NOTES ON ANATOLIAN CITIES

1. Kalynda

In 248/7 B.C., Kalynda had a contract with one of its citizens, Theopropos, to supply wine for a festival held annually at a village in the civic territory, Kypranda: παρασχεῖν οἶνον τῇ γινομένῃ πανηγύρει ἐγκατ’ ἐνιαυτόν (lines 10–11). He borrowed money to buy the wine for the city, which then refused to reimburse him the whole of his purchase price. He now writes to Apollonius, the dioiketes of Ptolemy Philadelphus, asking him to intervene in the matter and press the city magistrates and the local royal officials to see that he is paid the rest of the money.

Theopropos states that he bought 84 metretai for the festival at 10 drachmas per metretes, thus 850 drachmas; the city paid him only 600 drachmas, and he claims the further 250:

As was recognized from the start, these numbers do not add up. To be consistent with 84 metretai at 10 drachmas each, Edgar corrected 850 (line 13) to 840, and 250 (lines 21 and 30) to 240. But it seems more likely that the writer made one error rather than three: correct the number of metretai from πδ to πε, 85 metretai, and the remaining numbers fall into place. Theopropos spent 850 drachmas to acquire for the state 85 metretai of wine; the treasurers repaid him only 600 drachmas.

For the other 250 he denounced the city’s two treasurers before the regional agents of the Ptolemaic government:

In a passage of the draft which was then crossed out, Theopropos apparently cited precedent:

The text is a draft, with many corrections and deletions. Presumably it was composed in consultation with Zenon: this papyrus remained with Zenon’s papers, and it goes on to include other draft letters concerning Kalynda.

---

because of not being sufficient on the basis of the subscriptions, the reimbursement hap-
pened.2

Who was in the right? It is explicit that the city refused the further payment; and while Theo-
propos does not say so, the Ptolemaic officials evidently sided with Kalynda – they declined to
intervene and left the question to the city, which decided it by not passing a decree, thus sup-
porting their treasurers’ refusal. Theopropos makes no claim that the two royal officials decided
in his favor or told the city what to do (e.g., pass a decree), and he asks Apollonius to write re-
provingly to each of them as well as to the city (28–29: γράψας πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν
στρατηγὸν καὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον).

We have only the complainant’s account; I speak in defense of the city. The symbolai were
“subscriptions” volunteered by the citizens: the city asked the public for donations for the pur-
chase of wine for the festival4. Kalynda raised only 600 drachmas. I propose that the treasurers
had some legitimate reason for paying Theopropos only that amount and not more. For exam-
ple: without higher authorization they could not spend money which they had not received and
did not have, or other money which had not been budgeted for this purpose; or else the contract
stated, or could be interpreted to mean, that compensation to the buyer must match the city’s
revenue from the donations. Whatever was the city’s argument, the regional Ptolemaic author-
ities did not countermand it.

Theopropos was now serving as theōros (θεωρὸς ἀπὸ Καλύνδων, his title in line 2), i.e. repre-
senting Kalynda at one of the major Ptolemaic festivals: προχειρισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως θεωρὸς
μετὰ Διοφάντου ἐνὸς τῶν ταμιῶν παρεγενήθην ἐνταῦθα πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, “previously elected
by the city as theōros together with Diophantos one of the treasurers, I came here to the king”
(25–27). So when he wrote to Apollonius he was likely in Alexandria for the Ptolemaia or the Ba-
sileia or in Hiera Nesos for the other Ptolemaia5. His fellow theōros on this mission was one of
the treasurers whom he accused of underpaying him. So accuser and defendant found themselves
together in a higher legal jurisdiction and both inescapably subject to its decision and compul-
sion – a new opportunity for Theopropos. Theopropos was going over the heads of the Kalynda
magistrates and also of the royal officials in Anatolia. We do not know the result.

Theopropos had invested 850 drachmas in the expectation of some benefit to himself, wheth-
er monetary (e.g., if he was entitled to all the revenue from the donations, irrespective of the
price he had paid for the wine) or honorific. He had put himself in a situation comparable to
what many a Roman publican later would fear: he had overbid, using money that was not his
own and on which (as he says in two passages written and then marked to be omitted) he was
continuing to pay interest.

2 Edgar suggested ἑτέρος ἄγορας κόσιν ψήφιζε: “seeing that in former cases other contractors have
been paid by decree(? owing to the subscriptions being insufficient to provide for the payment”.
3 Orrieux p. 53: “un apport personnel sous forme de cotisation volontaire à la fête ... Les cités organisaient
donc les fournitures de victuailles par adjudication, recueillaient les souscriptions et payaient ensuite”.
4 Perhaps in exchange for entrance tokens, which are attested for festivals and other ceremonies: G. Lafaye,
228; Fuchs and Schwartz, GNS 30 (1980) pp. 68–69. Of the hundreds from Palmyra, many were for “access to the
ritual banquets or the distributions that followed some sacrifices” (H. Ingoldt, H. Seyrig, and J. Starcky, Recueil
des tessères de Palmyre (1955) p. iv); tessera no. 25 is especially evocative, with three symposiast “priests of Bel”
on one side, on the other a figure ladeling wine from an amphora into a cup.
The 85 metretai (ca. 330 liters) would be undiluted wine. A thought experiment: imagine that in the drinking it was watered down (on average) to \(1/3\), yielding 990 liters of potable wine; that the festival lasted one day; that each attendee (averaging across men, women, and children) consumed one litre in the course of that day. Then Theopropos had expected a crowd of 990 people. Here are too many variables for calculation to be taken seriously. But on the occasion of the festival, we can picture, as was said of desolate Plataia during the Eleutheria\(^7\), that Kypranda, otherwise unknown to us, “became a city”.

The divinity honored at this village festival is unfortunately not mentioned. The name Kypranda\(^8\), like Kalynda, is Luwian; it may be that the god was indigenous, older than the coming of the Greeks.

2. Teos

At the end of the third century B.C. Teos voted extensive honors for Antiochus III, who had liberated the city from the Attalids\(^9\). Various festivities are prescribed. On the first day of each year, in the bouleuterion the new magistrates, for their eisiteteria, are to sacrifice to the king and the Graces and Memory; on the same day the ex-ephebes are to make a separate sacrifice in the same fashion. “And we shall make their first entry into the agora most splendid.”

This last can be taken to imply that the young males were now permitted to enter the agora for the first time in their lives, and Peter Herrmann envisaged a coming-of-age ritual, comparable to the Romans’ deductio ad forum. But that gesture, in the course of which a boy was registered with his tribe, was a family matter, scheduled in keeping with each boy’s age (preparatory to taking on the toga virilis), and not a public ceremony or on a common date\(^10\).

A better analogy for the state excluding boys from the agora is offered by Athens. In Xenophon’s telling (Mem. 4.2.1), young Euthydemus was a member of Socrates’ entourage on a stroll through the city; but when they came to the agora, Euthydemus had to wait outside the boundary while the rest went in: “because of his youth he was not yet going into the agora”, διὰ νεότητα οὔπω εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν εἰσιόντα. He rejoined the group when they came back out. That is, Euthydemus was old enough to enjoy Socratic conversation (fourteen or fifteen?) but not old enough for the agora: the inference is that one had to be of ephebic age. This seems a matter of public law, and not just a custom that children should not be seen in public, or a fear for their safety – such concerns would apply outside of the agora as well as inside. A boy’s haircut would give him away: he had not yet performed the koureion.

So it may be that the Tean ephebes similarly had never been allowed in the agora. But the passage, in my view, addresses a different matter. To clarify the text, we should punctuate at the end of line 42. The two sacrifices are described, and two purpose clauses are then stated, the goals of the sacrifices: the first purpose clause pertains especially to the magistrates, the second...
to both the magistrates and the ephebes. A new sentence then follows, the city’s promise for the future about the procession: [ποιήσωμεν in 44 is indicative, not subjunctive11; in 43, not ἐπὶ ταύτα] but ἐπὶ ταύτα12:

“(...) the magistrates are to sacrifice as their eisiteteria, etc.) ...; the ex-ephebes, together with the gymnasiarch, are to sacrifice on the same day, in the way described above – so that they undertake to do nothing of public business before giving thanks to the benefactors, and so that we accustom those who come after them to value all things as secondary and minor in comparison with returning thanks; and toward these goals we shall make their first entry into the agora most splendid.”

The “ex-ephebes”, as Herrmann saw, are the graduates of the class of the year just ended13. If the phrase meant all former ephebes, it would likely encompass most or all the male citizens of Teos.

The passage implies that those who make this “first entry” are not just the ex-ephebes but also the magistrates, on the opening day of the year. That is, both groups are said to be entering the agora for the first time – not for the first time in their lives but for the first time in their new condition: the first public presentation of new magistrates and that of new adult citizens in the agora, entering upon their offices or their citizen rights. This reading of the passage does not exclude the possibility that Tean boys were indeed banned from the agora. It holds only that the scope of these provisions is narrow, describing the ceremonial entry of the new magistrates and new adults on 1 Leukatheon, the first day of the Tean year.

The sacrifices voted in honor of the king are new in this decree. Concerning the procession, the text offers no details (in contrast to the lengthy account of the sacrifices), only the one word εἴσοδος. So it probably was a traditional ceremony in which nothing was now changed beyond the state’s vague promise to make it more splendid.

This first entry of the magistrates and ex-ephebes into the agora was doubtless a cheerful affair. If the youths sacrificed in the gymnasium (rather than in the bouleuterion with the magistrates), their march proceeded down the street that parallels the city’s east wall14, from the

11 Herrmann p. 45, “und damit wir ihr erstes Auftreten auf dem Markt ebenso(?) möglichst feierlich gestalten”; Ma p. 315, “and so that we should make their first entrance into the agora as fine as possible, in the same spirit(?)”; A. S. Chankowski, L’éphébie hellénistique (2010), p. 298 n. 281, “et que, à cet effet, nous rendions ...”, claiming a mason’s error for subjunctive ποιήσωμεν.
gymnasium in the northeastern part of town to the agora in the southeast. That route took them past the front of the bouleuterion somewhat northwest of the agora, where the new magistrates, having completed their sacrifice, will have joined the procession.

3. In Phrygia

A block inscribed with a civic decree\(^{15}\) came to be incorporated into a mosque, along with other ancient stones, at Karayük bazar in southwestern Phrygia, a region acquired by the Attalids in 188 B.C.\(^{16}\) The decree honors a generous citizen, Chares son of Attalus. His benefactions had been directed to education: as paidonomos and otherwise, he made donations to students, teachers, ephebes, neoi, and to the gymnasium. His city is unidentified; Eriza and Themisonium are in the vicinity. The editors preferred Eriza, Ramsay “probably” Themisonium without argument; Ruge, Robert, and Cohen leave the question open\(^{17}\).

If the city is uncertain, a date is explicit: Chares served as gymnasiarch “in the year of the priest Chrysippus son of Antiochus, year 19”, \(\text{ἐπὶ} \, \text{idερέως} \, \text{Χρυσίππου} \, \text{τοῦ} \, \text{Ἀντίοχου}, \, \text{ἔτους} \, \text{ἐν} \, \text{ακακεκά} \, \text{του} \). Beginning with Cousin and Diehl, scholars have taken this to be the era of the province of Asia and dated the decree to 114 B.C.\(^{18}\)

There was however no such era\(^{19}\). The date might then be the Sullan era, which would place the decree in 67/62\(^{20}\). But consider that we have two dates: an eponymous priest of an unnamed god, followed by a numbered year. I propose that the first was the priest of the Attalid king\(^{21}\), and the second a regnal year. One can easily respect the editors’ judgment that the inscription belongs in the late second century; therefore rather than the 19\(^{th}\) year of Eumenes II = 179/8 B.C., that of Attalus II = 141.

Ramsay, commenting on this decree, painted an amiable picture of the tranquility and prosperity of this region under the Attalids\(^{22}\), which (using the date 114 B.C.) he then took to continue into the early province. But Chares’ earnest contributions exclusively in support of the edu-


\(^{18}\) Expressing uncertainty, but careless, R. Sherk, ZPE 88 (1991) p. 251 (under Eriza): “If this is the nineteenth year of the era of Asia, the date would be 133 BC.”


\(^{22}\) Compare Rostovtzeff, SEHHE, pp. 805–806, 818–825, on the wealth of Attalid Asia after 188 and the ruination of the 80s B.C.
cation of his city’s youth look more in keeping with that comfortable world under the Attalids than with the new Republican province, an anxious time in which we hear often of donations or loans for military defense, grain imports, and above all embassies to Rome – emergency measures. Chares’ single-minded concern, education, suggests a more tranquil time. The date 141/0 thus seems more likely than 67/6 and the aftermath of Mithridates, Sulla, and Fimbria.

4. Knidos

In 6 B.C. Augustus responded heatedly to an embassy from Knidos, as we know from an inscribed letter found on Astypalaea.

The facts: during three nights Philinus and his brother attacked the house of Eubulus and Tryphera; a slave of the house dropped a chamber pot on the brother, killing him; Knidos prosecuted the slave’s owners, who fled to Astypalaea; Eubulus has died; Knidos sends ambassadors and a decree to the emperor.

Augustus’ response, based on an investigation by Asinius Gallus: the killing was accidental, as Tryphera’s slaves have now stated under torture (and he rebukes the Knidians for declining to order their testimony by torture); the attack on the house was “hybris and violence … destroying the public safety of all of you”. He orders the Knidians to alter their written records accordingly. This must mean: to void the conviction of Eubulus and Tryphera.

Augustus’ letter was inscribed on Astypalaea: it was probably a private monument to Tryphera’s vindication. We might deduce that she did not return to Knidos.

In his anger Augustus does not deign to say what action Knidos requested of him (by contrast, emperors’ responses regularly summarize the substance of an embassy’s message). That is a loss to us, and scholars understandably have focused on the constitutional question of the emperor’s involvement in the affairs of a free city, when the principals were not Roman citizens. As to the facts of the case itself, little has been said; from the first publication, commentators have tended to echo Augustus: the behavior of the attackers was illegal, the death was an accident because

---

23 One example among many is the decree of Alabanda (80s B.C.) Blümel, *IK.Nordkarien* 211 – often commented on but see especially Ph. Gauthier, in *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique* (2005) pp. 85–89.

24 Sherk, *RDGE* 67; Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* 6; Blümel, *IK.Knidos* 34.

25 So most have deduced from the findspot; Dittenberger however took the inscription to have been transported from Knidos (*Syl.* 356 n. 1). The stone was subsequently reused by the Astypalaeans, who inscribed below Augustus’ letter a letter to them from Hadrian (Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* 64).

26 This implies that the trial did take place and that there the defendants used the age-old tactic of offering their slaves for torture, an offer any astute prosecutor will reject – to accept it would be to surrender his case to the unpredictable stalwartness of a defendant’s slave (the ancients reveled in stories of endurance of torture). At lines 29–30 οἱ φεύγοντες τὴν δίκην has been taken to mean that Eubulus and Tryphera “avoided the trial”, escaping to Astypalaea; but the expression more likely means “were the defendants in the trial” (LSJ s.v. φεύγω IV, e.g. Pl, *Ap.* 19C τοσαύτας δίκας φεύγομι, “I would face such prosecutions”).

27 The inscription was headed by a double date: the city eponym [-, δημιούργος δε Καιρογένεως] was preceded perhaps by a Roman consular date. Two civic dates, Knidos and Astypalaea, are excluded, because no city is named in the preserved phrase.
the killer said so, and the Knidian court was biased and in the wrong28. I speak, once again, in defense of the city.

For why indeed would a civic government tolerate an attack on a house, and why would it prosecute those who opposed it? And we should hesitate to envisage popular and governmental hatred of a family for being “important” or “powerful”. In the cities of the Roman Empire, the opposite sentiment was more common29.

I urge a different scenario that was altogether frequent, indeed normal, in Greek civic life: Philinus had a court-sanctioned and legal claim on Eubulus’ property and person – the right of seizure. From Augustus’ narrative, it is evident that both Philinus and the Knidians were confident that their several actions were lawful. In a Greek city, without public agents to enforce assessed damages, a successful plaintiff was authorized and expected to employ self-help30.

A decree of Hellenistic Ephesus is comprehensive and insistent:

ἐὰν δὲ ἐνοφείληταί τι αὐτοῖς ἐτι, εἶναι τὴν κομιδὴν τοῖς δανεισταίς ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης οὐσίας τοῦ χρείστου πασῆς τρόπωι ὃι ἄν δύνωνται ἀξίλυοι [ἀπάσῃς ζημίας, “if anything is still owed them, the lenders have the right of recovery from all remaining property of the debtor, by whatever means they can, immune from any penalty”.31

This seems a more likely explanation of the behavior of Philinus and of the Knidians than postulating an unaccountable hostility that was both individual and governmental.

Augustus reveals himself to be more interested in maintaining public order than in deciding legal niceties. And old tradition cast extra suspicion on violence undertaken at night32. Roman law too allowed self-help, but Romans slowly came to view private seizure with unease and hedged it with procedural restrictions, until it was outlawed entirely in 53733. We can suspect that the creator of the urban cohorts earlier and the nightwatch later had vivid memories of urban violence and its consequences. He was eleven years old in the busy year 52 B.C.; he attended finishing school in a city reputed to be among the best-governed34.


Sherk, RDGE, p. 344: “the family ... must have been of considerable importance, perhaps a noble family. Why else should the city of Cnidus be so disturbed and so hostile toward the defendants?” Oliver, Greek Constitutions, p. 38: “a hostile court”.

The inscriptions are beyond counting; but one thinks of the 68 Coan dedications honoring a citizen whom (unlike Eubulus) we know to have been important: IG XII.4 712–779 (C. Stertinius Xenophon).


33 Just. Nov. 52.1. θεσπίζομεν μηδένα παντελοὺς ἐνεχυριομούν κατά τὴν ἡμετέραν πολιτείαν κρατεῖν, “we command that no seizure at all is valid in our state”. See G. Luzzato, ZSS 73 (1956) 29–67; A. W. Lintott, Violence in Republican Rome (1968) pp. 22–34, 125–131; W. Nippel, Public Order in Ancient Rome (1995) pp. 35–39. Dig. 50.17.176: “it is not permitted to an individual do what a magistrate can do publicly, lest there be an occasion for a serious tumult”. Marcus Aurelius’ strictures: Dig. 4.2.13 never sine ullo iudice, 48.7.8 sine auctoritate iudicis.

34 Strab. 7.5.8 πόλεις εὐνομωτάτη (Apollonia Illyrici); Plut. Ast. 16.1, Brut. 22.2 (44 B.C.).
5. Neokaisareia

A unique coin of Neokaisareia in Pontus was published by B. Burrell in her valuable corpus on the civic title neokoros\(^{35}\). On the obverse she recognized NEP and the face of Trajan; on the reverse, inscribed within a double crown, ΝΕΟΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ ΝΕΟΚΩΡΟΙ (fig. 1). The collective name of the city is treated as plural, as in Ἡρακλέας νεωκώρων (Burrell p. 257 coin 1), Νικομήδειας νεωκώρων (p. 153 coin 11b), Ephesus τρίς εἶναι νεωκόρους τὴν πόλιν (p. 71 inscr. 124 = IK.Ephesos 212.20). Burrell accordingly attributed the first neokoria of Neokaisareia to Trajan.

The coinage of Neokaisareia was sporadic. The few issues under Trajan, dated to 100/1 and 101/2, show no civic title. Then there are no issues until 161/2, when we first see the title neokoros (Çizmeli nos. 10–11). This recurs on the later occasions of coinage: in 184/5 (nos. 13–17, adding prote), 204/5 (no. 22, adding metropolis), and the huge output (nearly half of Çizmeli’s corpus) in 205/6, when however neokoros is rarely stated (nos. 42 and 168; Burrell p. 207 coin 4) and the city is usually content with metropolis; but the tetrastyle temple that signals the neokoria is often shown. Then yet another hiatus until 226/7, when δίς νεωκόρος first appears (and sometimes two temples are shown), which is mentioned sporadically thereafter (twice neokoros last seen in 255/6, nos. 431 and 442).

The neokoria displayed under Trajan makes Neokaisareia the second city of the Roman Empire to put this title on a coin, preceded only by Ephesus, the capital of Asia, in 65/6. Important cities did so later, whatever had been the date of the granting of the title: Cyzicus (Antoninus Pius), Smyrna (Caracalla), Miletus (Elegabalus), etc. This priority for remote Neokaisareia prompts worry; arguably comparable cities are Amaseia in Pontus (M. Aurelius), Kaisareia in Cappadocia (Septimius Severus), Anycra in Galatia (Gallienus).

The reverse of the new coin, well preserved, has the civic name and title framed by a double crown. This arrangement (text within a crown) has two parallels at Neokaisareia: one of the city’s two pseudo-autonomous issues (dated to 92/3) has on the reverse ΝΕΟΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ ΡΕΙΑΣ framed by a crude single crown (Çizmeli no. 1); and in 255/6 (no. 431), μητροπόλεως ΝΕΟΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑΣ δίς νεωκόρους ἔτους ρϙβ, again in a single crown. For the double crown of the new coin, Neokaisareia offers no parallel.

The obverse, by contrast, is so effaced as to permit doubt about the reading NEP and the emperor’s identity. The image does not closely resemble his portraits on the issues of Neokaisareia (nos. 3–7). A later emperor seems possible, or a late commemoration of Trajan, who had transferred this region to Cappadocia, or even of Augustus, from whom the city dated its liberation (3/2 B.C.).

If these uncertainties are just, I make the tentative suggestion that the coin dates to the third century, and the double crown that frames ΝΕΟΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ ΝΕΟΚΩΡΟΙ intends the same message as the pair of temples seen on other issues of Neokaisareia under Severus Alexander and thereafter: it proclaims the two neokoriai. This in turn would mean that the city first advertised its single neokoria in 161/2, in the time of Marcus Aurelius like Amaseia in Pontus.

---

Özet

Makalede, daha önce yayınlanılmış olan bazı papyrolojik, epigrafik ve nümizmatik buluntular üzerine farklı yorumlar getirilmektedir:

1) Kalynda (Dalaman/Şerefler köyü) kentindeki bir festival için şarap satın alımı konusunda kentin bir vatandaş tazminat ödemeyi reddederken olsalıksa sağlam yasal dayanakları olmalıydı.

2) Teos’ta yılın ilk gününde bürokratların yeni mezun epheblerin “agoraya ilk girişleri” onların yaşamındaki “ilk giriş değil”, yeni statülerindeki bir “ilk giriş”ti.

3) Phrygia’da bulunan bir onur dekreti Eyalet Erası’na göre değil, Attalosların saltanat yıllarına göre, yani I.Ö. 140/139 yıla tarihlenmelidir.

4) Augustus’un Knidos’ındaki bir cinayet davasına müdahale ederken “kendini savunma” ve “bir Greq kentinde tutuklama” faktörleri gözardı edilmistiştir.

5) Karadeniz bölgesindeki Neokaisareia kentinin bir neokorosluk sikkesinin Traianus dönemi-ne değil, kentin ikinci neokorosluğunun kutlandığı I.S. 3. yüzyıla tarihlenmesi gerekir.