia; but also there is new evidence to be examined.

When Late Antiquity, Pamphylia and the Roman army are in question together, we no doubt mainly talk about civil wars, power and economic conflicts of various groups, rebellions, gangs, and armed robbery – though there were a few external attacks like Persian and Gothic invasions –, which armies have had to deal with, throughout history. The mountainous regions of south and south-eastern Asia Minor have often been scenes for troubles in the age of the Roman, Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman Empires, and the modern Turkish Republic. The task of policing against such affairs happened to be a duty for the army, beside its main function of war abroad<sup>2</sup>. Following the third century crisis, increasing outbreaks of civil wars, frontier invasions and uprisings conducted by bandits (ἄρσται / *latrones*) like the Isaurian revolts in Asia Minor, present a decline of internal peace and central authority. It is usually accepted that the external military threats

---

\* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatih Onur; Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Antik Diller ve Kültürler Bölümü, Kampüs 07058 Antalya. E-mail: fatihonur@akdeniz.edu.tr

The present study is supported as a publication project by the Administrative Unit of Scientific Research Projects of Akdeniz University in Antalya, Turkey.

<sup>1</sup> Bennett 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Le Bohec 1994, 14-5.

didn't create the main reasons for instability within the empire, though they did effect the situation, but armies spread in different regions of the empire encountered an imperial instability<sup>3</sup>. From the midst of third century until the beginning of the sixth century, the Roman army made great efforts to ensure the local security and imperial authority in Asia Minor, and the Pamphylian borders are one of the most remarkable areas that have incessantly been the scene of local unrest. Pamphylia was affected by this disorder especially due to its closeness to Isauria and also the attractiveness for enemies of its important harbours situated on important trade routes and transporting goods in abundance to the interiors and its rich fertile plain.

Military organization and civil administration in Pamphylia shifted through the ages; it was once in the province of Galatia (until Vespasian)<sup>4</sup>, then was combined with Lycia, and later finally became a sole province (probably by the time of Diocletian). Its position in military organization also varies in the cycles of time, but it was, due to its importance, protected well all the time by auxiliaries, legionary detachments and legions.

<sup>3</sup> Cameron 1993, 5. For instance, in a period of only fifty years (235–284), there were almost twenty emperors, who claimed to have the rightful authority for throne.

<sup>4</sup> For Adak's detailed account on the issue see Şahin – Adak 2007, 85–93. In a recent festschrift, two inscriptions (A and B) from Perge were published (Özdizbay 2008, 858–62) and these inscriptions support the position of Şahin (1994b, 130; 1999, 31 and fn. 49) clearly showing that *Lycia et Pamphylia* was not established during the rules of Claudius and Nero. However, these published inscriptions require a revision, due to several mistakes. A short investigation of these inscriptions and a comparison made with some inscriptions published in *I.v. Perge* (IK 54) showed that these are the bottom sections of two known inscriptions from Perge. Inscription A reads that the honoree was *praefectus praetorio* during the reigns of Claudius and of Nero. This person can only be Sextus Afranius Burrus, who was the sole praetorian prefect from 50/1 to 61/2 and is well known from Suetonius (*Nero* 35.5), Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.42.1), Cassius Dio (61.3–4; 62.13.1–3) and from an inscription from Gallia Narbonensis (*CIL* XII 5842). The information related to this person was identified on a published fragment from Perge (*I.v. Perge* no. 222), further it is shown that Inscription A is the lower part of this already published Perge fragment. The honoree in Inscription B was a prefect in *ala Picentiana* and later became *procurator of provincia Galaticae et Pamphyliae* in the reigns of Claudius and Nero. The individual having these two qualifications was Lucius Pupius Praesens, who was honoured in Iconium (*CIG* 3991 = *IGR* III 263), and is known from a fragmentary inscription published in *I.v. Perge* no. 24. The dimensions and content of this fragmentary inscription entirely correspond with Inscription B. Therefore, Inscription B should be the lower part of *I.v. Perge* I, no. 24. Below are the revised editions of the inscriptions. For a detailed analysis of the inscriptions see the article "Two Latin Inscriptions from Perge" in *Gephyra* 5.

**No. 1: Plocamus honours Sextus Afranius Burrus  
(I.v. Perge no. 222)**

[Sex(to) Afranio] Sex(ti) f(ilio) Vol(tinia)  
[Burro, tr(ibuno) mil(itum), pro]curat(ori)  
[Augustae, procurat(ori)]  
4 [Ti(beri) Caesaris, procurat(ori)]  
Divi Claudii pro[vin]-  
ciae Galaticae [et]  
Pamphyliae, et pr[ae]-  
8 fecto praetori Di[vi]  
Claudi et Neronis  
Claudi Caesaris  
Aug(usti) Germanici,  
12 Ti(berius) Claudius Divi Clau-  
di l(ibertus) et sacerdos  
Plocamus, amico  
suo h(onoris) c(ausa).

**No. 2: Plocamus honours Lucius Pupius Praesens  
(I.v. Perge no. 24)**

L(ucio) Pupio L(ucii) f(ilio) Sab(atina) Prae-  
senti, trib(uno) milit(um), prae-  
fecto equitum alae  
4 [Pi]centianae, proc[ur]-  
[ator] Divi Claudii  
[et Ne]ronis Claudii  
[Caes]aris Aug(usti) Germa-  
8 [nici] provinciae Ga-  
laticae et Pamphy-  
liae et a loricata,  
Ti(berius) Claudius Divi Clau-  
12 di l(ibertus) et sacerdos Plo-  
camus, amico suo  
h(onoris) c(ausa).

## Administration of Pamphylia in Late Antiquity

It is known that the province of *Lycia et Pamphylia* survived until the beginning of 4<sup>th</sup> century. However, several discussions have been continuing on the administrative centre of this joint province. Usually the prominent contending cities for the capital are Perge, Side and Patara. Pamphylia, as a province which had already held Roman officials for long and had the substructure of a Roman administration, is naturally expected to have held this seat. In Pamphylia, Perge seems to have been the city, for which the evidence suggests its importance exceeded the other important cities of *Lycia et Pamphylia*<sup>5</sup>.

In the late third and early fourth centuries, there were remarkable changes in administration. Diocletian, when he re-arranged the administrative structure of the empire, increased the number of provinces by splitting them<sup>6</sup>. One of the aims of the provincial partitions of Diocletian was to reduce the risk of military rebels, beside the segregation of civil and military responsibilities<sup>7</sup>. During this procedure, the exact date for the split of Lycia and Pamphylia couldn't be determined clearly so far. Lycia and Pamphylia were arguably attested together on an inscription of 312 from Arycanda, though the section, where "Lycia" was supposed to have existed, is restored by the editors<sup>8</sup>. Another attestation is a rescript of 313, which Eusebius, *praeses Lyciae et Pamphyliae*, received from Constantine the Great<sup>9</sup>. These are the latest attestations for the appearance of Lycia and Pamphylia together. The certain attestations where Lycia and Pamphylia mentioned separately are in the Nicene subscriptions of ca. 325 and in the *Notitiae Episcopatum*<sup>10</sup>. In the Verona List (ca. 310–320) Pamphylia was recorded as a single entry, but this time Lycia does not appear in the list.<sup>11</sup> The earliest epigraphic attestation of Lycia as a single province comes from a milestone, dated ca. 333–337, set up by *praeses* Aurelius Fabius Faustinus and found in Choma.<sup>12</sup> Libanius reported Lycia and Pamphylia in his letters separately in 350s.<sup>13</sup> Scholars have slightly different opinions while trying to picture the case of the province with these evidences. Barnes considers that the appearance of Lycia and Pamphylia separately in Nicene records is anachronistic and separation of the province had not yet occurred at those times. Besides, he believes that the appearance of Pamphylia without Lycia in the Verona List may be an omission of Lycia or meaning that Pamphylia comprised Lycia as well.<sup>14</sup> Brandt accepts that the split was done sometime between 311 and 325.<sup>15</sup> Nollé thought that the division was between 311/313 and 333/337, more probably

<sup>5</sup> Haensch 1997, 293 (for an account on the seat of government, see the section of "Lycia et Pamphylia" in pages 290-297).

<sup>6</sup> Lact. *Mors. Pers.* 7.4: provinciae quoque in frusta concisae

<sup>7</sup> Jones 1964, 45.

<sup>8</sup> TAM II 785 (= CIL 3.12132): ... παρὰ τοῦ | [τῶν Λυκίων καὶ Π]ανφύλων ἔθνους...; Şahin 1994a, 12-16, no. 12: ... παρὰ τοῦ | [τῶν ὑμετέρων Λυκίων καὶ Π]ανφύλων ἔθνους ...

<sup>9</sup> *Cod. Theod.* XIII 10.2 (= *Cod. Just.* XI 49.1). The name of Licinnius seems to have been omitted at the beginning of the law, however he was mentioned at the end as one of the consuls of the year.

<sup>10</sup> *Not. Ep.* (Darrouzès): e.g. 1.24 and 30, 2.23 and 29.

<sup>11</sup> *Verona List*: Asiana, Phanfilia (in: Barnes 1982, Part III Ch. XII, 206).

<sup>12</sup> Bean – Harrison 1967, 44, no. 11; *PLRE I* 328. s.v. Aurelius Fabius Faustinus 10.

<sup>13</sup> Libanius, *Epistulae* 366.3.3-5: ἐκεῖνον λέγω τὸν Φιλίππῳ παρεδρεῦσαντα, τὸν Λυκίαν θεραπεύσαντα, τὸν Παμφυλίαν σεσωκότα, τὸν κυβερνήσαντα Κύπρον.

<sup>14</sup> Barnes 1982, 219.

<sup>15</sup> Brandt 1992, 169

before 325.<sup>16</sup> Hellenkemper and Hild also believed that the split was after 312 because of the inscription from Arycanda and the rescript of 313, they also accepted that Pamphylia in the Verona List should be the shortened form of a joint province.<sup>17</sup> Bennett also seems to have believed that the province of Lycia and Pamphylia remained intact until at least 314/5–324.<sup>18</sup> Şahin approached to the issue with new, relatively more secure attestations and stated that the process of splitting the province should have started before 305.<sup>19</sup> His assertion is based on two inscriptions dedicated to Galerius and Constantius by *praeses provinciae Pamphyliae* Marcus Ulpius Urbanus in Perge. The crux in these inscriptions is the mention of the province of Pamphylia alone, namely without Lycia. Considering the title “Caesar” (of both Galerius and Constantius), the inscriptions should date before 305. In this puzzling case, he suggested that Pamphylia, as a province, might have incorporated Lycia. This is also an explanation for the absence of Lycia in the Verona List that seems to be confirmed by these inscriptions. In addition, Şahin states that the rescript of 313 in codices may be an exception, even a corrupt one, since the majority of the documents relating to the issue say that this split must have been initiated by Diocletian. After all, for now the evidence indicates that the province of Pamphylia seems to have been officially organized by the time of Diocletian, and the lands of Lycia, which might have been organized as a single province at a later date (ca. 330?), were presumably incorporated.

For the administrative situation of Pamphylia in the fourth and the fifth centuries, the most informative source is still the *Notitia Dignitatum*, which dates arguably from 397–427. In this source, the consular province of Pamphylia appears to have belonged to the diocese of Asiana established under the *praefectus praetorio per Orientem*.<sup>20</sup> A change was made in 472, when Leo I established new military command centres under *comes*, amongst which was Pamphylia.<sup>21</sup> From this point onwards a *comes* for Pamphylia was inducted, meaning that a military headquarter was established under a count. An inscription indicates that he resided in Side by the time of Zeno<sup>22</sup>. However, in the list of Hierocles, Pamphylia seems to have kept its consular status at least until early seventh century.<sup>23</sup>

### The Situation of Pamphylia in Roman Military Organization between the Third and Sixth Centuries A.D.

The military evidences for Pamphylia are acquired mostly from historical narratives, then different sources, such as inscriptions and coins. Pamphylia, as a land that accommodated Roman armies throughout history, was considered amongst the *inermes provinciae*

<sup>16</sup> Nollé 1993, 134.

<sup>17</sup> Hellenkemper – Hild 2004, 109.

<sup>18</sup> Bennett 2007, 134.

<sup>19</sup> Şahin 2004, 7-10 nos. 287 and 288.

<sup>20</sup> *Not. Dig. Or.* I 65 (Consulares...Per Asianam tres: Pamfyliae...), II 31 (dioceses...Asianae decem: Pamfylia ...), XXIV 12 (Sub dispositione viri spectabilis vicarii dioceseos Asianae provinciae ...: Pamfylia), II 4 (Sub dispositione viri illustris praefecti praetorio per Orientem sunt dioceses infrascriptae: ... Asiana ... ); *Lat. Ver.* III 2 (Dioecensis Asiana habet provincias numero IX: Panfilia...); For a comparison of lists see Jones 1964, 381-391 (Appendix III: Dioceses and Provinces).

<sup>21</sup> *Cod. Just.* 12.59.10: ... officii virorum spectabilium comitum Aegypti, Pamphyliae, Isauriae, Lycaoniae et Pisidiae; Jones (1964, 224 and 609) or others following him (i.e. Brandt 1992, 197-8) assert that these were certainly against Isaurians regardless the fact that there was no “increasing depredation” of Isaurians in this period and in 470s they had already occupied many high imperial posts.

<sup>22</sup> Nollé 2001, 492-6 no. 171.

<sup>23</sup> Hierocles 680.

of the Roman imperial age.<sup>24</sup> As was emphasized, this did not mean that province was unarmed totally, but it was garrisoned by auxiliary forces.<sup>25</sup>

In the third century, Pamphylia continued to play vital roles of logistics, such as in the times of Valerian and Gallien (253–268) for the eastern campaigns. Perge, the most remarkable city of Pamphylia, had a great military importance. An inscription<sup>26</sup> erected in the agora of Perge reveals that the city was honoured with an imperial temple by Valerian (253–260), and awarded with the title of metropolis by Tacitus (275–276). These honours indicate the military importance of the city where probably the office of the imperial war chest (ὁ θησαυρὸς τοῦ κυρίου) was centred along with the military headquarters by the reign of Tacitus. She hosted the sacred *vexillum* (ἱερῶ οὐξίλλω τετειμημένη), probably a detachment of the imperial army escorting to the emperor Tacitus,<sup>27</sup> when Roman armies fought against Gothic tribes (e.g. Heruli and Meotidae), who plundered Asia Minor from Pontus to Cilicia.<sup>28</sup> On one coin of Perge from the reign of Gallien (253–268) is a *vexillum* and legend of IEPON OYIEIAON<sup>29</sup> and on a coin of Perge of Valerian appear two legion eagles at both sides of the Temple of Artemis,<sup>30</sup> clearly depicting her military capacity. However, these honours also seem as an indication of a certain helplessness of the emperors, who were no longer able to compensate the needs of cities for their achievements due to financial inadequacy and therefore increased the honours granted at least in order to satisfy their prestige.<sup>31</sup> For instance, the port of Side gained a greater significance (especially after the pillage of Cilician harbours during Persian invasion of 260) for the transportation of *annona militaris* and soldiers to Syria, Egypt and Cyprus.<sup>32</sup> After nine years, when the city was besieged by Goths, Side was still able to resist against them successfully thanks to its city walls of good condition and its brave citizens.<sup>33</sup>

During the principate, auxiliary troops were regularly stationed in Pamphylia: the *Cobors I Flavia Numidarum* was in Perge in the second and third centuries;<sup>34</sup> the *Cobors Apula Civium Romanum* resided in Side in the 1<sup>st</sup> century<sup>35</sup>, the *Cobors I Hispanorum*, *Cobors IV Raetorum*, *Cobors I Musulamiorum* were also stationed in Pamphylia.<sup>36</sup> It is

<sup>24</sup> Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11; *ibid.* 2.81-82; *ibid.* 3.15; Sherk 1955, 400-1; Bennett 2007, 134-5. Even though “*inermes provinciae*” literally means “*unprotected provinces*”, it should be understood as the provinces that were not protected by legions, but auxiliaries.

<sup>25</sup> For the military forces at Pamphylia in early empire, see: Sherk 1955, 401-3; Bennett 2007, 136-43.

<sup>26</sup> Kaygusuz 1984; *SEG* 34 (1984) 1306; Nollé 1986, 199-202; Merkelbach – Şahin 1988, 115 no. 22; *BE* 1989, 70; Roueché 1989; Weiss 1991; Şahin 2004, 50-8 and no. 331.

<sup>27</sup> cf. Haensch 1997, 290 and fn. 167; Kaygusuz 1984, 3; Brandt 1992, 160; Mitchell 1993, 238; Foss 1996, 14-6; Şahin 2004, 2.

<sup>28</sup> *SHA* 13.2; Zosimus 1.63.1

<sup>29</sup> *NC* 1968, 31, no. 10 pl. 10, 10 (R. E. Hecht). *Vexilla* are depicted on other coins from Perge under Gallienus e.g. *BMC* 138, no.92, pl. xxv. 3; *SNG* von Aulock 4743.

<sup>30</sup> *SNG* von Aulock 4723-4

<sup>31</sup> cf. Stauner 2006, 37.

<sup>32</sup> Nollé 1993, 94; Mitchell 1993, 238; Stauner 2006, 35.

<sup>33</sup> Nollé 1993, 95.

<sup>34</sup> Bean 1965, no. 105 (= *CIL* XVI 128 = *AE* 1966, 459); cf. Grosso 1964, 548-50; Eck 1972, 429-36; Roxan 1978, no. 67 (a diploma from Nicopolis ad Istrum); Nollé 1986, 199-202; Şahin 1999, 185-6 no. 156; *FdX VII*, 5; Stauner 2004, 404 no. 376; Şahin 2004, 55; Bennett 2007, 141-3.

<sup>35</sup> Bean 1965, 57 no. 155; Speidel 1976, 339-41; Bennett 2007, 137-9.

<sup>36</sup> Bennett 2007, 136-41.

also worth mentioning that near Perge is a *mithraeum*,<sup>37</sup> though Mithraism is recently considered not necessarily as a “soldier religion”,<sup>38</sup> it is well known that Mithras was one of the popular gods worshipped by soldiers.<sup>39</sup>

During the Dominate legions replaced the auxiliaries. The known legions around Pamphylia are the *I-II-III Isaura* and *I-II Armeniaca*. The Isaura legions were conjectured to be possibly created at the time of Probus (276–282) and stationed in Isauria, while the Armenian legions were shifted into Isauria in the late fourth century, and their purpose was no doubt mainly to secure the region against Isaurian mountain brigands.<sup>40</sup> In the *Notitia Dignitatum*, *II* and *III Isaura* were shown under the *comes* of Isauria, who appears to be directly responsible to the Emperor, while *I Isaura* is under the *magister militum per orientem* as a legion of *pseudocomitatenses*, likewise *I Armeniaca*.<sup>41</sup> *Legio I Pontica* is also attested in an inscription of 288 from Colybrassus, a city in the eastern end of Pamphylia.<sup>42</sup> Some inscriptions from Arycanda in Lycia and Termessus record the praetorian officer M. Aur. Ursio and the praetorian prefect Ulpius Silvinus.<sup>43</sup> These indicate the presence of the Praetorian Guard presumably in Pamphylia at Perge or at Side at the end of the third century.<sup>44</sup>

In the fourth century (354/5), Ammianus (14.2.10) reports that some legions wintered in Side and these were considered as Isaurian legions,<sup>45</sup> however Nollé believes that Ammianus mentions the legions incorrectly.<sup>46</sup> Another inscription from Casae shows that in the eastern border of Pamphylia a military base existed.<sup>47</sup> This inscription was tentatively dated in the reign of Leo by Bean and Mitford, who use the law of 472 recorded in *Codex Justinianus* (12.59.10) that mentions newly created ducates in frontiers and *comites* of Pamphylia, Lycaonia and Pisidia.<sup>48</sup> However, Feissel suggests that the inscription is probably from the reign of Zeno.<sup>49</sup> So there was a *comes pamphylicae*, whose residence was attested in Side by the time of Zeno (see fn. 22), at most from the age of Leo I onwards.

<sup>37</sup> Şahin (1999, 278-80, no. 248) published an inscription found in front of the cave of *mithraeum* and dedicated to *Helios Mithras* by Marcus Luccius Crispus (Ἡλῖω Μίθρα[ρ] | Μάρκος Λούκιος Κρίσπος | ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱερᾶς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου Περγα[ίων] | εὐξάμενο[ς] καθιέρωσεν μετὰ τῶν τέκνων)

<sup>38</sup> Stoll (2007, 468-9) claims that Mithras' cult was not transferred from east to west and not a major religion in the terms of the military since amongst the soldier worshippers less than 20 percent were adherents of Mithraism. On the cult of Mithras see: Vermaseren 1956 – 1960; Merkelbach 1984; Claus 1990.

<sup>39</sup> For instance, *RIB* 1546 = *CSIR* I.6.122; *RIB* 1544 = *CSIR* I.6.121; *RIB* 1545 = *CSIR* I.6.123.

<sup>40</sup> Ritterling 1925, 1348 and 1468 (Isaura legions); *ibid.* 1356 and 1456 (Armeniaca legions). A certain Eusebius, the prefect of the legion I Armeniaca under *comes Isauriae* Matronianus, was attested in Isauria through a Sea-wall inscription in Anemurium (Alföldy-Rosenbaum 1972; *cf.* Jones 1972) and a rescript of 382 recorded in both Code of Theodisianus and Justinianus was addressed to the same Matronianus (*Cod. Theod.* 9.27.3 = *Cod. Just.* 9.27.1).

<sup>41</sup> *Not. Dig.* Or. VII 49, 50 and 56 (I - II Armeniaca and I Isaura sagittaria): Sub dispositione viri illustris magistri militum per Orientem ... pseudocomitatenses ... Prima Armeniaca. Secunda Armeniaca ... Prima Isaura sagittaria; *ibid.* Or. XXIX 7 and 8 (II and III Isaura): Sub dispositione viri spectabilis comitis rei militaris per Isauriam et praesidis: Legio secunda Isaura. Legio tertia Isaura.

<sup>42</sup> Bean – Mitford 1970, 76-7 no. 50 revised by Gilliam (1974); Lenski 1999a, 421.

<sup>43</sup> Şahin 1994, no. 26 (Arycanda, M. Aur. Ursio); *TAM* III 126 (Termessus, Ulpius Silvinus).

<sup>44</sup> Mitchell 1999, 166.

<sup>45</sup> Feld 2005, 141.

<sup>46</sup> Nollé 1993, 136.

<sup>47</sup> Bean – Mitford 1970, 51.31; Hagel – Tomaschitz 1998, 139-143 no. 5.

<sup>48</sup> Bean – Mitford 1970, 52.

<sup>49</sup> Feissel 2004, 288 and 303.

Finally, we are informed by an Anastasian Edict from Perge that there were legions stationed in Pamphylia.<sup>50</sup>

This unpublished Anastasian inscription of Perge contains a list that tells the numbers of soldiers and their salaries, and was sent to the legionary units in Pamphylia. The number of soldiers given in this *notitia* is large enough to present a double unit. One can think that the units in question might have been the imperial legions under praesental order, i.e. *legiones palatinae*,<sup>51</sup> due to geographical situation of Pamphylia and presence of *magister militum praesentalis* at this time in the region to deal with the Isaurians. Anyhow, the unit was headquartered in Side and Perge, and its detachments (*vexillationes*) should have also been spread in various places. Even though the types of legions cannot directly be derived from the inscription, a report from Theophanes gives us a noteworthy scene from the year of 493. In his narrative, *comes scholarum* Diogenes captured the city of Claudiopolis (Mut), but later his army was besieged in the city by Isaurians. The *Magister militum praesentalis* Flavius Ioannes having passed the narrows of Tauroi and taken the “guards” with himself, rescued the army of Diogenes from the siege.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, it is clear that the palatine units stayed in the region around and in Isaurian territory at least from 492 to 498, so that Ioannes was able to lift the siege of Claudiopolis quickly. So most probably, the legions mentioned in the Perge inscription, stationed in Pamphylian plain to stand against the Isaurian unrest that continued until 498, were among *legiones palatinae*.

## Isaurian Brigandage and Pamphylia

All those armies happened to be there mainly for internal security, namely mostly against Isaurian raids. Pamphylia has a large rich plain to the west of the Isaurian Mountains, so, it was an attractive and easily accessible region for pillage by brigands. These conditions made Pamphylia the most affected region from Isaurian raids and also these large troops sent by central authority often resided in Pamphylia and were supplied via its cities.

After the dubious victories of Severus Alexander in Isauria,<sup>53</sup> the age of Probus saw several military actions in Pamphylia and Pisidia. The Isaurian revolt under the leadership of Palfuerius Lydius threatened the lands of Pamphylia and Lycia.<sup>54</sup> Ritterling, basing his argument on this incident, conjectures that the legions of *I, II* and *III Isaura* were gathered in this era.<sup>55</sup> Palfuerius Lydius, who captured the city of Cremna, encountered Terentius

<sup>50</sup> Though the inscription's edition is currently in progress by the author of this paper, a thesis was completed mainly on the law texts of the reform (F. Onur, *Sermo Militaris Imperatoris Anastasii. Pamphylia-Perge'den Ele Geçmiş olan Anastasius Yazıtı*. Akdeniz University, Antalya 2007). The inscription was reported in: İnan 1983, 17-8; Şahin 1988, 255-6; Mitchell 1990, 120; Brandt 1992, 197-8.

<sup>51</sup> *Not. Dig.* Or. VI 26-47: ... Sub dispositione viri illustris magistri militum praesentalis (II):... Legiones palatinae sex: ... Matiarum seniores, Daci, Scythae, Primani, Undecimani, Lanciarum iuniores.

<sup>52</sup> Theophanes 138.24-26: ... πλὴν Ἰωάννης ὁ Κυρτὸς ὑπερβὰς τὰ στενὰ τοῦ Ταύρου καὶ τοὺς φύλακας ἐλῶν, αἰφνιδίως αὐτοῖς ἐπιστὰς διέφθειρε τὸ στράτευμα τῶν πολιορκούντων, ἐπεξεληθόντος καὶ Διογένους; *PLRE* II 617, s.v. Fl. Iohannes *qui et* Gibbus 93 and 362, s.v. Diogenianus 4.

<sup>53</sup> Syme (1967, ch.9 and 1971, 277) claims that the victories attributed to Severus Alexander in *SHA* (58.1) are invented by the author.

<sup>54</sup> Zosimus 1.69.1.1-12; *SHA*, Probus 16-17.

<sup>55</sup> Ritterling 1925, 1348 and 1468 (II Isaura). The main information relating to these legions comes from *Notitia Dignitatum*. II and III Isaura were under *Comes Per Isauriam* (Occ. XXIX: Sub dispositione viri spectabilis comitis rei militaris per Isauriam et praesidis: Legio secunda Isaura. Legio tertia Isaura), while I Isaura was under

Marcianus, *praeses* of Lycia and Pamphylia and commander of the Roman units around 278/9.<sup>56</sup> It is also attested that Roman forces requested support for the battle in Cremna from some cities in Lycia.<sup>57</sup> This revolt even extended to the territories of Termessus. A status transition of Trebenna can be traced from an inscription, which by M. Aurelius Torquatus, an ex-Lyciarch, honoured Terentius Marcianus.<sup>58</sup> The city here appears as a *colonia* (ἡ λαμπρὰ Τρεβεννατῶν κολωνεία), while the same Torquatus was honoured by the *polis* of Trebenna (ἡ λαμπρὰ Τρεβεννατῶν πόλις) in another unpublished inscription.<sup>59</sup> The status *colonia* shows that Trebenna should have been given a military character by the time of Terentius Marcianus due to this unrest, apparently in tune with *Historia Augusta*, which records that Probus brought the region under control by placing veterans on mountainous areas.<sup>60</sup> Here, it is also worth mentioning that an ossuary, presumably from the third century and belonging to a veteran was discovered in the lower necropolis of Trebenna.<sup>61</sup> An inscription from Colybrassus, a city on the western borders of Cilicia, shows that *Legio I Pontica* was stationed there in 288 (see fn. 42). Some suggested that the presence of this legion at this time may refer to security actions after the uprising of Lydius.<sup>62</sup> Others rightly believe that this existence is related to different incidents, which might have been invasions or larger threats.<sup>63</sup> In fact, if this legion was, even temporarily, here, it would have been the fourth legion in the region, besides the three Isauria legions. The Praetorian Guard also seems to have involved in the rebellion led by Lydius according to some inscriptions (see fn. 43) and it was presumably stationed at Perge or at Side<sup>64</sup>

Isaurian invasions continued in the fourth century. The years of 354, 369 and 375 saw great uprisings, which affected Pamphylia. In 354, the depredation of Isaurians increased, following the execution of Isaurian hostages in the games of the amphitheatre at Iconium.<sup>65</sup> During this uprising, as Ammianus narrated (14.2), Isaurians fearing Lycaonian reaction crept into Pamphylia, “which had long been free from wars and bandits” (though it was 75–80 years previously that the last known clash occurred), but still fortified strongly. However, they were able to reach the craggy banks of the river Melas (Manavgat Çayı), intending to pillage the region. Though they wished to cross the river for their purpose, they were hindered by the deep river. Then the “legions” wintering in

---

*Magister Militum per Orientem* (Occ. VII: Sub dispositione viri illustris magistri militum per Orientem:... Item pseudocomitatenses XI: ... Prima Isaura sagittaria).

<sup>56</sup> For the Cremna siege of 278/279 see: Mitchell 1989; idem 1995, 177-218; idem 1999; For the inscriptions of Terentius Marcianus, *praeses provinciae Lyciae Pamphyliae* / ἡγεμῶν Λυκίας Παμφυλίας, see: idem 1989, 320-323 (Cremna); idem 1995, 209 (Cremna); *TAM* III 89 = *IGRR* III 434 (Termessos); Paribeni-Romanelli 1914, 214 no. 152 = *AE* (1915) 53 (Trebenna); Horsley-Mitchell 2000, 47-9 no. 15 ; *PLRE* I 557, s.v. Terentius Marcianus 22. For a detailed account on Palfuerius Lydus see : Feld 2005, 128-32.

<sup>57</sup> Harrison 2001, 57-60 (on the town of Ovacık), 87-112 (Three Inscriptions from Ovacık by M. Balance and C. Roueché). Two of these inscriptions (nos. II and III) were previously published by İplikçioğlu (in İplikçioğlu – Çelgin – Çelgin 1992, nos. 2 and 4). However, Zimmerman (1996, 267-8) revised the inscriptions and presented a proper reading and commentary relating to the events of uprisings and Cremna siege in the reign of Probus; Mitchell 1999, 161-2.

<sup>58</sup> Paribeni – Romanelli 1914, 214 no. 152; Onur 2005, 18 no. 8.

<sup>59</sup> For more information on the Trebenna and rebellion, see: Onur 2005, 15-6.

<sup>60</sup> *SHA* 16.4-17.

<sup>61</sup> Onur 2005, 16.

<sup>62</sup> Gilliam 1974, 186-7.

<sup>63</sup> Lenski 1999a, 421 fn. 31; Feld 2005, 93.

<sup>64</sup> Mitchell 1999, 166

<sup>65</sup> Amm. Marc. 14.2.1



Side<sup>66</sup> prompted and counteracted the bandits, who were wedged between Melas and legionary forces. Obviously the Isaurians met the upper Melas in a lofty place and “legions” in Side must have crossed the river first to the east then rushed to the north to catch the bandits.<sup>67</sup> In 367, the Isaurians again rose in a rebellion that affected Cilicia and Pamphylia greatly.<sup>68</sup> After the usurpation of Procopius, who was of Isaurian origin<sup>69</sup>, the military deployment in the region weakened from 365 onwards, especially because of the problems on the Persian frontiers<sup>70</sup> and Valens was not able to send troops to the region because of the war on the Danube, both of which eased the raids of Isaurians.<sup>71</sup> The *Vicarius Asiae* Musonius, when he heard that Isaurians had again indulged in savagery whilst Roman soldiers were “*spending their time in luxury and inertness*”, took *diogmitae* (local militants) with him and marched to the region. However, he and his men were slain by an ambush laid in a defile, probably in Pamphylia.<sup>72</sup> After this victory, Isaurians broadened the range of their raids and continued their pillaging until the *comes rei militaris* Saturninus intervened.<sup>73</sup> The same Saturninus fought against Isaurians one more time because of another revolt in 375, which this time reached Lycia beside Pamphylia.<sup>74</sup>

Following the defeat of 378 in Adrianople and the loss of soldiers in large quantities, Goths started pillaging in the Balkans and in Asia Minor under Tribigild.<sup>75</sup> This situation in the East, whose army was destroyed at Adrianople, encouraged the Isaurians to create disturbance on neighbouring lands. Besides, the imperial forces in Isauria declined due to the battles against Maximinus in 388 and Eugenius in 394.<sup>76</sup> So, Pamphylia was again under incursions, especially between 396 and 408. Fravitta, who was *comes Isauriae* according to some while *magister militum per Orientem* according to others (probably the latter) between 396 and 400,<sup>77</sup> was charged with suppressing the raids. He was able to

<sup>66</sup> Nollé (1993, 136): „Im Winter 353/4 unternahmen sie einen Überfall auf Side, der jedoch von größeren militärischen Einheiten –Ammianus spricht, vielleicht unrichtig, von ‚Legionen‘-, die bei Side überwinterten, zurückgeschlagen wurde“.

<sup>67</sup> The uprising didn't end. After gaining their strength back, they attacked several wealthy cities and blockaded a store in Palea, where supplies were kept for troops securing the frontier. After this futile siege, they attacked to the capital, Seleuceia. It was a hard experience for the Roman army under *comes* Castricius (see. *PLRE I* 186, s.v. Castricius 1), whose number of soldiers was less than Isaurian invaders. Eventually, with the aid of troops collected by *comes Orientis* Nebridius (see. *PLRE I* 619, s.v. Nebridius 1), who was prompted by Gallus Caesar, they were suppressed (Amm. Marc. 14.2.8-17). Legions of *Armeniaca I-II* should have come here by this time (Woods 1998, 112).

<sup>68</sup> Amm. Marc. 27.9.6-7.

<sup>69</sup> *PLRE I* 742-3, s.v. Procopius 4.

<sup>70</sup> Feld 2005, 146.

<sup>71</sup> Lenski 1999, 311; Lenski 1999b, 423.

<sup>72</sup> cf. Feld 2005, 148.

<sup>73</sup> Saturninus appear in texts of Basilius as κόμης and στρατιάρχης. Basilius *Ep.* 132.6-8: ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διάγειν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ αἰδεσιμωτάτου Σατορνίνου τοῦ κόμητος.; Basilius *Mir.* 13.1-2: στρατιάρχης τις ἦν, τούτῳ δὲ ὄνομα Σατορνίλος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ γεννάδας οὗτος Σατορνίλος; *PLRE I* 807-8, s.v. Flavius Saturninus 10. This Saturninus was identified with Στρατιάρχης Σατορνίλος in *Mir.* 13 by Dagron (1978, 117).

<sup>74</sup> Zosimus 4.20.1-2: Ἴσαυροι ... τὰς ἐν Λυκίᾳ καὶ Παμφυλίᾳ πόλεις ἐπόρθουν, τειχῶν μὲν κρατεῖν οὐ δυνάμενοι, τὰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὑπαίθροις ἅπαντα διαρπάζοντες; Lenski (1999a) successfully dated the uprising in 375 on the basis of the evidences from Basilius.

<sup>75</sup> Zosimus 5.14-15.

<sup>76</sup> Woods 1998, 112.

<sup>77</sup> Eunapius (Dindorf, *HGM*) 1.264.15 = Suda Φ 681: Φράβιθος. οὗτος στρατηγὸς ἦν τῆς ἀνατολῆς; *PLRE I* 372-3, s.v. Flavius Fravitta; Woods 1998, 117 (*comes Isauriae*); Feld 2005, 96 and 355 (List 2) (*magister militum per Orientem*).

pacify the region in 400 successfully, as Eunapius reported with an exaggeration that *the word “banditry” fell from the memories of people*.<sup>78</sup> Hierax, who executed Fravitta, became *praeses* of Pamphylia in 403/4. According to Eunapius, he destroyed Pamphylia more than the Isaurians did during Fravitta’s time of office.<sup>79</sup> Finally he was arrested and fined 4000 *solidi* by the *vicarius Asiae* Herennianus, who was of Lycian origin.<sup>80</sup> Then, the Isaurians directed their raids to the east, even unto Jerusalem. This time, a certain Arbazacius was appointed as the commander of the Roman armies to deal with the revolt, because he had grown up in Isauria and was acquainted with the region.<sup>81</sup> He probably took the legions of *Armenica I* and *II* legions with him back to Isauria to overcome the brigandage.<sup>82</sup> In 404, Arbazacius defeated the Isaurians, who plundered the Pamphylian territory. Zosimus reported that he pursued the bandits, who fled back to mountains, and captured many of their villages killing many of bandits.<sup>83</sup>

### The Nature of Isaurian Brigandage

Armed banditry and gangs in Asia Minor were always a real threat and a very important factor for the insecurity in the provinces. Cilicia – later Isauria – was the most famous regions for brigandage and piracy. The Roman answer was mostly to send major forces in order to repress the dangers, since Roman authority was threatened. One can suggest several reasons for the occurrence of banditry in Asia Minor. Firstly, though there were Hellenized tribes, there were also semi-nomadic people, so that Banditry was a source of income for most people. The lack of agriculture led people to keep their tradition of armed robbery in order to provide for their life; and secondly Anatolia has a mountainous topography, hence law and order was not upheld to the same degree in the cities of the plain, at least in the early imperial time and after the third century.<sup>84</sup> Nevertheless, those

<sup>78</sup> Eunapius 1.264.20-22: δς τοὺς ληστὰς ῥαδίως συνείλεν, ὥστε μικροῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ληστείας ἐκ τῆς μνείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκπεσεῖν; Zosimus 5.20.15-9: τούτῳ τοῖνυν ἤδη πολλαῖς διαπρέψαντι στρατηγίαις, καὶ τὴν ἔψαν ἅπασαν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας ἄχρι Φοινίκης καὶ Παλαιστίνης τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ληστῶν λύμης ἐλευθερώσαντι, παραδεδώκασι τὰς δυνάμεις; By 400, Fravitta left the region for Cherronesos in order to suppress the uprising of Gainas (*PLRE I* 379-80, s.v. Gainas). Next year he was awarded with consulate, but the empress Eudoxia took a stand against him, who accused Ioannes (*PLRE II* 593-4, Ioannes 1) of sowing seeds of discord between Arcadius and Honorius. After that, Fravitta was executed in 403/4 by Hierax, who supported Ioannes.

<sup>79</sup> Eunapius 1.268.8-15: Παμφυλία γοῦν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰσαυρικῶν πολέμων πορθουμένη χρυσὸν ἐνόμισε τὰς Ἰσαυρικὰς συμφορὰς ... Ἰέραξ, οὕτω πάντα ἀνερευνησάμενος καὶ συναρπάσας ἀθρόως ἐπὶ τῷ Φραβίθου φόνῳ; *PLRE II* 556, s.v. Hierax 1.

<sup>80</sup> *PLRE II* 546, s.v. Herennianus; Eunapius 1.268.18-21: ὁ Λύκιος Ἐρεννιανὸς βικάριος ὦν· ἀετὸς δὲ γενόμενος αὐτὸν συνήρπασε τὸν Ἰέρακα, καὶ μόλις ἀφήκεν, εἰ μὴ τετρακισχιλίους ἐκεῖνος αὐτῷ χρυσοῦς ἀπέτισεν.

<sup>81</sup> *PLRE II* 127-8, s.v. Arbazacius 1; Feld (2005, 170) suggested that his Isaurian connection was due to his father, who was stationed in Isauria. The position of Arbazacius is not very clear. Zosimus (5.25.2.5) describes him as only στρατηγός, while Marcellinus Comes (a.c. 405) mentioned him as only *legatus*. Ridley (1970, 93, no.21) accepted him as *magister militum*. Woods (1998, 113-7), who claimed that he commanded the Armenian legions (the conclusion of his survey on ἐξ Ἀρμενίας in Eunapius), presents him as *comes rei militaris* of Armenian legions before he was sent to Isauria and after then as *comes Isauriae* and rejects the idea of *magister militum per Orientem*, while finally Feld (2005, 355, list 2) listed him as “*comes (Isauriae?)*”.

<sup>82</sup> Woods 1998, 114; Feld 2005, 170.

<sup>83</sup> Eunapius 1.267.3-5: Ἀρβαζάκιος Ἰσαυρος, ἐπὶ Ἀρκαδίῳ τοῦ βασιλέως, ὃν Ἀρπαζάκιον ἐκάλουον διὰ τὸ πλεονεκτικόν. ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐξ Ἀρμενίας; Zosimus 5.25.2.4-6: τούτων ἀπαγγελθέντων Ἀρβαζάκιος ἐκπέμπεται στρατηγὸς ὡς δὴ τοῖς ἐν Παμφυλίᾳ πράγμασι πονοῦσιν ἐπικουρήσων· δυνάμιν δὲ ἀρκοῦσαν λαβῶν, καὶ τοὺς ληστεύοντας ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι συμφυγόντας ἐπιδιώξας, κώμας τε αὐτῶν εἶλε πολλὰς καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ὀλίγον ἀπέσφαξε πλῆθος; for more about Isaurian raids of 404 see Joh. Chrys., *Ep.* 14.4; cf. Woods 1998, 109-119.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Brélaz 2005, 53-4.

reasons can be supplied with the construction of feudality amongst large clans, of which chiefs were very rich and prestigious by means of their people, who were reduced to work and made strongly dependent on them, partly similar to the picture in modern Turkey. Not only in late antiquity but also in earlier times we know about the rebellious character of the Isaurians.<sup>85</sup> The dates and evidence show that there was no problem in the imperial time for more than two hundred years after the middle of first century, but Isaurian rebellions re-started after the mid-third century. Hopwood defines the “hill-people of interior Isauria” as a constant threat from the first to the fifth centuries,<sup>86</sup> in spite of the tranquillity in the region from the middle of first century to the reign of Probus. It is also claimed that they were against even *Pax Romana*,<sup>87</sup> though Isaurians seem fairly quiet in this period, as was mentioned above. Shaw, argues that the rebellious nature of Isaurians remained the same and that the uprisings in late antiquity was deeply rooted in their past.<sup>88</sup> In fact, a discontinuation that lasted more than two hundred years and then a sudden decision to rebel doesn't support such notions. Lenski gave detailed evidences for urbanization, architectural improvements, life according to civic norms and peace with central government in mountainous Isauria in order to show that Isaurians adopted Greco-Roman cultural and political life between the late first century and the early third century.<sup>89</sup>

Ammianus Marcellinus reported that the Isaurians, “*who were accustomed to frequent alternations of peace, and of turbulence which threw everything into confusion with sudden outbreaks*”, were attacking the wealthy neighbourhoods or town centres, food stores, farmsteads and rich villas, “*being inflamed both by despair and hunger*”.<sup>90</sup> The clashes between the Roman army and Isaurian brigands continued constantly in late antiquity. They were sometimes punished, such as some Isaurian hostages who were captured in the suppression of 354 uprising and executed by being thrown to the wild beasts in the games at the amphitheatre of Iconium.<sup>91</sup>

The reason for the Isaurians' vital deprivations and maltreatment towards them may lie in various causes from somewhat earlier period. The third century crisis starting from the 260s with the capture of Emperor Valentinian, hit the empire greatly, and like many regions of Asia Minor the territory of Cilicia naturally had been afflicted by this crisis heavily. Persian incursions extending into Rough Cilicia in 260, the Gothic invasion of Cilicia in 276 and the instability of imperial authority were the contributing factors for their affliction.<sup>92</sup> In addition to these, one of the important factors should have been the religious views of both parts. Diocletian, who was a devoted pagan and had a great opposition to Christianity, formalised the Christian persecution by issuing edicts at the beginning of

<sup>85</sup> For detailed sources see: Lenski 1999b, 417-31; Shaw 1990 219-52; Feld 2005, 351-2 Taf. 1.

<sup>86</sup> Hopwood 1983, 173.

<sup>87</sup> Brélaz 2005, 55-6.

<sup>88</sup> Shaw 1990, 237.

<sup>89</sup> Lenski 1999b 431-9; Feld (2005, 152) is also against the “historical constancy” opinion of Shaw. However, Brélaz (2005, 56 fn. 62) claims, contra Lenski, that urbanization was never a character of rural population that was inclined to armed robbery.

<sup>90</sup> Amm. Marc. 14.2.12; When Ammianus (14.2.2) talks about Isaurians, he gives a quotation from Cicero who said “*even wild beasts, when reminded by hunger, generally return to that place where they have been fed before (Pro Cluentio 25.67)*”; cf. Shaw 1990, 241-3.

<sup>91</sup> Amm. Marc. 14.2.1.

<sup>92</sup> For detailed description on Cilicia of third century, see: Feld 2005, 119-37.

fourth century.<sup>93</sup> This persecution certainly multiplied the antipathy of Christians towards pagans and paganism. After the rehabilitation of Christians started in 311, when Galerius granted toleration, and they regained the social status under Constantine, the church gained remarkable power.<sup>94</sup> After that, religious policy took a strict stand against paganism.<sup>95</sup> The Mountainous Isaurians, who seem to have kept their pagan faith, were to be converted under church policy. Lenski reinforced this point.<sup>96</sup> Evidence from Basil reveals that these Isaurian brigands were mostly pagans and had a tendency of imposing their beliefs on Christians. In the Christian era, they were not only considered as bandits but also as unbelievers, who were opposed to the Christian beliefs and even wished to loot the churches. Obviously, they remained pagan in to the fifth century, particularly till the time of Zeno.<sup>97</sup>

Roman measures against the Isaurian banditry included some other precautions besides sending imperial troops. There were strongholds around the Taurus Mountains commanded by εἰρήναρχαι (peace-keepers) and built at various times. These eirenarchs received in special cases the assistance of παραφύλακες, who had the local militants, διώγμιται (pursuers), at their disposal.<sup>98</sup> On the borders of Pamphylia, some of these strongholds were discovered in Aydolin Kalesi, Güney Kalesi, Colybrassus, Casae, Syedra, Iotape, Cotenna, Amblada and Vasada.<sup>99</sup> Some inscriptions of late second or early third century show that εἰρήναρχαι were extremely rich, as they were πρόβουλοι, ἀρχιερείς or γυμνασίαρχοι.<sup>100</sup> But in the course of time, this institution seems to have been tainted and finally abolished in 409 by a law recorded in *Codex Theodosianus*.<sup>101</sup> According to this law, their task of

<sup>93</sup> Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 10-15; Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 8.2-8.6; Eusebius, *De Martyribus Palaestinae*, Pr., 1.4 and 3.1: According to these edicts, all the Bible copies should be collected and fired, all churches should be demolished or evacuated, Christian meetings should be banned. No Christian should be given official positions and right to defend himself in courts. Free Christians should be lowered to status of slave. The Christian clergy members should be arrested and everybody should offer sacrifices to pagan deities; Jones 1964, 71-6.

<sup>94</sup> Jones 1964, 73 and 89-97.

<sup>95</sup> However, it is claimed that the Christian attitude towards the paganism had positive approaches too; i.e. collecting the pagan statues in capitals instead of destroying them, caring for the ancient buildings by re-using them etc. (Saradi-Mendelovici 1990).

<sup>96</sup> Lenski (1999a, 322-5) uses Basilus (*Mir. Thec.* 28.32) and Dagron's comments on paganism in *De vita et miraculis sanctae Theclae* (Dagron 1978, 80-94). See Shaw 1990, 244-249 on Christianisation stories of the region. For a detailed account and discussion on the religion of Isaurians, see Feld 2005, 44-55.

<sup>97</sup> Zacharias from Mytilene reported that a certain Paralios talking about his memories before he converted narrated how he himself, Leontius, Illus, Pamprepius and all rebelled with them offered sacrifices to the pagan Gods in order to overcome Zeno and Christianity (Zach. Mit. 40-41). All those people had high imperial positions, even Zeno was a close friend of Illus, who together with Leontius has been influenced by pagan intellectual Pamprepius (*PLRE* II 586-90, s.v. Illus 1; *ibid.* 670-1, sv. Leontius 17; *ibid.* 825-8, s.v. Pamprepius).

<sup>98</sup> Wolff 2003, 237-9; Feld 2005, 181; for a very detailed account on εἰρήναρχοι, παραφύλακες and διώγμιται see Brélaz 2005, chapter III. The recent discovery of an inscription recording the portorium of the province Lycia of Neronic period revealed that the παραφύλακες were also involved in the collection of taxes (Takmer 2007, 175).

<sup>99</sup> Hopwood 1989, 192; Aydolin Kalesi: Bean – Mitford 1970, 38-41 no. 19. Güney Kalesi: *ibid.* no. 34. Colybrassus: *idem* 1965, nos. 9, 14 and 23. Casae: *idem* 1970, 43-5 no. 21. Syedra: *IGRR* III 830. Iotape: *CIG* 3.4413. Cotenna: Bean-Mitford 1970, 30-34 nos. 12-13. Amblada and Vasada: Swoboda – Keil – Knoll 1935, 26 no. 39.

<sup>100</sup> Hopwood 1983, 174-5; the inscriptions: Bean – Mitford 1965, nos. 9, 14 and 23; *idem* 1970, nos. 12, 20, 21a, 34 (?), 46 and 81.

<sup>101</sup> *Cod. Theod.* 12.14.1: Impm. Honorius et Theodosius AA. Anthemio praefecto praetorio. Irenarcharum vocabula, quae adsimulata provincialium tutela quietis ac pacis per singula territoria haud sinunt stare concordiam, radicitus amputanda sunt. Cesset igitur genus perniciosum rei publicae; cesset rescriptorum irenarchas circiter inconcussa simplicitas et celsitudinis tuae sedes provinciarum defendenda suscipiat pacis huiusmodi, locupletioribus commissura, praesidia. Dat. VIII kal. ian. Constantinopoli Honorio VIII et Theodosio III aa. cons. [409 dec. 25].

peace-keeping was unreliable and they swerved from their original tasks, therefore peace keeping should be entrusted to wealthier men. It certainly attests to their diminishing capability of keeping the peace or wealth, but the law also sounds as if they created disorder rather than peace, reflecting their corruption as well. Their untrustworthiness and cruel actions detracted from the expected concord. But there is also a confusing law in the Codex Justinianus, which was also given in 409 and permitted governors to appoint eirenarchs from among the decurions.<sup>102</sup> After eleven years, another law re-established the institution of eirenarchate.<sup>103</sup> They seem to have probably realized that military policing in the area was burdensome<sup>104</sup> and also the problems relating to the eirenarchate might have been pacified between 409 and 420.

It is notable that the Isaurians' efficiency against imperial forces continuously increased – or that of Roman Army decreased – starting from the third century. Each uprising following the other was more destructive and affected more lands, and the Isaurian warlords and soldiers consolidated their positions in the army and imperial services. From the mid-fifth century to its end, thanks to Leo I, who sought for a resolution to balance the increasing proportion of Germans in the army, Isaurians were taken into the army in large groups.<sup>105</sup> They were commanded by Tarasicodissa, who would change his name to Zeno when he became emperor.<sup>106</sup> Before long, he was raised to the rank of *magister militum*. Until 491, when Anastasius came to throne, Isaurians should have been the most privileged group, who were able to use imperial sources greatly.

When Zeno and his Isaurian cabinet gained the absolute dominance on imperial authority, the positions in the high command structure of the Roman army were already occupied by Isaurian war lords. They also undertook many vital palatine tasks and some high offices under this favouritism that created corruption as well.<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, Malchus tells more about the conditions of soldiers under Zeno. He reported that corruption and demotivation was a character of the legions,<sup>108</sup> a situation that conforms with the reasons of the Anastasian Edict from Perge. For few troubles occurred, so he didn't use the army and the soldiers were accustomed to a "peaceful" time and shirking, some of them were even earning quite a lot through selling the ranks to those who wished to have them by paying.

<sup>102</sup> *Cod. Just.* 10.77: Impp. Honorius et Theodosius AA. Anthemio pp. Irenarchae, qui ad provinciarum tutelam quietis ac pacis per singula territoria faciunt stare concordiam, a decurionibus iudicio praesidium provinciarum idonei nominentur. *D.viii k. Ian.Constantinopoli Honorio viii et Theodosio iii AA. cons* [a. 409].

<sup>103</sup> *Cod. Just.* 10.19: ... super irenarcho et optione omni antiqua consuetudine observanda.

<sup>104</sup> Feld 2005, 185.

<sup>105</sup> Elton 1996, 133.

<sup>106</sup> The rise of this Isaurian Tarasicodissa in palace and that of other Isaurians through him are remarkable. In 466, the treason of Ardabur, the son of *magister militum* Aspar of Alan origin, was disclosed by him. After the publicity loss of commanders in naval defeat of 468 in northern Africa, Taracodissa became the most favoured commander of Leo. 17<sup>th</sup> December 474 was the date when Zeno became the sole emperor. According to Jones (1964, 225) "it was only adroit and unscrupulous diplomacy that he managed to survive for seventeen years". Because of his origin, senate and people couldn't really internalize him. Even it is reported that palatine officials hated him because of this (Josh. Styl. 12).

<sup>107</sup> Malchus, who claims that Zeno was not capable enough for commandership and administration, reported that Zeno's praetorian prefecture Sebastianus sold the offices regularly and shared the income with the emperor, and even that Zeno sold the offices to their relatives cheaper, then these relatives sold them again to others for a higher price so that they could get a better profit. See: Malchus 9 and *PLRE II* 984-5, s.v. Sebastianus 5.

<sup>108</sup> Malchus 18; Feld 2005, 264; Kaegi 1981, 37-40.

In fact, it was a unique time in history when the Isaurians had imperial power and enjoyed its privileges. That the Isaurians had the imperial authority in their hands was in fact an irony of fate. As pointed out,<sup>109</sup> they were the same Isaurians, who created troubles, with their rebellious nature. In fact, the Eastern Empire was about to experience an incident which perhaps partly resembles the Western empire and the Germans, except for that Zeno and his cabinet didn't seem to have wished to found an Isaurian Empire. This situation, which was already alarming, did not last long and when Zeno died on 4<sup>th</sup> April 491 and Anastasius succeeded to the throne through Ariadne (Zeno's widow, later wife of Anastasius). His primary action was to drive the Isaurians, who occupied the high administrative and military posts,<sup>110</sup> out of Constantinople and to cut the special tax paid for the Isaurians.<sup>111</sup> This caused a major rebellion, probably the most remarkable revolt of Isaurians. It was not an uprising of bandits, in legal terms, but mainly all the Isaurians including the imperial commanders, e.g. the *comes* and *praeses* of Isauria Lilingis and his subordinate generals were involved in the revolt as well.<sup>112</sup> This Lilingis fought in the battle of Cotyaeum against the imperial forces. Anastasius had to cope with this unrest through a decisive battle in Cotyaeum, and sieges for seven years until 498, when all the strongholds of the rebels were captured.<sup>113</sup> During the battle at Cotyaeum, Anastasius, in order to fight against Isaurians, used a large army which consisted of the Eastern Army under the command of Ioannes Scythia, his praesental armies under the command of Flavius Ioannes, and troops of Goths and Huns. The severity of the war reflects the Isaurians' shock when Anastasius drove out those who had already occupied many institutions belonging to civil and military affairs. Anastasius stationed his praesental troops in Pamphylia at least until 498. The attitude of Anastasius seems the final stroke which unseated the Isaurians from political and financial posts of the empire<sup>114</sup> until the early eighth century, when the Isaurian dynasty succeeded to imperial throne again.

---

<sup>109</sup> Shaw 1990, 248.

<sup>110</sup> Jones 1964, 230.

<sup>111</sup> Feld 2005, 332.

<sup>112</sup> *PLRE* II 683, s.v. Lilingis

<sup>113</sup> Stein 1949, 81-4; Jones 1964, 230-1; Lee 2000, 53; Feld 2005, 332-5.

<sup>114</sup> While Jones (1964, 230) describes the situation as a pacification, Shaw (1990, 255-9) doesn't agree. Lee (2000, 53), though agreeing with Shaw, he also supports Jones and accepts that they were kept away from official issues. Their image doesn't seem to have been restored throughout the centuries. Even after ca. 600 years, the impression of Zeno and the Isaurians was not rehabilitated. Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, 615: ἦν γὰρ ὁ Ζήνων τῆς κακίστης καὶ εἰδεχθοῦς γενεᾶς τῶν Ἰσαύρων, δασύς τε καὶ εἰδεχθέστατος, ὡσπερ Ἕλληνας ζωγραφοῦσι τὸν Πάνα τραγοσκελῆ καὶ δασύκνημον, τὴν χροιάν μέλας, τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀσύμβλητος, ὀργίλος, μνησικακὸς καὶ φθόνου μεστός (*Zeno was of the worst and ugly race of Isaurians, both shaggy and ugliest, just as Greeks paint Pan as goat-shanked and shaggy-legged, black-skinned, in unintelligible manhood, irascible, bearing malice and full of ill-will*).

## Bibliography

- Alföldi-Rosenbaum 1972 E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum, "Matronianus, Comes Isauriae", *Phoenix* 26, 1972, 183-186.
- Barnes 1982 T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (1982).
- Bean – Harrison 1967 G. E. Bean – M. Harrison, "Choma in Lycia", *JRS* 57, 1967, 40-44.
- Bean – Mitford 1965 G. E. Bean – T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia in 1962 and 1963* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse., Denkschriften 85) (1965).
- Bean – Mitford 1970 G. E. Bean – T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse., Denkschriften 102) (1970).
- Bean 1965 G. E. Bean, *Side Kitabeleri. The Inscriptions of Side* (1965)
- Bennett 2007 J. Bennett, "The Roman Army in Lycia and Pamphylia", *Adalya* 10, 131-153.
- Brandt 1992 H. Brandt, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft Pamphyliens und Pisidiens im Altertum* (1992).
- Brélaz 2005 C. Brélaz, *La sécurité publique en Asie Mineure sous le Principat (I<sup>er</sup>–III<sup>ème</sup> s. ap. J.–C.)* (2005).
- Cameron 1993 A. Cameron, *The Later Roman Empire AD 284–430* (1993).
- Clauss 1990 M. Clauss, *Mithras – Kult und Mysterien* (1990)
- Çevik – Akyürek – Varkıvanç 2005 N. Çevik – E. Akyürek – B. Varkıvanç (eds.), *Trebenna. Tarihi, Arkeolojisi ve Doğası. Its History, Archaeology and Natural Environment* (2005).
- Delemen – Çokay-Kepçe – Özdizbay – Turak 2008 İ. Delemen – S. Çokay-Kepçe – A. Özdizbay – Ö. Turak (eds.), *Prof. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu'na 65. Yaş Armağanı – Euergetes – Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu zum 65. Geburtstag. 2 Vols.* (2008)
- Eck 1972 W. Eck, "Bemerkungen zum Militärkommando in den Senatsprovinzen der Kaiserzeit", *Chiron* 2, 429-436.
- Elton 1996 H. Elton, *Warfare in Roman Europe AD 350–425* (1996).
- Erdkamp 2007 P. Erdkamp (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army* (2007)
- Feissel 2004 D. Feissel, "Un rescrit de Justinien découvert à Didymes », *Chiron* 34, 2004, 285-365.
- Feld 2005 K. Feld, *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich* (2005).
- Foss 1996 C. Foss, *Cities, fortresses and villages of Byzantine Asia Minor* (1996).
- French – Lightfoot 1989 D. H. French – C. S. Lightfoot (eds.), *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire* (B.A.R. Int. Ser. 553) (1989).
- Grosso 1964 F. Grosso, *La lotta politica al tempo di Commando* (1964).
- Haensch 1997 R. Haensch, *Capita Provinciarum: Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1997)
- Hagel – Tomaschitz 1998 S. Hagel – K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften: nach den Scheden der Kleinasiatischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1998).
- Harrison 2001 M. Harrison, *Mountain and plain: from the Lycian coast to the Phrygian plateau in the late Roman and early Byzantine period* (2001).

- Hellenkemper – Hild 2004  
H. Hellenkemper – F. Hild, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini 8: Lykien und Pamphylien* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse., Denkschriften 320) (2004).
- Hopwood 1983  
K. Hopwood, "Policing the Hinterland: Rough Cilicia and Isauria", in Mitchell 1983, 173-187.
- Hopwood 1989  
K. Hopwood, "Consent and Control: How the Peace was Kept in Rough Cilicia", in French – Lightfoot 1989, 191-201.
- Hopwood 1999  
K. Hopwood (ed.), *Organized Crime in Antiquity* (1999).
- Horsley – Mitchell 2000  
G. H. R. Horsley – S. Mitchell, *The Inscriptions of Central Pisidia (IK 57)* (2000).
- İnan 1983  
J. İnan, "Perge Kazısı 1981 Çalışmaları", *TAD* 26/2, 1983, 1-64.
- Jones 1964  
A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602; a social, economic and administrative survey* (1964).
- Jones 1972  
C. P. Jones, "The Inscription from the Sea-Wall at Anemurium", *Phoenix* 26/4, 1972, 396-399.
- Kaegi 1981  
W. E. Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest, 471–843: An Interpretation* (1981).
- Kaygusuz 1984  
İ. Kaygusuz, "Perge unter Kaiser Tacitus Mittelpunkt der Welt", *EA* 4, 1984, 1-4.
- Le Bohec 1994  
Y. Le Bohec, *The Imperial Roman Army* (Trans. by Raphael Bate) (1994).
- Lee 2000  
A. D. Lee, "The Eastern Empire: Theodosius to Anastasius", in *CAH* 14, 2000, 33-62.
- Lenski 1999a  
N. Lenski, "Basil and the Isaurian Uprising of A. D. 375", *Phoenix* 53-3/4, 1999, 308-329.
- Lenski 1999b  
N. Lenski, "Assimilation and Revolt in the Territory of Isauria, from the 1st Century BC to the 6<sup>th</sup> Century AD", *JECHO* 42/4, 1999, 413-465.
- Mackenzie, M. M. – Roueché, C. (eds.) 1989:  
M. M. Mackenzie – C. Roueché (eds.), *Images of Authority. Papers presented to Joyce Reynolds on the Occasion of Her 70th Birthday* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. Vol. 16) (1989).
- Merkelbach 1984  
R. Merkelbach, *Mithras* (1984).
- Merkelbach – Şahin 1988  
R. Merkelbach – S. Şahin, "Die publizierten Inschriften von Perge", *EA* 11, 1988, 97-170.
- Mitchell 1983  
S. Mitchell (ed.), *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia* (B.A.R. International Series 156) (1983).
- Mitchell 1989  
S. Mitchell, "The Siege of Cremna", in French – Lightfoot 1989, 311-328.
- Mitchell 1990  
S. Mitchell, "Archaeology in Asia Minor 1985–1989", *AR* 36, 1990, 83-131.
- Mitchell 1993  
S. Mitchell, *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Volume I: The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule* (1993).
- Mitchell 1995  
S. Mitchell, *Cremna in Pisidia. An Ancient City in Peace and in War* (1995).
- Mitchell 1999  
S. Mitchell, "Native Rebellion in the Pisidian Taurus", in Hopwood 1999, 155-177.
- Mitchell 2007  
S. Mitchell, *A History of the Later Roman Empire AD 284–641: The Transformation of the Ancient World* (2007).
- Nollé 1986  
J. Nollé, "Pamphyliche Studien", *Chiron* 16, 1986, 199-202.



- Nollé 1993 J. Nollé (ed.), *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse. Band I (IK 43)* (1993).
- Nollé 2001 J. Nollé (ed.), *Side im Altertum. Geschichte und Zeugnisse. Band II (IK 44)* (2001).
- Onur 2005 F. Onur, "Trebenna Tarihi / History of Trebenna", in *Çevik – Akyürek – Varkıvanç* 2005, 7-20 and 161-166 (bilingual)
- Özdizbay 2008 A. Özdizbay, "Pamphylia – Perge Tarihi ve Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi Öncesi Perge'nin Gelişimi: Güncel Araştırmalar Işığında Genel bir Değerlendirme", in *Delemen – Çokay-Kepçe – Özdizbay – Turak* 2008, 839-871 (Vol. 1).
- Paribeni – Romanelli 1914 R. Paribeni – P. Romanelli, "Studii e ricerche archeologiche nell-Anatolia meridionale", in *Mon. Ant.* 23, 1914, 6-274.
- Ridley 1970 R. D. Ridley, "The fourth and Fifth Century Civil and Military Hierarchy in Zosimus", *Byzantion* 40, 1970, 91-102.
- Ritterling 1925 E. Ritterling, "Legio", in *RE XII*, 1925, 1211-1829.
- Roueché 1989 C. Roueché, "Floreat Perge", in *Mackenzie – Roueché* 1989, 206 –228.
- Roxan 1978 M. M. Roxan, *Roman Military Diplomas 1954–1977* (1978).
- Saradi-Mendelovici 1990 H. Saradi-Mendelovici, "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries", *DOP* 44, 1990, 47-61.
- Shaw 1990 B. D. Shaw, "Bandit Highlands and Lowland Peace: The Mountains of Isauria-Cilicia", *JECHO* 33/2, 1990, 199-233 and B. D. Shaw, "Bandit Highlands and Lowland Peace: The Mountains of Isauria-Cilicia (Continued)", *JECHO* 33/3, 1990, 237-270.  
(Note: Shaw's two articles above are given in a sole paging in footnotes.)
- Sherk 1955 R. Sherk, "The Inermes Provinciae of Asia Minor", *AJPh* 76/4, 1955, 400-413.
- Southern – Dixon 1996 P. Southern – K. R. Dixon, *The Late Roman Army* (1996).
- Speidel 1976 M. Speidel, "Citizen Cohorts in the Roman Imperial Army. New Data on the Cohorts Apula, Campana, and III Campestris", *TAPA* 106, 1976, 339-348.
- Stauner 2004 K. Stauner, *Das offizielle Schriftwesen des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Gallienus (27 v. Chr.–268 n. Chr.)* (2004)
- Stauner 2006 K. Stauner, "Militär und Wirtschaft: Überlegungen zu den wirtschaftlichen Vor- und Nachteilen römischer Heereszüge durch Kleinasien von Septimius Severus bis Tacitus", *Gephyra* 2, 2006, 21-46.
- Stein 1949 E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire. Vol. I* (1949).
- Stoll 2007 O. Stoll, "The Religions of Armies", in *Erdkamp* 2007, 451-476.
- Swain – Edwards 2004 S. Swain – M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching late antiquity: the transformation from early to late empire* (2004).
- Swoboda – Keil – Knoll 1935 H. Swoboda – J. Keil – F. Knoll, *Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien* (1935).
- Şahin 1988 S. Şahin, "Pamphylia'da Epigrafi ve Tarihi Coğrafya Araştırmaları", *AST VI*, 1988, 253-256.
- Şahin 1994a S. Şahin (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Arykanda (IK 48)* (1994).
- Şahin 1994b S. Şahin, "Ein Vobericht über den Stadiasmus Provinciae Lyciae in Patara", *Lykia* 1, 1994, 130-135.

- Şahin 1999 S. Şahin (ed.), Die Inschriften von Perge. Teil I. Vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit (IK 54) (1999).
- Şahin 2004 S. Şahin (ed.), Die Inschriften von Perge. Teil II, Historische Texte aus dem 3. Jhdt. n. Chr., Grabtexte aus den 1.-3. Jahrhunderten der römische Kaiserzeit, Fragmente (IK 61) (2004).
- Şahin – Adak 2007 S. Şahin – M. Adak, *Stadiasmus Patarensis. Itinera Romana Provinciae Lyciae* (2007).
- Takmer 2007 B. Takmer, “Lex Portorii Provinciae Lyciae. Ein Vorbericht über die Zollinschrift aus Andriake aus neronischer Zeit”, *Gephyra* 4, 2007, 165-188.
- Vermaseren 1956 – 1960 M. J. Vermaseren, *Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithricae* I (1956) – II (1960).
- Weiss 1991 P. Weiss, “Aux Perge”, *Chiron* 21, 1991, 353-392.
- Wolff 2003 C. Wolff, *Les brigands en Orient sous le Haut-empire romain* (2003).
- Woods 1998 D. Woods, “Arbazacius, Fravitta, and the Government of Isauria CA A. D. 396-404”, *Phoenix* 52, 1998, 109-119.
- Zimmermann 1996 M. Zimmermann, “Probus, Carus und die Räuber im Gebiet des pisidischen Termessos”, *ZPE* 110, 1996, 265-277.

## Öz

### İ.S. Geç Üçüncü Yüzyıl ile Erken Altıncı Yüzyıl Arasında Pamphylia'da Roma Ordusu

Pek çok çalışmada dağınık olarak değinilmişse de, İ.S. 3. ve erken 6. yy.'lar arasında Pamphylia'da Roma ordusu hakkında başlı başına bir çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Erken İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde Lykia ve Pamphylia'da Roma ordusu üzerine Bennett'in (2007) yazdığı son makalede belirtildiği gibi, Anadolu'daki Roma ordusu üzerine yapılan çalışmaların azlığı nedeniyle özellikle imparatorluğun doğu eyaletlerindeki askeri yapılanma hakkındaki bildiklerimiz kısıtlıdır. Bu eksiklik, Erken İmparatorluk Dönemi için olduğu kadar, 3. yy. sonrasında Geç İmparatorluk Dönemi için de geçerlidir. Hâlbuki bu dönemden önemli askeri yazıtlar ve edebi verilerin sayısı çoktur. Pek çok modern çalışmada dağınık olarak karşımıza çıkan Pamphylia'nın geç dönemine ilişkin askeri ve idari veriler bu makalede bir araya getirilmiştir. Bu verilerle, imparatorluğun iktisadi, idari ve askeri istikrarsızlıklarla sıkıntıya düştüğü üçüncü yüzyıl krizinden (İ.S. 235/8) itibaren, genel istikrarını sağlayıp, askeri sorunların üzerine giderek orduyu ıslah eden Anastasius'un tahta geçişine (İ.S. 491) kadarki süreçte, Roma ordusunun Pamphylia'da nasıl hareket ettiği izlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Pamphylia, sadece Geç Roma Ordusu'na dair izlerin sık belgelenmesi ve birçok Geç Roma askeri harekâtın burada gerçekleşmesi nedeniyle değil, aynı zamanda değerlendirmeye alınması gereken yeni malzemelerin bulunması dolayısıyla da bu çalışmanın coğrafi alanını oluşturmaktadır.

Geç Antik Dönem, Pamphylia ve Roma Ordusu; bu üç ifade beraberce söz konusu olduğunda, –her ne kadar Pers ve Got istilaları gibi bir kaç harici saldırı olmuşsa da– hiç şüphesiz genellikle orduların tarih boyunca uğraşmak zorunda kaldıkları iç savaşlar, bazı zümrelerin iktidar ve iktisadi çatışmaları, isyanlar, çeteler ve silahlı soygunlardan bahsetmek gerekir. Roma, Bizans, Selçuklu ve Osmanlı imparatorlukları ve hatta Türkiye Cumhuriyeti bile, Anadolu'nun güney ve güneydoğu dağlık bölgeleri, çok kere bu tip sorunlarla karşı karşıya kalmıştır. Orduya, dışarıda ya da sınırlarda savaşma işlevinin yanı sıra, bu tip meselelere karşı emniyeti ve hukuku sağlama görevi de verilmiştir. 3. yy. buhranından sonra artan iç savaşlar, sınır istilaları ve Anadolu'da haydutlar (λησται / *latrones*) tarafından çıkarılan ayaklanmalar (örn. Isauria isyanları) iç huzurdaki düşüşe ve merkezi yönetimdeki zayıflamaya işaret etmektedir. Dış saldırıların –kuşkusuz etki etmişse de– genellikle imparatorluk içerisindeki istikrarsızlığın temel nedenini oluşturmadığı kabul edilmektedir. Fakat yine de değişik bölgelere yayılmış olan ordular belirgin bir imparatorluk istikrarsızlığı ile yüz yüze gelmişlerdir. Bu gibi durumlarda Roma ordusu, yerel emniyeti sağlamak ve imparatorluk iktidarını korumak için büyük çaba sarf etmiştir. Pamphylia Bölgesi'nin sınırları ise söz konusu dönemlerde yerel huzursuzluklara sürekli sahne

olmuştur ve Roma ordusu isyanları bastırmak için burayı bir üs olarak sürekli kullanmıştır. Pamphylia, Isauria Bölgesi'ne olan yakınlığı ve zengin limanlarıyla düşmanlar için çekici olması ve ticari öneminden dolayı, bu kargaşadan en fazla etkilenen bölge olmuştur.

Pamphylia'nın askeri ve idari yapılanması zaman içerisinde değişik şekillerde karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Vespasianus dönemine kadar Galatia Eyaleti içerisinde kalmış fakat sonra Lykia ile birleştirilip *Lycia et Pamphylia* Eyaleti'nin bir parçası olmuştur. Veriler, Vespasianus döneminde kurulan *Lycia et Pamphylia* Eyaleti'nin büyük ihtimalle Diocletianus döneminde sadece *Pamphylia* olarak adlandırıldığı (Lykia toprakları muhtemelen hâlâ bu ifadenin içerisindeydi), daha geç bir dönemde ise (belki 330'lu yıllar?) Lykia ve Pamphylia'nın iki ayrı eyalet olarak düzenlenmiş olabileceği yönündedir. *Notitia Dignitatum* (İ.S. 397–427), Pamphylia'yı *praefectus praetorio per Orientem* idaresi altındaki Asiana *diocese*'sinde gösterir. Kısa bir süre sonra, Codex Justinianus'taki bir yasadan (12.59.10) anlaşıldığına göre, İmparator Leo I, 472 yılında Pamphylia'da bir *comes* altında askeri merkez oluşturmuştur. Bu durum bölgenin askeri niteliğini artırmıştır. Bu *comes*'in Zeno döneminde (İ.S. 476–491) Side'de kaldığına dair izler bulunmaktadır. Bununla beraber, Bizans coğrafyacısı Hierokles bölgenin yedinci yüzyılda bir *consularis* olduğunu bildirmektedir.

Geç dönemde bölge, askeri açıdan oldukça hareketlidir ve pek çok iç çatışmaya, Isauria istilalarına ve az sayıda da dış saldırıya maruz kalmıştır. Bu tehlikelere karşı Pamphylia'da, çoğunlukla geç dönem lejyon birlikleri kullanılmıştır. Bu birlikler, Erken İmparatorluk Dönemi'nin yardımcı birlikleri (*auxilarii*) olup, Geç İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde lejyonlara (örn. *Pseudocomitatenses*) dönüşmüştür. Bilindiği kadarıyla *legio I Pontica*, *legio I Armeniaca*, *legio II Armeniaca*, *legio I Isaura*, *legio II Isaura* (*comes Isauriae* altındadır), *legio III Isaura* bu lejyonlar arasındadır. 3. yy. ve sonrasında imparatora doğrudan bağlı birliklerin de bölgeye geldikleri bilinmektedir. Bunlara örnek olarak, Tacitus'a (İ.S. 275–276) eşlik eden imparator birlikleri, Lydius önderliğinde başlayan Isauria ayaklanmasındaki (İ.S. 278/9) imparator muhafız alayı (*praetorium*) ve Anastasius döneminde 5. yy. sonlarındaki büyük Isauria isyanına karşı duran *praesentalis* birlikleri (e.g. *legiones palatinae*) verilebilir. Anastasius'un birliklerinin bölgeye geldiği, Perge'den ele geçen büyük bir fermandan ve dönemi anlatan edebi kaynaklardan tespit edilmiştir. Bu büyük birimlerin yanı sıra, εἰρήναρχαι olarak bilinen 'barış koruyucuları'nın yardımına başvurduğu παραφύλακες ve onların komutasındaki δῶγμαται olarak bilinen yerel birlikler de bu isyanlara karşı harekâta bulunmuşlardı. Pamphylia ve Lykaonia gibi komşu bölgelere de sıçramış olan ve en nihayetinde 476 yılında tahta geçen Isaurialı Zeno dönemi sonunda oldukça güçlenen Isaurialıların yaratmış olduğu bu yerel kargaşalar, Anastasius'un 491-8 arasında yedi yıl boyunca verdiği mücadele sonrasında son bulmuş ve bölgede barış sağlanmıştır.