

Einführung

Dank seiner strategischen Lage, als besondere Durchgangsregion zwischen West und Ost, der Anatolien und Syrien verbindet, sowie an das effiziente Straßennetz und der gut ausgestatteten Häfen, die mit dem Nahen Osten und den Mittelmeerlandern Handel treiben, war das alte Kilikien ein Ort von kultureller, wirtschaftlicher und religiöser Austausch von der Vorgeschichte bis in der Spätbyzantinische Zeit. Die Region war durch vielfältige Mobilitätsprozesse, Migrationsbewegungen und Austausch zwischen Menschen und Kulturen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte gekennzeichnet.

In den letzten Jahrzehnten haben archäologische Ausgrabungen und topographische Forschungen unsere Kenntnisse über die Region erheblich erweitert und ihre Identität deutlich hervorgehoben. Europäische und türkische Universitäten führten zahlreiche Forschungen und Projekte in der gesamten Region durch (von Mopsuestia über Yumuktepe, Soli Pompeiopolis, Elaiussa Sebaste, Olba, Boğsak Adası und Antiochia ad Cragum) und leisteten einen wesentlichen Beitrag zum Verständnis der Entwicklung der Region.

Außerdem trug die Gründung der Abteilung für Archäologie und des Forschungszentrums für kilikische Archäologie an der Universität Mersin im Jahr 1993 dazu bei, das Interesse an Kilikien zu erhöhen, neue Surveys und Ausgrabungen in der Region durchzuführen und nicht zuletzt regelmäßig Symposien zu organisieren. Neben den jährlichen Treffen, die in Mersin stattfinden, um über die Ausgrabungsergebnisse zu berichten, fand das letzte internationale Symposium über Kilikien 2007 in Lincoln (Nebraska) statt.

All diese Projekte und Forschungen haben gezeigt, dass Kilikien nicht nur eine sehr aktive Handelsregion war, die von fremden Kulturen beeinflusst wurde, sondern auch ein Gebiet mit einer lebendigen, eigenen Identität. In Anbetracht der Analyse des urbanen Raums und der ländlichen Siedlungen, der Gebäude als Orte der Begegnung, Erinnerung oder Kontinuität sowie der Gegenstände als Handelsobjekte müssen die etablierten Hypothesen zur kulturellen Entwicklung und historischen Bewertung Kilikiens überdacht und auf der Grundlage neuer Forschungen aktualisiert werden.

Ziel des Workshops, der am 18. und 19. Mai 2018 an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München stattfand, war es auf der Grundlage jüngster archäologischer Forschungen, eine kritische Neubewertung der Identität und des multikulturellen Charakters von Kilikien aufgrund seiner territorialen Unterschiede und kulturellen Besonderheiten vorzunehmen. Dabei sollten besonders bereits erschlossene Themen und Fallstudien aus verschiedenen Städten mit neuen archäologischen und historischen Ansätzen verglichen und aus einer veränderten Perspektive neu bewertet werden.

Im Zentrum der Beiträge dieses Sammelbandes stehen einige Fragen, die während des Symposiums aufgeworfen wurden und die als Grundlage für einen interdisziplinären Dialog angesehen werden können.

In Anbetracht der zahlreichen Ideen, die dank des kulturellen und wirtschaftlichen Austauschs von außen auf Kilikien einwirkten, stellt sich zunächst die Frage, was zu

dem langsamen Akkulturationsprozess Kilikiens beigetragen hat, dem die Region zwischen hellenistischer Zeit und Spätantike unterworfen war.

Eine zweite Frage beschäftigt sich mit der lokalen Identität der Region. Trotz der großen physischen Vielfalt des Landes, die sicherlich die Entwicklung der Stätten im Laufe der Jahrhunderte beeinflusst hat, und der Anwesenheit verschiedener Gemeinschaften, die in der Region lebten, zeigen einige Artikel, welchen Beitrag die archäologische Forschung zur Definition spezifischer regionaler Merkmale leisten kann.

In Hinblick auf das in der Region stark vertretene Christentum kreisen weitere Fragen um die Analyse einiger Gebäude bzw. Stätten, die nach Auswertung archäologischer und schriftlicher Quellen Wallfahrtsorte oder Verehrungsorte lokaler oder internationaler Heiliger waren.

An der Tagung nahmen Wissenschaftler teil, die ein breites Themenspektrum abdecken und mit einer Vielzahl von Methoden und Ansätzen arbeiteten. Sie eint die gemeinsame Absicht, die neuen Ergebnisse ihrer Studien über die Spätantike vorzustellen.

Der erste Beitrag von **Prof. Dr. Marcello Spanu** (Universität Roma Tre) befasst sich mit dem Prozess der Urbanisierung in der Region. Durch die Analyse der Infrastruktur, Einrichtungen und Gebäude unterstreicht er die Veränderungen der Stadtlandschaft während der römischen Zeit.

Prof. Dr. Annalisa Polosa (Universität Roma La Sapienza) untersucht die Münzprägung in den kilikischen Städten von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zur Spätantike und bis zum Ende des Münzumschlages.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa H. Sayar (Universität von Istanbul) konzentriert sich auf die Untersuchung einiger Siedlungen in dem gebirgigen Taurus-Gebiet der *Cilicia Pedia*, das Kappadokien vom kilikischen Plateau trennt. Im Licht der Inschriften beschreibt er die Entwicklung einiger spätantiken Siedlungen.

Die Prozesse der Mobilität, der Migration und des Austauschs, die Kilikien zwischen der römischen Zeit und der Spätantike charakterisierten, wird von **Prof. Dr. Emanuela Borgia** (Universität Roma La Sapienza) umfassend beschrieben. Sie untersucht die verschiedenen in Kilikien bezeugten ethnischen Gruppen anhand der epigraphischen Quellen von der römischen Zeit bis zur frühbyzantinischen Zeit.

In zwei Beiträgen wird die Bedeutung von Olba in der Spätantike hervorgehoben, und es wurden einige wichtige Ergebnisse der neuen Ausgrabungen der Universität Ankara gezeigt. Die Leiterin der Ausgrabung, **Prof. Dr. Emel Erten** (Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University), untersuchte die Gründe, die zu der Aufgabe von Olba in der Spätantike führten. **Dr. Yavuz Yeğin** (Universität von Ardahan) – **M.A. Murat Özyıldırım** (Universität von Mersin) konzentrierten sich auf das spätantike Kloster Olba. Der Kloster, der aus dem Jahr 2011 ausgegraben ist, brachte viele interessante Erkenntnisse ans Licht, die zeigen, welche Bedeutung das Komplex in der Spätantike für Olba und die Umgebung erlangte.

Mein Beitrag, der aus der noch laufenden Arbeit an meiner Doktorarbeit zu Kilikien als spätantike Sakrallandschaft hervorgegangen ist, konzentriert sich auf die Hafengstadt Korykos und besonders auf die dortige Grabeskirche *extra muros*. Die Analyse

des Gebäudes und die Entdeckung einiger Inschriften lassen vermuten, dass hier in der Spätantike ein besonderer Kult stattgefunden haben muss.

Der letzte Beitrag von **Prof. Dr. Troels Myrup Kristensen** (Aarhus Universität) berücksichtigt zwei aktuelle Themen, die mit dem Erlebnis des spätantiken Raums verbunden sind: das Konzept der Mobilität und das der Versammlungsorte mit einem Beispiel aus dem Wallfahrtsort der Hl. Thekla in Meryemlik.

Abschließend möchte ich allen Teilnehmer danken, die viele neue Informationen über Kilikien zwischen der Römerzeit und der Spätantike zusammengetragen haben.

Ein besonderer Dank geht an Prof. Dr. Franz Alto Bauer (LMU München), der mich unterstützt und ermutigt hat, diesen Workshop aufzubauen und mein Forschungsprojekt in Kilikien fortzusetzen.

Hier möchte ich mich bei allen Partnern, Unterstützern, Freunden, Helfern bedanken, die mich bei der Realisierung des Workshops und des Buchprojektes unterstützt haben. Insbesondere der Verein „Spätantike Archäologie und byzantinische Kunstgeschichte“ für die Übernahme der Druckkosten; Das Münchner Zentrum für Antike Welten (MZAW) und schließlich das Förderprogramm „Globale Kulturen – Welten verbinden“ des Deutschen Akademischen Austauschdienstes (DAAD).

Eine wertvolle Hilfe war auch Dr. Markus Lox (Universität Regensburg) durch seine präzise Begutachtung der Artikel. Ferner danke ich ihm für den regen Meinungsaustausch sowie Dr. Anna Sitz (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg) für die Überprüfung der englischen Texte.

Arabella Cortese

München – Regensburg, Mai 2019



The Cities in Kilikia During the Roman Period: a Reassessment

MARCELLO SPANU

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to propose a reassessment of the cities of Kilikia. The phenomenon of urbanization occurred in Kilikia later than in other regions of Asia Minor, but, after the arrival of the Romans in the region, the process was virtually concluded thanks to the client kings.

Furthermore, in the Roman period, small and large towns were furnished with buildings, monuments and infrastructures that transformed not only the appearance of the single centres, but also the society and daily-life.

In addition to a general overview of Cilician cities, an overview of the principal architectural typologies will be proposed.

Introduction

To propose a reassessment of the Roman cities in Kilikia is not an easy task for various reasons.

One of the most complete reviews of the Roman cities of Kilikia was carried out by Hansgerd Hellenkemper in 1980¹ and although surely we have today more information and data, it is necessary to say that after a moment of high interest at the turn of the new millennium, today excavations and researches are not numerous. Moreover, we must point out a substantial lack of scientific publications concerning the results.²

In this regard, the scarcity (of course with some exceptions) of detailed studies and of archaeological plans for many cities in Kilikia is regrettable. This is true both for the cities with a continuous life as Seleukeia-Silifke and for abandoned cities, where modern technologies may permit an easy and precise work.³

Therefore, I will not explore single cases or a detailed review city after city, rather I prefer to underline some peculiar aspects of the cities in Kilikia in the Roman times (fig. 1).

Development of Urbanization in Kilikia

Generally speaking, it is necessary to highlight that the phenomenon “city” in Kilikia is very different if compared to other regions of Asia Minor. In fact, the density of ancient settlements is not so high as in the Aegean coast, and within Kilikia there is

-
- 1 Hellenkemper 1980; for detailed information on the single sites, Rosenbaum et al. 1967; Hild – Hellenkemper 1990 remain essential. For a brief overview on the Roman influence in Kilikia, Spanu 2003a.
 - 2 In 2015, regular and continuous excavations of the classical period have been carried out at: Anazarbos, Anemurion, Antiokéia epi Krago, Diokaisareia, Elaioussa-Sebaste, Issos, Hierapolis-Kastabala, Kelen-deris, Magarosos and Olba. For the preliminary reports, see the annual publication in KST. Summaries and main publications are mainly lacking.
 - 3 A good methodological example is offered by the recent investigations at Anazarbos, of which only a preliminary report has been published: Posamentir – Sayar 2006.

the well-known difference between the two Kilikias: to the East the Pedias, a flat very fertile region and to the West the Tracheia, a rocky area very difficult to be settled, especially if we consider extensive settlements.

After all, we must recall the very late “fortune” of the city in the area. In the Achaemenid empire (that is to say until the fourth century BCE) we have situation a totally different from Ionia and other regions, especially because of the substantial absence of a strong Greek colonization, and therefore significant models or predecessors in Kilikia did not exist, apart from some single cases, such as for instance Tarsos. The particular political, social and cultural concept of the Persians didn’t require very large cities within the satrapies. Before the fourth century BCE, in fact, in Kilikia we have a small number of very important settlements, most of which claimed a foundation by (or a connection to) the Greeks, as at Tarsos, Kelenderis, Soloi, Aigeai and Mopsuhestia.⁴

The situation changes totally after the conquest of Alexander the Great and especially during the Seleucid kingdom. Within two centuries, the region saw a very strong increase of cities. Surely Seleukos I founded Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos, and maybe Issos and Alexandria kat’Isson. The process of Seleucid urbanization continued with Antiochos Epiphanes IV (215–164 BCE) at the beginning of the second century BCE, with interventions at Tarsos, Adana, Aigeai, Hierapolis Kastabala, Epiphaneia and, very probably, Magarsos.⁵

These interventions, often characterized by the attribution to the city of a dynastic name, were probably of different natures: new foundations,⁶ promotion to the rank of city for minor settlements or new building activities for old cities (such as Tarsos). Anyhow, I believe that the changes of names generally indicated monumental or urban interventions and were not a mere action of propaganda.

Subsequent to the Seleucids, in Kilikia the scattered presence of the Ptolemies is known, but they were more interested in resources of the western area (especially timber), and the realization of new cities was limited to Arsinoe and a problematic Berenike, both of which were anyhow small settlements.⁷

Finally, it is important to consider the possible but still uncertain development in the middle and late Hellenistic period of other towns, such as Anemourion, Elaioussa and Korykos, that became real cities after a slow and progressive development.

The last phase of urbanization of Kilikia coincides with the arrival of the Romans in the region. The victory over the pirates by Pompey the Great corresponds with the *re-dactio ad provinciam* of Kilikia (but at this time the province was limited to the Plain) and to the action of the Roman *imperator* to stabilize the pirates and not only. From

4 For the (true or presumed) Greek colonies in Kilikia, see Bing 1971; Jean 1999; for the Achaemenid period: Desideri, Jasink 1990; Casabonne 2004.

5 Desideri 1991; Cohen 1995, 355–372. Concerning the Hellenistic period: for an epigraphic overview, Sayar 2012; for the major sanctuaries, MacKay 1990; Tempesta 2016.

6 At the moment, the only clear evidence (from the archaeological point of view) of a new foundation is that of Magarsos. Here the results of investigations carried out with prospectings and other techniques show a regularly planned city, with the exception of the theatre and the stadium: Rosenbauer – Sayar 2012.

7 For the relationship of the Ptolemies with Kilikia: Foraboschi 2003; Tempesta 2011; for the inscription concerning the relationship between Arsinoe and Nagidos: Opelt – Kirsten 1989; Jones – Russell 1993; for an attempt to locate Berenike: Zoroğlu 1999.

literary and numismatic sources we are informed of the adoption of a Pompeian era by many cities (for Soloi also the change of the name to Pompeiupolis occurred) and it's more than probable that these changes are connected with some (at the moment indefinable) architectural interventions in these cities.⁸

The progressive installation of client kingdoms in the area was the opportunity for another important phase of urbanization. This happened thanks to the Teucrids, to Archelaos of Kappadokia, to the dynasty of the kings of Kommagene (especially during the reign of Antiochos IV) and then to the Tarkondimotides.⁹

In detail, in Kilikia Pedias, Augusta was founded in 20 BCE, while the settlement of Anazarbos was re-organized in 19 BCE under Tarkondimotos II; very probably Neronias-Irenopolis was founded in 51–52 CE by Antiochos IV of Kommagene. In Kilikia Tracheia Archelaos of Kappadokia renamed Elaioussa as Sebaste, whereas the same Antiochos IV founded Iotape and Antiocheia epi Krago. More problematic (for data currently available) are the cases of Titiupolis, Domitiupolis and Germanikoupolis; the question concerning the chronology of Diokaisareia (founded by Tiberius or after the annexation to the Roman Empire under Vespasian?) is still unsolved.¹⁰

It is worthy of attention that, from a formal point of view, the Hellenistic-fashioned dynastic toponymy continued with names referring to the dynasty of client kings or to the Roman allies. Nevertheless, it is more important to underline that, in this period, areas still unsettled were furnished with cities, especially in the Tracheia, and we can affirm that the development of the urbanization of Kilikia was completed only at the beginning of the Christian era.

On the real question of what client kings effectively did, we can say at the moment very little information, since the excavations (where they have been carried out) have not reached buildings pertaining to these phases: but my opinion is that they really realized ambitious programs, as some evidence shows.¹¹

Finally, it is worth observing that, in contrast to the western provinces (but as it usually happens in Asia Minor), in all Kilikia we have only one Roman colonial foun-

8 Interventions by Pompeius after the pirates war are explicitly recalled by literary sources for Adana, Mallos and Epiphaneia and we must add, of course, Soloi-Pompeiupolis; furthermore, the coins of Alexandria kat'Isson, Mopsuestia and Zephyrion bear 65 BCE as the starting year of their urban era. See Trampedach 2012; for the coinage, Ziegler 1993. At the moment, we do not have any evidence concerning this phase.

9 For the historical features and development of client kingdoms: see Pani 1970; Barrett 1990; Jacobson 2001; Tempesta 2005; Wright 2008; Wright 2012; Tempesta 2013; Ziegler 2016; Borgia 2017a.

10 A summary of the problems related to this foundation is in Spanu 2011, 5–6. The crucial point is the inscription Heberdey – Wilhelm 1896, no. 160, 84, where Tiberius is defined as *ktistes tēs póleos*, but it is very probable that this inscription is posthumous.

11 A significant piece of evidence in this sense is the monumental dedication of Antiochos IV at Elaioussa-Sebaste: Borgia 2013a. Unfortunately, the absence of plans (and often of excavations) makes it impossible to draw any conjecture on the type of adopted urban schemes for the new foundations realized in this phase. For the cities founded on flat areas (like Anazarbos) we could expect regular urban grids, but it is not excluded that in some cases with conditioning orographic situations (such as Iotape), the roads were arranged according to the morphology of the territory.

dation, the discussed case of *Colonia Augusta Felix Ninica Claudioupolis*, whose location remains uncertain.¹²

At any rate, at the moment of the complete annexation of Kilikia by Vespasian, the urbanization of the region was completed, but only after a long-lasting process of development.

The Roman control of the region, in fact, did not correspond to the realization of new cities, but thanks to the *pax romana* and the new general possibilities, Cilician cities experienced an impressive growth from many points of view. Not secondary from this perspective was the improvement of connections, thanks to the development of old routes and the realization of new roads and the related infrastructures, facilitating the contacts with the settlements of the hinterland.¹³

The already mentioned absence of extensive excavations offers a very fragmentary framework for the single cities. Although we can go to Kilikia and we can see a lot of archaeological ruins, a not secondary problem is that we see monuments casually preserved (or excavated), but not the principal entities of the cities.

In this regard, I think that the words of Pausanias about the elements that constitute a city are very significant. Speaking with disdain about Panopeas in Phocis in the second century CE, Pausanias wrote that a city must have a political organization (*archeia*), a gymnasium, a theatre, an agora and an aqueduct.¹⁴ Of course, every element corresponds to something that is both symbolic and monumental. The agora, for example, can be interpreted as market-place, but (and mainly) as a political centre, that is to say the heart and the core of the city.

At this point, we can ask ourselves how many *agorai* we know archaeologically for the Roman Cilician cities. The answer is: not one! There are some hints of their location for some cities, but it is impressive that until now we do not know of any agora in Kilikia.¹⁵ Maybe this depends, also, on the fact that often the excavations prefer to investigate more “prestigious” buildings like theatres, baths, etc.

In the same passage, Pausanias underlined the wish of the Panopeans to be considered as inhabitants of a city. The desire to be considered a city, a *polis* (or an *urbs* in Latin), and not a village is typical for this period. A strong piece of evidence in this sense is offered by a recurring motif on the coins of the cities: the Tyche inside a temple, where the Tyche is the personification of the city. At the moment we don't know of temples of Tyche in Cilician cities,¹⁶ but I think that the principal message for these representation of Tyche was not the memory of a specific building, but the vigorous pride to be considered as a city, also for the small centres.¹⁷

12 *Colonia Augusta Felix Ninica Claudioupolis* (cited by Amm. XIV, 8, 1–2 and minting coins with a Latin legend until Maximinus) has been identified with Mut (Mitchell 1979, 426–435), but recently it was proposed that it could be somehow connected with Iuliosebaste, located in the coastal area of Rough Kilikia (Tomaschitz 2003).

13 Without doubt, the realization of a road network permitted an increase of contacts, trade and so on. For the Roman road-network in Kilikia, see Hild 1991; French 1981; Spanu 2009; French 2014; Spanu 2016.

14 Paus. 10,4,1–7.

15 The building at Elaioussa-Sebaste, usually called the “Roman Agora” (see Equini Schneider 2010), is to be understood as a *macellum*.

16 There is only the exception of Diokaisareia, paradoxically without coins bearing this motif.

17 Spanu 2003b, 493–495.

Infrastructures and facilities in Roman period

Coming to the changes, transformations and innovations that occurred in Roman times, the cities in Kilikia increased following the general tendencies visible in the rest of the Empire and, expressly, according to the trend of the other provinces of Asia Minor.

One of these trends was pointing to the *utilitas* of buildings, that is to say the consideration of practical and useful edifices. It is not by chance that in Roman times, many cities were enhanced with aqueducts. At the moment, we know of fourteen cases, but my opinion is that this number can be easily increased.¹⁸

Most of these aqueducts are not studied and we have only a single epigraphically dated case, that of Anazarbos,¹⁹ built in 90–91 CE, that is to say a few years after the Roman annexation (fig. 2).

Among the few studied aqueducts in Kilikia, significant is the case of Elaioussa-Sebaste and Korykos. Its development is particularly rich in terms of technical solutions: from a channel cut in the rock to a *specus* carried on arches, with a spectacular solution crossing the theatre of Elaioussa-Sebaste. Nevertheless, more interesting is another aspect: the aqueduct, in fact, was built in order to supply not only one single city. After reaching Elaioussa-Sebaste, the aqueduct crossed a river and went ahead to serve the nearby city of Korykos.²⁰

The construction of an aqueduct for more than one city is not exclusive, but surely rare, like the exceptional case of the *Aqua Augusta* (aqueduct of Serino) in Italy, useful for many cities, like Pompei, Neaples, Puteoli and so on, realized by Agrippa.

For the case of Elaioussa-Sebaste and Korykos, it is evident that a “common” aqueduct depended not only on a municipal decision, but also quite certainly on a decision by a higher authority, maybe of the Roman governor of the province. After all, this kind of constructions required very skilled architects and it is plausible to imagine (or to suspect) for some cases the advice of Roman engineers with a full competence on the use of mortars and of the system of building with arches.

In many cases, the effect of the construction of aqueducts was not limited to the arrival of the water to urban areas, but often it involved the realization of monuments of prestige, like the nymphaea, as it is possible to see in Diokaisareia and in Olba.²¹

18 At the moment aqueducts are known for the following Cilician cities: Anazarbos, Anemurion, Antiocheia epi Krago (Can et al. 2016; Murphy et al. 2017), Diokaisareia (Murphy 2016), Elaioussa-Sebaste/Korykos (Özbay 2011; Murphy 2013, but for ignored details of the aqueduct inside Elaioussa-Sebaste, see Spanu 2003c, 55–56; 72–73), Epiphaneia, Hierapolis Kastabala, Klaudioupolis, Koropissos, Mopsuestia, Olba, Selinus, Soloi, Syedra. Recent studies have focused above all on identifying the layout, but numerous open problems remain, first of all that of the chronology, of difficult resolution.

19 Sayar 2000, 20.

20 S. Özbay 2011. The first phase of the aqueduct is not dated by epigraphic data, but by the relationship with the theatre at Elaioussa-Sebaste and a former building: Spanu 2003c, 105–113.

21 Surely, nymphaea were widespread in all the cities provided with aqueducts. For the best preserved and known buildings (at Diokaisareia and Olba), see Dorl-Klingenschmid 2001, 178, 251–252; Dorl-Klingenschmid – Kayser 2009; a small nymphaeum has been discovered below the theatre of Elaioussa-Sebaste (Spanu 2003c, 72–73). Furthermore, we have evidence of nymphaea from the representations on coins, for example from Tarsos (SNG France 1505) and Anazarbos (SNG Switzerland 1450).

Thus, aqueducts are clear indications of the change of status in the monumentality of the cities. At any case, they marked a radical change in the quality of city life.

Leaving aside the aqueducts, another kind of important infrastructure, linked to Roman skills, was the harbour. The plentiful presence of coastal cities (together with the increase of trades) was a reason to improve the harbours in the region, but to the harbours of Kilikia few scientific studies have been dedicated,²² and in the same way their construction is not easy and also for them we can imagine some involvement (or support) of Roman architects and engineers.

As far as the harbours are concerned, especially in the last years, the research work are complicated by the new modern constructions that have deeply changed the ancient landscape, like – for example – at Selinus (the harbour where the dying Trajan arrived). Recently investigations have been carried out in some sites, as in the extraordinary case of Soloi-Pompeioupolis, where a new harbour built during the reign of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius was probably planned with a general reorganization of the city (**fig. 3**).²³ However, this exception excluded, the state of knowledge of the harbours in Kilikia is still very limited. Meaningful in this sense is the case of Aigeai, one the most important harbours of the region, where Roman troops arrived frequently to march towards the East, and one of the least known harbours in the whole Mediterranean. The harbour is clearly recognisable in the satellite views (**fig. 4**), and the fame of the harbour was also celebrated on the coins.²⁴

Urban Temples

Coming to the features of Cilician cities in Roman times, evidence of their urban nature is offered by temples. I do not want to propose a list of the temples in Kilikia²⁵ and, of course, the majority of previously existing buildings remained active (as, for example, the famous Hellenistic temple of Zeus Olbios at Diokaisareia). Nevertheless, starting from the years of the client kings and then in the Roman age we can observe an increase of religious buildings in Cilician cities.

Due essentially to the absence of inscriptions or of excavation data, the few temples now visible (or identified) in Kilikia are characterized by doubts and uncertainties.²⁶ In this sense, the most symbolic case is probably that of the great temple in Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos (**fig. 5**), that's dating is based exclusively on the style of the few preserved elements of architectural decoration. On this weak basis, the temple has

22 For a general overview of harbours in Kilikia, see Vann 1997.

23 For the harbour of Soloi-Pompeioupolis, see Brandon et al. 2014, 94–101.

24 Aigeai was the only city in Kilikia that minted coins with a ship (i.e. SNG von Aulock 5454) or a lighthouse and a ship (i.e. SNG France 2344; SNG France).

25 Besides MacKay 1990, for Rough Kilikia, a brief overview is in Giobbe 2013.

26 The more recently excavated case is that of the temple of Antiocheia epi Krago: despite the accurate investigations and the good state of preservation, it lacks, unfortunately, any certain indication of to whom the building was dedicated (the general publication should appear soon, see Hoff et al. 2018, 11–13).

been dated at the beginning of Christian era or in the second century CE; moreover no evidence concerning the divinity to whom it was dedicated survives.²⁷

In this regard, a major innovation in the Roman period was the introduction of the cult of the Roman emperors. One of the first cases has been identified in Diokaisareia, where, near the big Hellenistic temple, a small temple, of Augustan date, has been discovered, most probably dedicated to the Imperial cult.²⁸

The same dedication has been convincingly proposed for the temple in the suburbia of Elaioussa-Sebaste. The temple has features pertaining both to the Roman and to the Greek tradition; unfortunately it had a difficult life, due to earthquakes and to the transformation into a Christian complex. For these reasons, we have no dedicatory inscription, but the surviving architectural elements suggest a chronology in the first half of the first century CE and a connection with the imperial cult.²⁹

The introduction of temples dedicated to the Roman emperors and their family became a constant in the cities of Kilikia, with clear consequences from architectural and social points of view. This presence must be considered widespread, reaching all the cities, including the small ones. This is the case, for example, of the small centre of Kestros, where two temples of the imperial cult have been uncovered. They have been the constant object of illegal diggings, but the discovered inscriptions to Vespasian, Hadrian and other emperors are unquestionable evidence of the widespread presence of imperial worship.³⁰

Temples dedicated to the imperial cult changed radically the appearance of cities, and the most impressive case at this regard is the Donuk Taş in Tarsos. The actual state of preservation and the dimensions of this building are so problematic that it's very difficult to appreciate its original appearance, but, although today only the core of the substructure survives (in *opus caementicium*) a hypothetical reconstruction of the building is possible (fig. 6).³¹

Despite the absence of epigraphic evidence, the common opinion is that it must be identified with the decastyle temple represented in the coinage of the city, dedicated by the koinon of Kilikia to Hadrian and functioning for the imperial cult.

It is therefore most probable that this temple has been realized on the concession of the first neorate obtained by Tarsos, and on this matter it is necessary to remember that the same city was granted three titles of neorate, Anazarbos three and Aigeai one. The title of neorate is not only clear evidence of the role acquired

27 For a high chronology, Berns 1998, 141–144 (followed by Giobbe 2013, 132–134), while the traditional dating to the 2nd century CE proposed by Keil – Wilhelm 1931, 8 has been stressed by Kaplan 2006, 92–3 and Spanu 2013c, 103–104. Chronological differences are essentially based on stylistic criteria and on comparisons of the architectural elements.

28 Wannagat 2005, 140–145. A (not totally persuasive) proposal to date the monument during Tiberius' principate can be found in Kaplan 2012.

29 Borgia 2008; Borgia 2017b.

30 For Kestros, see Bean – Mitford 1962, 211–217; Bean – Mitford 1970, 155–170; for a dedication to Hadrian in the “Vespasian Temple”, see Quadrino 2007. Meaningful for the particular attention for the members (also minor) of the imperial family in a very small city is the dedication to Lucius Aelius Caesar, discovered in the same temple (quoted in Spanu 2013a, 109, Anm. 6 and still unpublished).

31 Some details will be clarified by the recent researches carried out by W. Held. For preliminary reports, see Held 2008; Held et al. 2014; Burwitz 2015.