

Marco VITALE*

Imperial Phrygia: A “Procuratorial Province” Governed by *liberti Augusti*?

Abstract: During imperial times, Phrygia seems to have formed an administrative sub-district in terms of a ‘sub-province’ of the gubernatorial *provincia* Asia. A striking number of epigraphic records of freedman procurators refer to that Phrygia. Some of the office holders are explicitly attested as procurators “of Phrygia”. Moreover, one inscription mentions Phrygia not simply as a place name, but as a *provincia*. In all known cases, the Phrygian procurators were *liberti Augusti*, in contrast to the high-ranking equestrian procuratores Asiae residing in Ephesus. However, a freedman *procurator Phrygiae* reported directly to the governor of Asia, and was apparently not under the supervision of the equestrian *procurator Asiae*. Considering the spread of epigraphic attestations of procuratorial office holders, Phrygia did certainly not constitute a mere imperial estate within the province of Asia in terms of a *regio* or *tractus*. On the contrary, e.g. the imperial freedman Aurelius Philocyrius covered several estates that lay quite far apart. “Procurators of Phrygia” are attested in connection with several functions, e.g. resolving legal disputes about the distribution of “requisitions” (*ἀγγραρεία*), dealing with boundaries between communities or guaranteeing the export of important local products, in particular the so-called “Phrygian” marble from Docimium. The seat of the procurators of Phrygia was most likely located in Synnada. Hence, as an area with freedman procurators of its own, Phrygia occupied a special position in relation to most of the other sub-provinces of Asia Minor: no independent procurators are known for example for the sub-provinces Armenia Minor, Bithynia or Pamphylia. Rather, equestrian procurators governed several sub-provinces jointly. Of course, because of the special social status of the Phrygian procurators as *liberti*, it’s not possible to define Phrygia’s administrative status in analogy to the two Syrian sub-provinces Judaea and Commagene. However, under the financial and judicial administration of a freedman procurator Phrygia seems to have actually constituted an imperial “procuratorial province”.

Keywords: Phrygia; Synnada; Takina; procurator; libertus Augusti; procuratorial province; eparchy.

I. Introduction: the provincia Phrygia

On the following note, I argue using epigraphic evidence that during the Roman Imperial period ‘Phrygia’ was a relatively independent sub-province that was (normally) part of the *provincia* Asia. Under the fiscal administration of a freedman *procurator Phrygiae* who reported directly to the governor of Asia, and who was apparently not under the supervision of the equestrian *procurator Asiae*, Phrygia seems to have actually constituted in administrative and jurisdictional terms an imperial “procuratorial province”.¹ Obviously, this particular form of procuratorial government by *liberti Augusti* has to be distinguished from the equestrian praesidial imperial procurators attested for the first time under Emperor Claudius, which ‘governed’ their own *provincia* in all effects.²

* Dr. Marco Vitale, Universität Zürich, Historisches Seminar / University of Oxford, Faculty of Classics (marco.vitale@classics.ox.ac.uk).

¹ For procuratorial jurisdiction independent from Asia’s governors see most recently Kantor 2011, 155–158; part. 156.

² On praesidial procurators, cf. in part. Levick, Claudius 48–50; Eck, Verwaltung I 327–340; Eich, Metamorphose 150–154.

A striking number of records of procurators and their subalterns refer to Phrygia. Some of the office holders are explicitly recorded as “*procurator* of Phrygia” without their duty being specified. Most of the inscriptions that mention them are restricted to an area of the *provincia* of Asia that included at least two of the more than ten *conventus (iuridici)* or διοικήσεις into which the provincial territory was divided. This territorial order was based on the fact that province-wide jurisdiction by travelling magistrates was practicable.³ Probably, the Phrygian communities were distributed across the territories of a mere four of the 13 *conventus* of Asia, *Apamené*, *Synnadiké*, *Lykaoniké* and *Kibyratiké*.⁴ The ancient find spots of our inscriptions Tricomia/Troknada (modern Kaymaz), Stektorion (modern Kocahüyük) and Synnada (modern Şuhut) lay within the court district of *Synnadiké*; Takina (modern Yarıklı) in the court district *Apamené*.⁵ Moreover, inscriptions, mainly from Synnada, attest a large number of assistant clerks, so-called “reckoners” (*tabularii*).⁶ A number of further inscriptions from the same area mention *procuratores* but do not specify their subject territory.⁷ These were probably also *procuratores Phrygiae*. Considering the spread of epigraphic attestations of procuratorial office holders, Phrygia did certainly not constitute a mere imperial estate within the province of Asia, for to date it has not appeared on any inscription explicitly as a *regio* or *tractus*. By contrast, Phrygia itself was made up of many *regiones*.⁸ Neither was Phrygia a *conventus iuridicus*, such as stated e. g. by S. Mitchell,⁹ for Phrygia covered several court districts. Moreover, one of our inscriptions mentions Phrygia not simply as a place name, but as a *provincia* (No. 4A), although, up until the mid-3rd century A.D. Phrygia never appears as “a ‘province’ in its own right”,¹⁰ ruled over by its own governors.

According to most recent studies, Phrygia seems to have formed an administrative sub-district in terms of a ‘sub-province’ of Asia, which was a gubernatorial province subject to consular governors.¹¹ The main point is that both whole gubernatorial *provinciae* and sub-provinces as well were likewise called *provinciae*, in Greek ἐπαρχείαι.¹² We are dealing here with variable meanings of the term *provincia*/ἐπ-

³ On the system of conventions in general, cf. Marshall 1966, 231–246; Burton 1975, 92–106; Dräger, Städte 24–26; 275–352 summary according to cities of all known Asian *conventus*; Haensch, Capita provinciarum 27–36; Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, Πολιτικῶς ἄρχειν 227–237; Merola, Autonomia locale 143–145 with an extensive list of secondary literature in Note 1.

⁴ In this context, Plin. nat. 5,105–106 mentions the “inland judicial districts” (*mediterraneae iurisdictiones*); on the assembly cities Apameia Kibotos, Philomelion and Laodicea on the Lycus cf. Hensch 1997, 324.

⁵ Troknada: No. 4A (CIL 3 348); Stektorion: No. 5A (IGR 4 749); Synnada: No. 9A (MAMA 4 63); Takina: No. 10A (SEG 37 1186).

⁶ SEG 28 1211 (Synnada); Drew-Bear 1978, 12 No. 5 (Synnada); IGR 4 679 (Eulandra); MAMA 4 53 (Synnada); Drew-Bear 1978, 10 No. 4 (Synnada); AE 1973, 533 (Prymnessos).

⁷ Marcianus: IGR 4 856 (Laodicea on the Lycus); Anonymous: Judeich, Inschriften 87 No. 42 (Hierapolis); Aurelius Theon: MAMA 9 17 (Aizanoi); Saturninus Aponius: MAMA 9 180 (Aizanoi); Symmachos: MAMA 6 149 (Acmonia); Zotikos: IGR 4 727 (Eumeneia); Aurelius Faustinus: MAMA 6 378 (Acmonia).

⁸ See Boulvert, Esclaves 294 Note 209; supported by Hirt, Imperial Mines 114.

⁹ On the basis of E. Kornemann, see “Domänen”, RE Suppl. 4, 1924, 248 e.g. Mitchell 1999, 28–29; supported by Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, Πολιτικῶς ἄρχειν 224 Note 3; Hirt, Imperial Mines 114 Note 38; for an in-depth counter-argument, cf. Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon 55–60.

¹⁰ Hirt, Imperial Mines 114.

¹¹ In the following, a distinction is made between ἐπαρχείαι/*provinciae* in the sense of the whole area subject to a governor, i.e. “gubernatorial provinces”, on the one hand (e.g. Asia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia, Lycia-Pamphylia, Pontus-Bithynia) and ἐπαρχείαι/*provinciae* in the sense of administrative sub-units, i.e. “sub-provinces” (e.g. Phrygia, Armenia Minor or the half-provinces Bithynia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Pontus); on this ambivalent use of the two terms ἐπαρχία/*provincia* see Marek, Geschichte Kleinasiens 449–453; Vitale, Koinon Syrias 13–20; in reference to Syria, Rey-Coquais 1981, 25–31.

¹² On this see the discussion by Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon 13–20.

αρχεία, as recent research has shown regarding the administrative geography of Roman Asia Minor and Syria.¹³ For example Judaea and Commagene were governed as sub-provinces by equestrian *praefecti* under the supervision of the governors of Syria.¹⁴ In the same way, there are different administrative layers – suprasedgmental as specific – at work in Phrygia, as the proconsular level, the level of ‘sub-province’, the structure of imperial estates and quarries, the hierarchy of equestrian and freedman procurators. It’s often difficult to assign systematically and definitely the epigraphical evidence to these layers. According to the traditional thesis, Phrygia as a conglomerate of several imperial estates was only placed under the supervision of its own procurator under Emperor Hadrian or even M. Aurelius.¹⁵ But sources of the 1st century A.D. already, such as the dedicatory inscriptions of a εἰρηνοφύλαξ τῆς ἐπαρχείας¹⁶ contradict this thesis by already confirming the early existence of a sub-province Phrygia. Nonetheless, a majority of researchers doubt the correctness of the choice of term ἐπαρχεία/*provincia* in regard to Phrygia. However, this assumes that both the Roman administration and the provincial officers used the terms incorrectly. According to this view, in using the term ‘eparchy’ alongside the name of the actual province Asia, the provincials would have upgraded Phrygia, a mere “natural regional division” – and with the approval of the Roman provincial government (“allowed for the natural proliferation of local pride”);¹⁷ of course this argument cannot be supported methodologically. H.-G. Pflaum also sees references to Phrygia as *provincia/ἐπαρχεία* as “abusif” as far as the structure of governmental offices is concerned, as the procurators *provinciae Phrygiae* as imperial freedmen held a lower position

¹³ See Marek, Stadt; Marek, Pontus et Bithynia; Marek, Geschichte Kleinasiens in part. 449–453 on the Black Sea region; see Ziegler 1999, 137–153 and Vitale 2010, 103–111 on the south-eastern provinces; see Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon *passim* on all provinces of Asia Minor; see Sartre 2004, 167–186 and Vitale, Koinon Syrias *passim* on the provinces in the Levant.

¹⁴ Eck 2007, 193–195; Eck, Rom und Judaea 24–36; Speidel 2008, 58–62; Vitale, Koinon Syrias 74–91.

¹⁵ Under Hadrian: Hirt, Imperial Mines 114 with classical references; under M. Aurelius: Bowersock, Martyrdom 85–98; supported by Potter 1998, 270–274 and Kantor 2013, 144; a counterargument presented in Puech 2004, 381–383; Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon 74–77. That Hadrian’s many gifts of marble columns in particular are explicitly recorded – for example, according to Pausanias the Emperor donated 100 Phrygian marble columns to a new building east of the Agora in Athens – does not mean that the quarries near Docimium were not under the charge of a procurator of the whole of Phrygia before this time; cf. on the donation of marble columns for the Athenian Agora Paus. 1.18,9; on this Boatwright, Hadrian and the Cities 153–156; 161; also Birley, Hadrian 223.

¹⁶ Two inscriptions for Zeus Brenno from Appia (from the assembly region of Synnada) were dedicated by Titus Flavius, one of Vespasian’s freedmen, by 79 A.D. at the latest; Drew-Bear – Naour 1990, 1967–1977 No. 15; 1977–1981 No. 16 = SEG 40 1232–1233; on this, see Mitchell 1999, 29. See also the military diploma of a “Phrygian from Laodicea (on the Lycus)” (Diomedes Artemonis [f]ilio Phrygio Laudic[ea]); ILS 1988: from the reign of Galba (68/69 A.D.). Military diplomas list the recipient’s province of origin, in this case Phrygia; on this, Speidel 1986, 467–481.

¹⁷ Bowersock, Martyrdom 98; cf. most recently somewhat contradictory Kantor 2013, 144: “traditional ethnic and cultural regions, such as Phrygia (...) continued use for certain administrative (and judicial) purpose of administrative divisions [sic!, M. V.] based on the traditional regions of Asia Minor in the High Empire (...) Even though, precise understanding of the exact administrative meaning of ‘Phrygia’ and of its significance in the legal sphere may remain elusive”; similarly, Drew-Bear – Naour 1990, 1974–1977 cast doubts on the administrative meaning of the term ‘Eparchy/*provincia*’ in reference to sub-provinces generally. They claim that ἐπαρχεία as the direct translation of the Latin *regio* refers to “une seule région ethnique” in a province’s interior. Accordingly, the Latin *provincia* in all official titles was adjusted to match this Greek usage of the term. However, if this synonymy of *provincia/ἐπαρχία* = *regio* were really accurate, the titles of, for example, L. Vibius Lentulus (AE 1913, 143a; AE 1924, 81; Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes, No. 66), “procurator of Asia, Pannonia and Dalmatia” or T. Stat[ilius] Apollinarius (MAMA 6 97 = Robert Carie 163 No. 40; Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes, No. 124), “procurator of Lycia, Pamphylia and Cyprus” would be odd, for no one will deny that Pannonia, Dalmatia and Cyprus (all outside of Asia Minor) are regular gubernatorial provinces; for a detailed counterargument to the theories of Bowersock, Martyrdom und Drew-Bear – Naour 1990, cf. Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon 15–18.

in the hierarchy than equestrian officials.¹⁸ According to this view, the rank of the office-holders alone determined the administrative status of their area of responsibility: only equestrians were able to govern *provinciae*, and thus Phrygia was not a proper *provincia*.

However, the criterion of rank gets us no further either, especially as Phrygia also appears as a sub-province governed by senators holding offices outside Asia during the 1st and 2nd centuries B.C. Exactly three of nine surviving career descriptions of governor legates of the gubernatorial provinces Galatia and Cappadocia-Galatia list Phrygia as one of several *provinciae* included in their area of responsibility. Indeed, Phrygia was not a constant part of the province of Asia. This seeming contradiction led earlier research in particular to assume that the territorial name “Phrygia”, like “Lycaonia” for example, in the inscriptions of governors and procurators referred to the tribal territories of ethnic groups divided by provincial borders. However, there is no proof of ethnically determined territorial units such as “Phrygia Galatica” or “Lycaonia Galatica” as distinct from “Phrygia”, belonging to the gubernatorial province Asia, or “Lycaonia”, belonging to the gubernatorial province Cilicia (Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia); rather, “Phrygia Galatica” and “Lycaonia Galatica” are territorial names constructed by the researchers themselves. Other criteria, logistical and strategic, must thus have played a decisive role in the mention of Phrygia in connection with officials from different gubernatorial provinces (see for this chap. II.3 below).

As an area with procurators of its own, Phrygia occupied a special position in relation to most of the other sub-provinces of Asia Minor: no independent procurators are known for example for the sub-provinces Armenia Minor, Lycaonia, Pontus, Bithynia or Pamphylia. Rather, equestrian procurators governed several sub-provinces jointly, as in the case of Valerius Eudaimon, whom records show as serving under Hadrian as ἐπίτροπος ἐπαρχειῶν. However, it's hardly possible to define Phrygia's administrative status in analogy to Judaea and Commagene, for Phrygia was entrusted to imperial freedmen throughout, unlike the two Syrian sub-provinces. In all known cases, the Phrygian procurators were *liberti Augusti*, in contrast to the high-ranking equestrian *procuratores Asiae* residing in Ephesus. Certainly there are records of equestrian office-holders in Phrygia as well, but these governed Phrygia together with other sub-provinces; their exact offices are described, for example that of the *procurator ad vectigal XX hereditatum* (No. 3B) or the *praepositus vexillationum* (No. 4B).

What then were the factors that influenced this special position of Phrygia? And how might we define the relationship between freedmen and equestrian procurators on the one hand and procurators and governors on the other hand? In order to gain insight into these aspects, in the following we will discuss the evidence of procurators in Phrygia according to their specific areas of responsibility and position in the ranking system.

II. Provincial office-holders ‘of/in Phrygia’

The number of epigraphic records of the provincial administration of Phrygia is comparatively high. Various non-gubernatorial offices are documented. Inscriptions attest the following office-holders with “Phrygia” either as their sole or part of their area of responsibility; they are listed here in chronological order according to their social status (freedman/equestrian), office and territorial responsibility. Some of the freedman procurators ‘of Phrygia’ are also documented with the simple wording ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ (e. g. Hesperus, No. 1A). Accordingly, we also included procurators from the relevant area without the designation “of Phrygia” in their titles, and who appear to have been *liberti* on prosopographical grounds. All of them seem to have occupied the same functions of freedman procurators ‘of

¹⁸ Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes* 746; Pflaum 1974, 368–371; arguing against this view, Christol – Drew-Bear 1983, 40; Haensch, *Capita provinciarum* 321 Note 100; Vitale, *Eparchie und Koinon* 16. The official title of M. Aurelius Marcion (No. 4A) has been a particular point of contention.

Phrygia’:

A. Freedman procurators ‘of Phrygia’

Name	Responsibility	Date	Reference
1A Hesperus (lib.)	-[---]FRV[---]; [--- s]ub cura Hesp[er]ii //] lib(erti) proc(uratoris) [---]; [---]es sub c[ura ---] / [--- p]roc(uratoris) F[---] -ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ	Hadrian	-IRT 794c; 794d; 794g (Leptis Magna); Christol – Drew-Bear 2005, 189–216; part. 196–204; cf. AE 2005, 1439–(CIL 3, 355 = IGR 4 571; Abbott – Johnson, Municipal Administration, 403–405 No. 82; Christol – Drew-Bear 2005, 199–200
2A Papirius Paullinus (lib.)	procur(atorem) Septembre Aug(usti) lib(erto)	Hadrian	AE 1993, 1511; MAMA 10 255 (Kotiaion, modern Kütahya)
3A? [St(atilius)] Marcianus	ἐπίτροπος [?] τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ	Hadrian (?)	IGR 4 856; ILaod.Lyk 43
4A M. Aurelius Marcion (lib.)	proc. prov. Fryg(iae)	176–180	CIL 3 348 (Tricomia/Troknada)
5A M. Aurelius Crescens (lib.)	ἐπίτροπος Φρυγίας	Marcus / Commodus	IGR 4 749 (Stektorion)
6A Aurelius Elpidophorus	ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ	3 rd cent.	AE 2006, 1430; SEG 56 1689 (Synnada)
7A Cristobulus	ἐπίτροπος	207/208	SEG 48 1585a (modern Karamanlı-Eren Çayı Vadisi)
8A anonym	procurator Augg.	205/208	AE 2003, 1690 (Tymium, modern Uşak)
9A Aurel. Aristainetus (lib.)	τὸν δικαιοτάτον τῆς Φρυγία[ς] ἐπίτροπο[v]	212–249	MAMA 4 63 (Synnada); cf. IGR 4 703
10A Aurelius Philocyrius (lib.)	ὁ τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπίτροπος	213	SEG 37 1186; cf. SEG 13 625; De-stepen 2007, 147–173
11A Aurelius Threptus	procurator	212-237	SEG 13 625 (Eulandra, modern Sülmenli-Akar Çay)
12A Novellius	procurator	237	SEG 13 625 (Eulandra, modern Sülmenli-Akar Çay)
13A Aurelius Theon	κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος τῶν Σεβαστῶν	244/249	MAMA 9 17 (Aizanoi, modern Çavdar Hisar)

B. Equestrian Procurators ‘in Phrygia’

Name	Responsibility	Date	Reference
1B P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Aristus Zeno	συνήγορο[v] [τ]οῦ ἐν Φρυγί[α] / [τ]αμείου / [καὶ] τοῦ ἐν Ἀσι[ᾶ] ¹⁹	Marcus	IGR 4 819 (Hierapolis); Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes No. 205
2B Tib. Claudius Seren[us]	proc. rationis p[ri]vatae pro[v]inciae Asi[ae] et Phrygi[ae] et Cariae	176–180	IEphesos 3 647 = IMixed 129; Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes No. 283
3B Q. Cosconius Fronto	proc. ad vectig. XX her. per Pamphylia/Asiam ²⁰ , Lyciam, Phrygiam, Galatiam, Insulas Cycladas;	between 198–209	CIL 10 7583 (Carales); 7584 (ibid.); Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes, No. 264

¹⁹ On a honorary inscription from Synnada (MAMA 6 128 = AE 1940, 205) for Ulpia Saturnina, her son Iulius Lycinus and her father Ulpius Lycinus are each said to be a former σύνδικος ταμείου (advocatus fisci). Probably, this charge was also for Phrygia; Kantor 2013, 150 No. 9; cf. also the comments on Ulpia Saturnina’s genealogy in Samama, Médecins 405–406 No. 300.

²⁰ Asia and Pamphylia are left out in turn in CIL 10 7583; 7584.

	proc. ad vectig. XX per Pontum, Bithyniam, Pontum Mediterra- neum, Paphlagoniam		
4B C. Titius Similis	praeposito vexill(ationum) e[x- peditio[n]is pe]r Asiam Liciam Pamphiliam et Phrygiam	214–217	CIL 2 484 (Emerita); Pflaum, Car- rières procuratoriennes, No. 330

II.1. Provincial and imperial finances of the province Asia

According to an honorary inscription from the Phrygian city of Hierapolis, P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Aristus Zeno (No. 1B) held office under Marcus Aurelius as a συνήγορος τοῦ ἐν Φρυγίᾳ ταμείου καὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ, a “legal official responsible for the treasury in both Phrygia and Asia”. While Hadrian had created the new post of *advocatus fisci* throughout the entire Empire, in the case of Phrygia this institution actually appears not to have been an innovation of the 2nd century A.D. During Cicero’s period as governor of Cilicia, Phrygia is already mentioned separately in regard financial matters: in the mid-1st century B.C., like two governors before him, Cicero also governed “three allocated Asian court districts [i.e. Synnadicé, Apamené, Kibyratiké; M. V.]” besides his provincia Cilicia as well as the later court district surrounding Philomelion on the army route to the Taurus crossing near the Cilician Gates. Against the wishes of his troops, Cicero did not deposit the remainder of the annual sum promised him (*ex annuo sumptu qui mihi decretus*) in the army treasury, but repaid them to the *aeraria Phrygum et Cilicum*, “the treasuries of the Phrygians and Cilicians”. These were advances from the *Aerarium Saturni*, which were usually deposited with the tax farmers and customs officials (*publicani*) of the respective province or the provincial treasury for the governors as payment for carrying out their office. Of course, it is surprising that Cicero did not have a single provincial treasury for the entirety of the territory he governed, but instead had two treasuries, an *aerarium Cilicum* and an *aerarium Phrygum*. This last fact must relate to the court districts of Asia, which were *adtributae* of his actual gubernatorial territory Cilicia.

D. Campanile explains this division of the governor of Cilicia’s provincial treasury by the fact that Phrygia only formed part of the province Cilicia temporarily and was thus still part of Asia as far as financial matters were concerned.²¹ The decisive factor for our question is that the inscription of Aelius Zeuxidemus attests a specific treasury for Phrygia besides the provincial treasury for Asia held in Ephesus, at least for the second half of the 2nd century A.D. This necessarily means that Phrygia – even though it was a sub-province of Asia – was governed by its own procurator.

Accordingly, there seems to have been no comprehensive imperial private treasury (*ratio privata*) for the gubernatorial province Asia. Rather, there were individual administrative units. This is shown, for example, in a base inscription from Ephesus – now with a partially damaged upper right-hand section – which the tax collector (*exactor*) and *verna Augustorum* Severus had made in honour of his equestrian superior (*praepositus iustissimus*) Tib. Claudius Serenus (No. 2B). According to lines 3–4 of the surviving text, the honoured individual, who held office under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, was procurator of the *ratio privata* for Asia, Caria and a further administrative unit missing from the damaged inscription. As this is not an office spanning several provinces, “Phrygia” is the only option for filling in the missing part of the line on Serenus’s responsibilities: he was ‘the *proc(urator) rationis p[ri]vatae pro]vinciae Asia[ae et Phrygi]ae et Cariae*’.

Looking at Serenus’s official title, it is striking that the term Asia, as in the case of the official title of the *advocatus fisci* Aelius Zeuxidemus, is not used *pars pro toto* for the entire gubernatorial province of Asia, but only for part of its territory besides Caria and Phrygia. In contrast, the known official titles of governors only use “Asia” as a comprehensive term referring to the entire province. Asia’s structure of

²¹ Campanile 2001, 261-263 and Alpers, Finanzsystem 248-251.

individual administrative units was apparently only fully expressed in the office titles of financial officers. Administering both imperial and provincial finances required Asia to be divided up into smaller administrative units, which certainly seems plausible given the province’s large territory the province. In line with this, the largest unit, Phrygia, had procurators of its own.

II.2. Imperial Freedmen as *Procuratores Phrygiae*

In Tricomia/Troknada in the region of Docimium, the freedman and *tabularius* Senecianus had an honorary inscription erected for his superior, the imperial freedman M. Aurelius Marcion (No. 4A). Marcion served under a pair of emperors, most likely M. Aurelius and Commodus, as “procurator of the province of Phrygia” (proc. prov. Fryg[iae]). A Greek inscription from the same period shows, that the same office of ἐπίτροπος Φρυγίας, was held by a further imperial freedman, M. Aurelius Crescens (No. 5A). An inscription from the first half of the 3rd century B.C. in Synnada, the assembly city of the court district Synnadiké, describes Aurelius Aristainetus (No. 9A) as δικαιοτάτος τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπίτροπος (“exceedingly just procurator of Phrygia”). According to this inscription, jurisdiction also seems to have been part of the duties of the *procuratores Phrygiae*.

Aurelius Philocyrius (No. 10A) appears in 213 A.D. in connection with resolving legal disputes as τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπίτροπος (l. 39). Following the orders given in the imperial rescript, the freedman of Emperor Caracalla (ὁ ἐπίτροπός μου καὶ ἀπελεύθερος [l. 4]) listened to the citizens of Takina’s complaints. This village lay within an imperial estate in the south of the province Asia on a main road on the border to the province Lycia-Pamphylia. The villagers complained to the Emperor about illegal levies and attacks by soldiers. In the same year (11 October 213) Philocyrius dealt with a dispute between two communities about the distribution of “requisitions” (ἀγγραρεία) on yet another imperial estate close to Prymnessos in central Phrygia (modern Sülün, 11 miles north of Synnada). A few years before, an anonymous procurator of the Emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla (*procurator noster*, No. 8A) had to deal with the same legal issue of *inlicitae exactiones* in Tymium (modern Uşak). The same inscription concerning Philocyrius’ intervention in Prymnessos (SEG 13 625) mentions two other office holders, namely Aurelius Threptus (No. 11A) and Novellius (No. 12A). Both are simply called “*procuratores*” in connection with the redefinition of boundaries between two communities; under Hadrian, the *libertus Augusti* Papirius Paullinus was already concerned with the adjustment of *termini (positi)* of a community close to Kotiaion, the findspot of the respective inscription (MAMA 10 255, ll. 4–7). All of these imperial freedman procurators must have occupied the same function as Philocyrius – explicitly attested as τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπίτροπος – in different years. The procuratorial seat of Novellius was most probably Synnada (SEG 13 625, l. 33).

“Procurators of Phrygia” are also attested in connection with export products, such as the so-called “Phrygian” marble from Docimium. Inscribed blocks of marble in the thermal baths of Hadrian in Leptis Magna in North Africa state that they were produced under the supervision (*sub cura*) of Hesperus (No. 1A), the *procurator Frygiae*. This Hesperus is also mentioned in an inscription dossier from the Phrygian polis Aizanoi (near to modern Çavdarhisar) in the court district Synnadiké in connection with land surveying on the territory of the city’s temple of Zeus. Here, his office is simply described as ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ (l. 11–12) under the governorship of T. Avidius Quietus in 125/126 A.D. In his letter to the council and assembly of Aizanoi, the governor immediately refers to Hesperus in regard to the execution of land surveying (l. 40: mi Hesper carissime). By contrast, the procurator of Asia residing in Ephesus is not called upon as an intermediary: as least as far as this matter was concerned, Phrygia did not form part of his area of responsibility.

On the one hand, Hesperus’s inscriptions from Leptis Magna and Aizanoi are proof of the wide area across which the Phrygian marble was sold (see below). On the other, they show that a procurator

Frygiae was not only in charge of individual infrastructures or imperial estates, but administered the entire territory. Therefore, none of the procurators listed in Tab. A. is specifically attested as ‘procurator lapi[dicin]arum’, unlike the freedman Chresimus according to inscriptions from Ephesus and Tralleis (IEphesos 13.3, 856 and ITralleis 148). On the contrary, the area of responsibility of the imperial freedman Aurelius Philocyrius (No. 10A) in the office of procurator Phrygiae covered several estates that lay quite far apart, for example those near Takina and Prymnessos. The title “of Phrygia”, which denotes an official area of responsibility, cannot therefore be reduced to a regio in the sense of an individual imperial estate, but must refer to the entire *ἐπαρχία*. This is also suggested by the description of the duties of the freedman M. Aurelius Victorinus, who according to a tomb inscription of the very early 3rd century A.D. from Prymnessos held the office of *tabularius regionarius Ipsinae et Moeteanae*, that is the reckoner of the regions Ipsina and Moeteana; his superior, a procurator Phrygiae, must thus have been in charge of at least two regiones.

The seat of the procurators of Phrygia was most likely located in Synnada. This is supported by the comparatively high number of records of procurators from this region, and Synnada’s close proximity to the marble quarries in Docimium. By contrast, records show that the seat of the patrimonial procurator of Asia was in Ephesus. This separation of Asia and Phrygia into distinct procuratorial regions is reflected, for example, in connection with the treasury in the frequent records attesting members of the procurators’ teams, the *tabularii* (ταβλάριοι) mentioned above. Nearly all of these records are from either Synnada or Ephesus.

The number of epigraphic records of the procuratorial administration of Phrygia is comparatively high. Various offices below the level of governor are attested, all linked to various infrastructures: the quarries near Docimium (modern Isehisar) produced one of the types of marble most frequently used throughout the Empire, the so-called pavonazzetto, which quickly made its way to the Mediterranean from Synnada via Apameia Kibotos (modern Dinar) and Laodicea on the Lycus (modern Eskihisar) through the Meander valley to Miletus or Ephesus. One of the most important army and long-distance routes in Asia Minor went through Phrygia (which bordered on the provinces Pontus-Bithynia and Lycia-Pamphylia in the north and south respectively) from Apameia Kibotos via Philomeion (modern Akşehir) towards the southeast (via Antioch in Pisidia – Ikonion – Cilician Gates – Tarsus). Dorylaion (modern Eskişehir) in the north was directly connected to the main mid-Anatolian routes, several main roads which led straight to the legionary camps along the Euphrates (via Ankyra – Tavion – Sebasteia/Amaseia/Nicopolis – Satala/Melitene). Takina was on a main road between the navy bases Attaleia and Side and the west coast. All of these places were important logistical traffic hubs throughout the imperial period. Obviously, the military and transportation systems played a decisive role in Phrygia’s administration.

II.3. Equestrian Procurators ‘in Phrygia’ vs. Freedman Procurators ‘of Phrygia’

Larger areas of responsibility, which included Phrygia, were exclusively entrusted to equestrian office holders: e. g. the collection of inheritance tax could spill over into several gubernatorial provinces, as in the case of the procurator Q. Cosconius Fronto (No. 3B). Under the Severan emperors, he held the office of procurator Augustorum ad vectigal XX hereditatum in two groups of provincial sub-districts: in Pontus, Bithynia, Pontus Mediterraneus and Paphlagonia on the one hand and in Asia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Phrygia, Galatia and the Insulae Cycladae on the other. Thus Cosconius’s office covered at least five different gubernatorial provinces (Asia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Lycia et Pamphylia, Pontus et Bithynia). However, the individual areas the procurator was to visit were not grouped according to their gubernatorial membership, but were apparently randomly combined into two groups. Several details show that none of the territorial names listed appear in the sense of a “gubernatorial province”. For example,

the territorial names Asia and Galatia in this case refer to sub-provinces on the same level as Phrygia, Paphlagonia or Pontus Mediterraneus. Accordingly, these strange groupings of territories must have been due to some other factor than administrative geography.

This grouping of sub-provinces into two separate areas of responsibility appears less random when approached in terms of travel from the perspective of marching routes. Both groups of territories correspond to two different road networks: the northern Pontic road network on the one hand, and the mid- and southern Anatolian road network on the other. The order of the sub-provinces in each group could correspond to these networks: at least the order Asia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Phrygia, Galatia can be drawn as a plausible travel route connecting the respective procuratorial seats: (Asia) Ephesus – Laodicea – Kibyra – Termessos – (Pamphylia) Attaleia – (along the coast and via the sea to Lycia) – Xanthos – Kibyra – Laodicea – (Phrygia) Synnada – Dorylaion – (Galatia) Ankyra.

In connection with the movement of troops, too, Phrygia explicitly formed one of several administrative units under the government of an equestrian official. During the Parthian Wars of Caracalla, C. Titius Similis (No. 4B) was given the command of reinforcement troops (*praepositus vexillationum*) in an expedition through Asia, Lycia, Pamphylia and Phrygia. The order of the territorial names in the inscription corresponds to the marching route detailed above. Perhaps Titius Similis was responsible for taking care of the needs of the troops moving eastwards as reinforcements in the areas listed. The troops would arrive in Phrygia, listed last, moving further inland both from the west coast of Asia Minor (“Asia”) and from the Lycian and Pamphylian port towns (“Lycia, Pamphylia”). There was a base for soldiers near the Phrygian Apameia Kibotos,²² in Aulutrene;²³ Apameia was the assembly city of the eponymous court district Apamené and was thus also a compulsory stop on the judicial journeys of the governors. The most important garrison-place in the province of Asia was at the Attalid foundation Eumeneia (modern Işıklı). It occupied the southwest bank of the Maeander (modern Büyükenderes) on the road from Apameia to southern Caria and Lycia et Pamphylia. Under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius the cohort I Raetorum equitata was permanently stationed in Eumeneia.

In regard to interpreting the territorial names Asia, Lycia, Pamphylia and Phrygia, the same observations hold true as for the career description of Q. Cosconius Fronto (No. 3B) described above: only sub-provinces are listed, no comprehensive gubernatorial provinces. The care of troops was thus organised on the basis of sub-provinces. In this regard, too, Phrygia had its own role, independent of its administrative belonging to the gubernatorial province of Asia. The legal cases of the villagers of Takina regarding attacks by soldiers that were heard over many years by the Φρυγίας ἐπίτροπος Aurelius Philocyrius (No. 10A) and other officials probably need to be seen in a similar context, perhaps in connection with the incipient Parthian Wars of Caracalla. According to the evidence provided by milestones, Takina lay right on the army road from Pergamon to the Pamphylian harbour-Polis Side, which had been measured and fully paved by the first proconsul of Asia, Manius Aquillius (129–126 B.C.). Prynnessos, where Philocyrius was responsible for regulating the distribution of ἀγγραρεία, was conveniently located at an important road junction on the route between Docimium and Synnada. It would seem that the road network played a key role in the Phrygian procurators’ area of responsibility, even though the milestones always record governors, not procurators, for example for repairs.

The flexibility of the Roman territorial order based on the road system in middle Anatolia provide a plausible explanation for the particular status of the provincia Phrygia: provincial sub-districts could be provisionally separated off from gubernatorial provinces and temporarily put in charge of governors of other provinces. In the case of sub-provinces of logistical and strategic importance, this procedure is

²² Christol – Drew-Bear, Castellum romain.

²³ Speidel 1987.

hardly surprising. Besides Phrygia, it also applies to Armenia Minor on the army route to Satala and particularly to Lycaonia and Isauria; like central Phrygia, these two lay on the army route to the Cilician Gates towards Tarsus and Syria, and which gubernatorial province they belonged to shifted several times (Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia).

Even merely separating off individual Phrygian court districts and attaching them to neighbouring gubernatorial provinces for strategic and logistical reasons is a familiar phenomenon in the provincial history of Asia Minor. For example, between 57/6 and 51/50 B.C. the governors of Cilicia not only ruled over the catchment area of the assembly city Philomelion, but also over three individually “allocated Asian dioceses”. The south Phrygian road axis to the gubernatorial province Lycia in the early imperial period is an analogous example. The oppidum Phrygiae (Plin. nat. 5,105) Kibyra honoured Q. Verianus, the first governor of the province of Lycia set up under Claudius, for building works linked to the Lycian road network. The governor of Lycia was put in charge at least of the section of the road as far as Kibyra, if not also its northern extension, that is the entire conventus Kibyratiké, as an additional official area of responsibility.

On the whole, both records of freedman *procuratores (provinciae) Phrygiae* and those of equestrian procurators holding Phrygia as a subset of a conglomerate of provinciae suggest that Phrygia, as a sub-province governed by imperial freedmen under the supervision of the consular governors of Asia, held a comparatively independent administrative status. Because of its strategic and logistical importance and extent, Phrygia was so noteworthy that its personification appeared alongside Asia (!) and other gubernatorial provinces in the *Adventus Augusti* and *Restitutor* series of the so-called “travel coins” of Emperor Hadrian. The coinage representing Phrygia illustrates his visit to the procuratorial seat of Synnada and possibly also the marble quarries of Docimium.²⁴

III. Conclusions

In most cases, epigraphic or numismatic records of ‘sub-provinces’, such as Lycaonia, Pamphylia or Paphlagonia for example, are only sparse. These sub-provinces formed administrative districts within the provinces ruled over by governors (gubernatorial provinces). There are seldom, if at all, any records of the officials in specific charge of individual territories under the supervision of governors, such as procurators or prefects. Usually procurators administered a whole bunch of provinciae in terms of sub-provinces, which could belong to different gubernatorial provinces. Phrygia by contrast, which was primarily subject to the consular governors of Asia, appears comparatively frequently; provincial officials held responsibility for its territory in connection with various offices and infrastructures, such as the marble quarries in Docimium, collecting inheritance tax, supervising the provincial treasury or catering for troops moving through the region. In particular, at least for the high and later imperial period, the specific office of the procurator Phrygiae is recorded in several inscriptions, including on blocks of marble. Even though these *procuratores Phrygiae* were all imperial freedmen, Phrygia seems not to have been supervised by the procurator Asiae in Ephesus, but to have constituted a relatively independent administrative unit. The frequency of records of Phrygian provincial officials may not simply be due to the favourable source conditions. The expanse of Phrygia’s territory, its particular geography that included many important junctions within the road network of mid-Asia Minor, and a significant product like Docimium marble obviously demanded the creation of an independent administrative unit within the province Asia. This is the reason that Phrygia required its own provincial treasury alongside the treasury for the rest of Asia. Even though Phrygia was subordinate to the gubernatorial provincia Asia in administrative terms, its designation as an imperial “procuratorial province” seems to be accurate in

²⁴ Cf. for this Vitale 2012, 167–168.

this case.

Abbreviated Literature

- Abbott – Johnson, Municipal Administration F. F. Abbott – A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, New York 1968².
- Alpers, Finanzsystem M. Alpers, *Das nachrepublikanische Finanzsystem: Fiscus und Fiscii in der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin 1995.
- Birley, Hadrian A. R. Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, London 1997.
- Boatwright, Hadrian and the Cities M. T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton 2000.
- Boulvert, Esclaves G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le Haut-Empire romain. Rôle politique et administrative*, Naples 1970.
- Bowersock, Martyrdom G. W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome*, Cambridge 1995.
- Burton 1975 G. P. Burton, *Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire*, *JRS* 65, 1975, 92–106.
- Campanile 2001 M. D. Campanile, *Provincialis molestia. Note su Cicerone proconsole*, in: B. Virgilio (ed.) *Studi Ellenistici* 13, Pisa 2001, 243–271.
- Christol – Drew-Bear 1983 M. Christol – Th. Drew-Bear, *Une délimitation de territoire en Phrygie-Carie. Travaux et Recherches en Turquie 1982 (Collection Turcica 2)*, Leuven 1983, 23–42.
- Christol – Drew-Bear, Castellum romain M. Christol – Th. Drew-Bear, *Un castellum romain près d’Apamée de Phrygie*, Vienna 1987.
- Christol – Drew-Bear 2005 M. Christol – T. Drew-Bear, *De Lepcis Magna à Aizanoi: Hesperus procureur de Phrygie et l’administration des carrières de marbre*, in: J. Desmulliez – C. Hoët-Van Cauwenberghe (eds.), *Le monde romain à travers l’épigraphie: méthodes et pratiques. Actes du XXIV^e Colloque international de Lille, 8–10 November 2001, Lille 2005*, 189–216.
- Destephen 2007 S. Destephen, *La frontière orientale de la province d’Asie: Le dossier de Takina*, *EA* 40, 2007, 147–173.
- Dräger, Städte M. Dräger, *Die Städte der Provinz Asia in der Flavierzeit*, Bern/Frankfurt am Main 1993.
- Drew-Bear 1978 Th. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie*, Zutphen 1978.
- Drew-Bear – Naour 1990 T. Drew-Bear – Ch. Naour, *Divinités de Phrygie*, *ANRW* 2. 18,3, Berlin/New York 1990, 1907–2044.
- Eck, Rom und Judaea W. Eck, *Rom und Judaea*, Tübingen 2007.
- Eck, Verwaltung I W. Eck, *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge* 1, Basel 1995.
- Eck 2007 W. Eck, *Die politisch-administrative Struktur der kleinasiatischen Provinzen während der hohen Kaiserzeit*, in: G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 28–30 September 2006*, Pisa 2007, 189–207.
- Eich, Metamorphose P. Eich, *Zur Metamorphose des politischen Systems in der römischen Kaiserzeit: die Entstehung einer „personalen Bürokratie“ im langen dritten Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2005.
- Haensch, Capita provinciarum R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz 1997.
- Haensch 1997 R. Haensch, *Zur Konventsordnung in Aegyptus und den übrigen Provinzen des römischen Reiches*, in: B. Kramer (ed.) *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13–19 August 1995, Vol. 1*, Stuttgart 1997, 320–391.
- Hirt, Imperial Mines A. Hirt, *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World: Organizational Aspects 27 BC–AD 235*, Oxford 2010.

- Judeich, Inschriften W. Judeich, Die Inschriften, in: C. Humann et al., *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, Berlin 1898, 67–202.
- Kantor 2011 G. Kantor, Procuratorial Jurisdiction in the Lex Portorii Asiae, *ZPE* 179, 2011, 155–158.
- Kantor 2013 G. Kantor, Law in Roman Phrygia: Rules and jurisdictions, in: P. Thonemann (ed.), *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*, Cambridge 2013, 143–166.
- Levick, Claudius B. Levick, *Claudius*, London 1990.
- Marek, Stadt Ch. Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia (*IstForsch* 39), Tübingen 1993.
- Marek, Pontus et Bithynia Ch. Marek, Pontus et Bithynia. Die römischen Provinzen im Norden Kleinasiens, Mainz a. Rhein 2003.
- Marek, Geschichte Kleinasiens Ch. Marek, *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, Munich 2010.
- Marshall 1966 A. J. Marshall, Governors on the Move, *Phoenix* 20. 3, 1966, 231–246.
- Merola, Autonomia locale G. Merola, Autonomia locale, governo imperiale. Fiscalità e amministrazione nelle province asiatiche, Bari 2001.
- Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, Πολιτικῶς ἄρχειν E. Meyer-Zwiffelhofer, Πολιτικῶς ἄρχειν. Zum Regierungsstil der senatorischen Statthalter in den kaiserzeitlichen griechischen Provinzen, Stuttgart 2002.
- Mitchell 1999 S. Mitchell, The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 BC to AD 250, in: W. Eck et al. (eds.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1999, 17–46.
- Pflaum, Carrières procuratoriennes H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain I–II*, Paris 1960.
- Pflaum 1974 H.-G. Pflaum, in: *Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes Etudes*, 4, 1974/75, 368–371.
- Potter 1998 D. Potter, Procurators in Asia and Dacia under Marcus Aurelius: a Case Study of Imperial Initiative in Government, *ZPE* 123, 1998, 270–274.
- Puech 2004 B. Puech, Des cités-mères aux métropoles, in: S. Follet (ed.), *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine: nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches (Ier s. a. C. – IIIe s. p. C.); actes du Colloque International à la Mémoire de Louis Robert*, Paris, 7–8 July 2000, Paris 2004, 357–404.
- Rey-Coquais 1981 J.-P. Rey-Coquais, Philadelphie de Coelésyrie, *AAJ* 25, 1981, 25–31.
- Robert, Carie L. Robert, *La Carie, II, Le plateau de Tabai*, Paris 1954.
- Samama, Médecins E. Samama, Les médecins dans le monde grec: sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical, Geneva 2003.
- Sartre 2004 M. Sartre, M. Sartre, Les manifestations du culte imperial dans les provinces syriennes et en Arabie, in: C. Evers - A. Tsingarida (eds.) *Rome et ses provinces. Genèse et diffusion d'une image du pouvoir*, Brussels 2004, 167–186.
- Speidel 1986 M. P. Speidel, The Soldiers' Home, in: W. Eck – H. Wolff (eds.), *Heer und Integrationspolitik. Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle*, Cologne 1986, 467–481.
- Speidel 1987 M. P. Speidel, Roman Troops at Aulutrene. Observations on two Inscriptions, *EA* 10, 1987, 97–100.
- Speidel 2008 M. A. Speidel, Kappadokien. Vom Königreich zur Provinz, in: Ioan Piso (ed.), *Die römischen Provinzen. Begriff und Gründung*, Cluj-Napoca 2008, 51–64.
- Vitale 2010 M. Vitale, Zwei neue Prägephasen des «Koinon von Lycaonia» unter Antoninus Pius und Maximinus Thrax: Neue Erkenntnisse zum Landtag der Eparchie Lycaonia, *SM* 224, 2010, 103–111.
- Vitale 2012 M. Vitale, Personifikationen von *provinciae* auf den Münzprägungen unter Hadrian: Auf den ikonographischen Spuren von 'Statthalterprovinzen' und 'Teilprovinzen', *Klio* 94.1, 2012, 156–174.

- Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon M. Vitale, Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr. (AMS 67), Bonn 2012.
- Vitale, Koinon Syrias M. Vitale, Koinon Syrias: Priester, Gymnasiarchen und Metropoleis der Eparchien im kaiserzeitlichen Syrien, Berlin 2013.
- Ziegler 1999 R. Ziegler, Das Koinon der drei Eparchien Kilikien, Isaurien und Lykaonien im 2. und frühen 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr., AMS 34, 1999, 137–153.

Özet

Phrygia İmparator Azatlıları Tarafından Yönetilen bir Procurator Eyaleti miydi?

Yazar makalesinde Phrygia'nın İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde sahip olduğu özel konuma dikkat çekerek Asia eyaletinin doğusunu kapsayan bu bölgenin azatlı prokuratorlar tarafından yönetildiğini vurgulamaktadır. Yargı dâhil birçok yetkiyle donatılmış olan Phrygia prokuratoru, Asia mülk prokuratorundan tamamen bağımsız hareket etmekteydi ve sadece Asia prokonsuluna hesap vermekle yükümlüydü. Prokuratorluk görevini üstlenen kişilerin epigrafik belgelerdeki dağılımı, Phrygia'nın Asya eyaleti içinde sadece imparator mülklerinin yer aldığı bir bölge olmadığını göstermektedir. Aksine, Phrygia prokuratorlarının hukuki anlaşmazlıklara çözüm bulmaktan topluluklar arasındaki sınır sorunlarına ya da Dokimeion mermeri gibi önemli yerel ürünlerin ihraç edilmesini teminat altına almaya kadar pek çok görevi yerine getirmiş gibi görünmektedir. Yazar, Armenia Minor, Bithynia, Pamphylia gibi alt-eyaletlerin bağımsız bir prokuratoru olmadığını göz önünde tutarak, Phrygia'nın kendi başına imparator azatlısı bir prokurator tarafından yönetilerek bu kapsamda özel bir konuma sahip olduğunun altını çizmektedir. Yazar, her ne kadar Phrygia'nın idari statüsünün Iudaea ve Kommagene gibi alt eyaletler ile kıyaslanamayacağını ifade etse de, sonuç olarak imparator azatlısı bir prokuratorun mali ve adli yönetimi altında olan Phrygia'nın İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde aslında bir prokurator eyaleti olduğunu önermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Phrygia; Synnada; Takina; *procurator*; *libertus Augusti*; Prokurator eyaleti; *ep-arkhia*.