Spring 2015

Asylia and Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Period

Kathleen Ann Kirsch
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Kirsch, Kathleen Ann, "Asylia and Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Period" (2015). *Master's Theses*. 4548.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.csq9-k6vj>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/4548

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

ASYLIA AND PEER POLITY INTERACTION IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of History

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Kathleen A. Kirsch

May 2015

© 2015

Kathleen A. Kirsch

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Designated Thesis Committee Approves the Thesis Titled

ASYLIA AND PEER POLITY INTERACTION
IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

by

Kathleen A. Kirsch

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

Dr. Jonathan P. Roth

Department of History

Dr. John W. Bernhardt

Department of History

Dr. Ronald Marchese

Professor Emeritus-University of
Minnesota- History/Classics

ABSTRACT

ASYLIA AND PEER POLITY INTERACTION IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

by Kathleen A. Kirsch

This thesis proposes that the Peer Polity Interaction Theory can explain the spread of the civic title of territorial *asylia* (inviolability) in the Hellenistic period. The Greeks had always considered sacred space to be inviolable; thus there was no apparent need to acquire a separate title of inviolability. During the Hellenistic period, however, ambassadors canvassed the Greek world for recognition of *asylia*, and acceptances were inscribed in stone and placed in highly visible places. It was clearly a particularly sought after title.

By surveying the primary epigraphic and numismatic sources and examining *asylia* in the context of the Peer Polity Interaction Theory, we can explain the networks created between the *poleis* in the Hellenistic period that enabled *asylia* to thrive. Interacting with other *poleis* within these networks would have been important in a world dominated by meddling Hellenistic kings, and later, by an emerging Roman power. The Peer Polity Interaction Theory proposes that a shared civic culture, competitive emulation, and kinship diplomacy, led to *asylia* becoming one of the most popular civic titles to obtain in the Hellenistic period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2. The Peer Polity Interaction Theory and <i>Asyilia</i>	16
CHAPTER 3. The Beginnings of <i>Asyilia</i> in the Third Century B.C.E.....	39
CHAPTER 4. Magnesia and Teos: Two Case Studies on <i>Asyilia</i> and Peer Polity Interaction.....	54
CHAPTER 5. <i>Asyilia</i> from the Second Century B.C.E. to the First Century C.E.....	72
CHAPTER 6. Conclusion.....	92
APPENDIX. Chronological Overview of New or Renewed Crowned or Panhellenic Festivals.....	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	99

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1 Boeotia & Greek East: Hellenistic <i>Asylia Poleis</i>	14
1.2 Cilicia, Phoenicia/Syria: Hellenistic <i>Asylia Poleis</i>	15

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Asylieurk.Kos:</i>	R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach. <i>Asylieurkunden aus Kos</i> . Berlin, 1952.
<i>BCH:</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i> .
Bloesch:	H. Bloesch. <i>American Numismatic Society Museum Notes</i> 27, 1982.
BMC:	<i>Greek Coins in the British Museum</i> , 27 vols. London, 1873-1910.
<i>CIG:</i>	A. Bockh. <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> . Berlin, 1828-77.
<i>FD:</i>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> . III: <i>Epigraphie</i> . Paris, 1929-.
Houghton:	A. Houghton. <i>American Numismatic Society Museum Notes</i> 33, 1988.
<i>IG:</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> . Berlin, 1890-.
Imhoof-Blumer:	F. Imhoof-Blumer. <i>Revue Suisse de Numismatique</i> 8, 1898.
<i>I.Cret:</i>	M. Guarducci. <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> . Rome, 1935-50.
<i>I.Kalchedon:</i>	Merkelbach & Reinhold. <i>Die Inschriften von Kalchedon</i> . Bonn: Habelt, 1986.
<i>I.Magnesia:</i>	O. Kern. <i>Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander</i> . Berlin, 1900.
<i>I.gr.Ital.Porto:</i>	Sacco, Giulia. <i>Iscrizioni greche d'Italia: Porto</i> . Rome 1984.
<i>I.Smyrna:</i>	G. Petzel. <i>Die Inschriften von Smyrna</i> , I-II.
<i>I.Stratonikeia:</i>	M.Ç. Sahin. <i>Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia</i> , 2 vols. Bonn, 1981-90.

<i>LSCG</i> :	F. Sokolowski. <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques</i> . Paris, 1969.
<i>MbBerlin</i> :	<i>Monatsbericht der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin</i> . 1880, 646-651.
<i>OIGS</i> :	W. Dittenberger. <i>Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae</i> . Leipzig, 1905.
<i>RC</i> :	C.B. Welles. <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period</i> . New Haven, 1934-.
<i>Rogers</i> :	E. Rogers. <i>The Second and Third Seleucid Coinage of Tyre, Numismatic Notes and Monographs</i> 34. New York, 1927.
<i>Roman Doc</i> :	R.K. Sherk. <i>Roman Documents from the Greek East</i> . Baltimore, 1969.
<i>SEG</i> :	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> . Leiden and Amsterdam, 1923-.
<i>SGDI</i> :	H. Collitz and F. Bechtel. <i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i> . 4 vols. Göttingen, 1884-1915.
<i>Syll.</i> ^{2/3} :	W. Dittenberger. <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> . 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1898, 3rd ed. 1915-1920.
<i>Zeigler</i> :	R. Zeigler. <i>Städtisches Prestige und kaiserliche Politik</i> . Düsseldorf, 1985.
<i>ZFN</i> :	<i>Zeitschrift für Numismatik</i> . Berlin, 1874-1935.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The early death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E. sent the Eastern Mediterranean into a sort of controlled chaos. His short-lived empire was belligerently split between his military generals and advisors, known as the *diadochoi*, or the successors. The fragmented empire ranged from the Greek city-states in the west all the way east, to parts of India, including Egypt, Babylonia, the Levant, and parts of Persia. The inexhaustible fighting gave way to four kingdoms with significant power: the Antigonids in Macedon and Central Greece, the Ptolemies in Egypt, the Seleucids in Syria and Mesopotamia, and the Attalids in Anatolia. The Hellenistic period (323-30 B.C.E.) in Greece, Asia Minor, and beyond saw the flourishing spread of Greek culture, bellicose Hellenistic kings fighting for their own territory, and *poleis* trying to retain their identities. The rising power of Rome increasingly encroached on both.

The Greek city-state, or *polis*, continued to exist under the Hellenistic monarchies. The question of the real independence of these Hellenistic *poleis* is a vexing one. How much independence from the hegemonies did they enjoy? How does a Hellenistic *polis* compare to a *polis* from the Classical era? Historians support a wide range of answers to these questions, but lately the most substantial evidence supports the idea that Hellenistic *poleis* still enjoyed quite a bit of independence. In her book on Hellenistic democracies, Susanne Carlsson argues that “in spite of the changing Hellenistic hegemonies and the coming of Rome, the Hellenistic *poleis* continued to act, as in the classical period more or less independently, on the international arena, just as they had done in the classical

period.”¹ Peter Rhodes, on the other hand, in his book on Greek city-states, claims that only the larger city-states like Athens, Sparta, and a few others experienced any real autonomy. The smaller *poleis*, he states, “commonly had had their freedom limited by one or more of the larger,” and in the Hellenistic period, “most states, for most of the time, though not absolutely free, were not subjected to direct rule by the greater powers.”² Some higher power always existed, be it a more powerful *polis* or a Hellenistic king that would try to sway those with less power to its side. Rhodes also points out that Greek *poleis* continued to run their own internal affairs, negotiations and quarrels with other city-states, and also combined to form leagues and federations.³ Carlsson agrees, stating that the Greek *poleis* of the Hellenistic world were concerned about their political independence vis-à-vis the kings, and also continued to be involved in alliances and conflicts with their fellow city-states.⁴

Fortunately, we have a vast number of inscriptions dating to the Hellenistic period dealing with interstate relations, and more come to light each year. These are vital in explaining how the *poleis* functioned alongside the hegemonic powers. Today, the study of *poleis* in the Hellenistic period no longer looks at the *polis* as in decline, but rather

¹ Susanne Carlsson, *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence, and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), 99.

² Peter Rhodes, *The Greek City States: A Source Book*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 276.

³ Rhodes, 276.

⁴ Carlsson, 101.

looks at the influence and the role it played within historical developments of the time. In a recent study on the post-classical *polis*, Martzavou and Papazarkadas stress that *poleis* “were not deprived of agency; on the contrary, they constantly invented new ways of exercising it, notably through developing a discourse with the royal powers, and eventually the Romans.”⁵

One of the ways in which the Greek *poleis* contended for honor and recognition during the Hellenistic Period was through a civic title known as *asylia*. To the Greek *poleis*, the title of *asylia* invoked inviolability for a temple, sanctuary, and/or territory. It was obtained on behalf of a *polis* in the name of its patron deity, and usually involved ambassadors canvassing the Greek world for acknowledgment of the *asylia* from different Greek *poleis* abroad. The first known evidence of a *polis* receiving *asylia* began in the 260s B.C.E, and requests for *asylia* continued until the year 22/3 C.E.

The title itself has perplexed historians: why would a *polis* need confirmation from other *poleis* that its temple was inviolable when culturally Greek temples had always been considered inherently to be immune from violence? In a passage from Thucydides, for example, the Boeotians reminded the Athenians that the inviolate nature of sacred space was a universal custom and the law of the Hellenes that sacred places were not to be misused:

⁵ Paraskevi Martzavou and Nikolas Papazarkadas, *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2013), 2.

Of what use was the universal custom protecting the temples in an invaded country if the Athenians were to fortify Delium and live there, acting exactly as if they were on unconsecrated ground, and drawing and using for their purposes the water which they, the Boeotians, never touched except for sacred uses?⁶

In this case, the Athenians had seized and defiled the temple at Delium, transgressing a law that the Boeotians claimed all Greeks followed. The latter, in turn, refused to return the dead Athenians back to their own people until they left the temple at Delium, a common practice in Greek warfare.

The question still remains, if Greek temples and sacred spaces had always been known to be inviolable, why was a civic title put into use to proclaim it? Some scholars of the past have declared the incessant war in the Hellenistic period the motive for a title of inviolability, while some blame piracy, and others a loss of religious zeal.⁷ Modern scholarship has turned to interstate relations to discuss *asylia*, while the latest compiler of *asylia* epigraphy thus far, Kent. J. Rigsby, claims that the purpose of seeking *asylia* was

⁶ Thucydides 4.97 “πᾶσι γὰρ εἶναι καθεστηκὸς ἰόντας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλλήλων ἱερῶν τῶν ἐνόντων ἀπέχεσθαι, Ἀθηναίους δὲ Δήλιον τειχίσαντας ἐνοικεῖν, καὶ ὅσα ἄνθρωποι ἐν βεβήλῳ δρῶσι πάντα γίνεσθαι αὐτόθι, ὕδωρ τε ὃ ἦν ἄψαυστον σφίσι πλὴν πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ χέρνιβι χρῆσθαι, ἀνασπᾶσαντας ὑδρεύεσθαι· ὥστε ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἑαυτῶν Βοιωτοῦς.” Also see W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War: Part V* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 160-163, for more examples of sanctuaries and plunder.

⁷ See Arthur Eckstein, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 80; Martin P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1972), 119-122; also Pritchett, 125-132.

merely to attain honor.⁸ By taking into account what was going on in the Hellenistic period between the *poleis*, the Hellenistic kings, and the Romans, and studying the epigraphic primary sources, it would be reasonable to assume that the Greek *poleis* sought *asylia* for honorific reasons; however, there is more to the story.

Considering that the civic title of territorial *asylia* arose in the Hellenistic period, and that we have no evidence of the very beginning of its existence, we have to look back at existing cultural institutions to conjecture from where the idea possibly could have originated. Greek sacred spaces were considered to be under a god's authority. Thus it was sacred and, more or less, out of the jurisdiction of secular rule. Consequently, temples and sanctuaries became places of refuge, as once a person touched or was within a sacred space, he or she were considered immune from violence. Temples had ways of regulating this practice so that it did not get out of hand. *Hikesia* is the Greek term for supplication, or someone seeking protection within a sacred space. Supplicants had to prove they had a just reason for refuge or else they could be turned away. Apart from being under the authority of their patron deity, sacred spaces were also inherently immune from violence, that is, they were inviolable, as mentioned above. The violation of that law was called *hierosyilia*, which was considered a heinous crime.⁹

⁸ Kent J. Rigsby, *Asyilia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 22-24.

⁹ Pritchett, 161, n. 211.

Another Greek custom upon which *asylia* was possibly built was the *ekecheiria*. This was the sacred truce used by cities holding Panhellenic festivals (as well as lesser games), and also by those attending a festival. The sacred truce forbade those participating in the festival or game from engaging in warfare for its duration. Also sometimes referred to as *sponde*, it protected those traveling to the festival as well. Pausanias, in his description of Greece, wrote how the first Olympic games were organized and that they included the *ekecheiria*: “Iphitos...a contemporary of the Lykourgos who wrote the laws for the Lakedaimonians, organized the Olympic festival in Olympia from the start and established the *ekecheiria*...”¹⁰ Thucydides, writing about the Peloponnesian War, describes how the Chians were eager to revolt against the Athenians, however, the Corinthians wanted to wait until the Isthmian *sponde* was over:

They were now impatient to set sail, but the Corinthians were not willing to accompany them until they had celebrated the Isthmian festival, which fell at that time. Upon this Agis proposed to save their scruples about breaking the Isthmian truce by taking the expedition upon himself.¹¹

Agis was willing to take the blame for sailing during the sacred truce of the Isthmian games, however, the Corinthians were not willing to break the truce. A number of the *asylia* decrees that also ask for recognition of a Panhellenic festivals mention *ekecheiria*. The *ekecheiria* or *sponde* were common Greek institutions used to protect people and

¹⁰ Pausanias 5.24.9-10, in Stephan G. Miller, *Arete: Greek Sports from Ancient Sources* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 68. The author notes that the dates of Iphitos and Lykourgos are not agreed upon, however that this is what Pausanias accepts to be right.

¹¹ Thucydides *The Peloponnesian War* 8.9.1

sacred spaces during festivals, and it is possible *asylia* arose from those customs. It is conceivable that a *polis* thought its temple or sacred space was so important that it thought it should assume a perpetual sort of *eckecheiria*.

In fact, there was a city that was able to enjoy a special inviolate status, and that was Plataea. It is noteworthy that the first evidence of *poleis* obtaining *asylia* came from Boeotia, the region in which Plataea is found. There was actually a cult of *Homonoia* (unity) at Plataea upon which much debate has been focused.¹² The cult of *Homonoia* could possibly have some ties to *asylia*. According to Shane Wallace, in his work on Greek *eleutheria*, there are two schools of thought on the origins of the cult of *Homonoia*: first, that the cult emerged in the fourth century in connection with Philip and Alexander, and second, the cult came to be in the 260s in connection with the Chremonidean War.¹³ In any case, Plataea played a role in developing the sense of unity and freedom or “Panhellenism” the Greeks needed in this new age to come together against the barbarian. Wallace states: “Plataea provided an ideological template, from which the new struggle for Greek freedom could assume, vicariously, a series of pre-defined goals and values.”¹⁴ In other words, Plataea’s inviolability might have been a status that other sanctuaries and *poleis* wished to have themselves; therefore, they could have used Plataea as a model.

¹² Shane Wallace, “The Significance of Plataia for Greek Eleutheria in the Early Hellenistic Period,” in *Creating a Hellenistic World*, ed. Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (Oxford: The Classical Press of Wales, 2011).

¹³ Wallace, 147.

¹⁴ Ibid., 161.

Several ancient writers mention the special status of Plataea, which was quite possibly the precursor to the Hellenistic style of *asylia*. Thucydides writes about promises made by the Greeks to the Plataeans that their city should be inviolate and free from aggression and that if anything were to happen, any ally should stand to protect it.

...and calling all the allies together restored to the Plataeans their city and territory, and declared it independent and inviolate against aggression or conquest. Should any such be attempted, the allies present were to help according to their power.¹⁵

Plutarch mentions Plataean inviolability, he states:

After this, there was a general assembly of the Hellenes, at which Aristides proposed a decree to the effect that deputies and delegates from all Hellas convene at Plataea every year, and that every fourth year festival games of deliverance be celebrated—the Eleutheria; also that a confederate Hellenic force be levied, consisting of ten thousand shield, one thousand horse, and one hundred ships, to prosecute the war against the Barbarian; also that the Plataeans be set apart as inviolable and consecrate, that they might sacrifice to Zeus the Deliverer in behalf of Hellas.¹⁶

Elis was another *polis* which most likely enjoyed inviolability. As Strabo and Polybius state, the Eleans and their territory were declared sacred and inviolable, also

¹⁵ Thucydides 2.71, trans. Richard Crawley, “...καὶ ζυγκαλέσας πάντας τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἀπεδίδου Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν σφετέραν ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν, στρατεῦσαι τε μηδένα ποτὲ ἀδίκως ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς μηδ’ ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμύνειν τοὺς παρόντας ξυμμάχους κατὰ δύναμιν.”

¹⁶ Plutarch *Aristides* 21.1, trans. Bernadotte Perrin, “ἐκ τούτου γενομένης ἐκκλησίας κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔγραψεν Ἀριστείδης ψήφισμα συνιέναι μὲν εἰς Πλαταιὰς καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος προβούλους καὶ θεωροὺς, ἄγεσθαι δὲ πενταετηρικὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ἑλευθερίων. εἶναι δὲ σύνταξιν Ἑλληνικὴν μυρίας μὲν ἀσπίδας, χιλίους δὲ ἵππους, ναῦς δ’ ἑκατὸν ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς βαρβάρους πόλεμον, Πλαταιεῖς δ’ ἀσύλους καὶ ἱεροὺς ἀφείσθαι τῷ θεῷ θύοντας ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος.”

demilitarized and freed from interstate politics.¹⁷ This status arose because the Eleans were the keepers of the sanctuary at Olympia and the administrators of the Olympic games. Bauslaugh proposes that the total inviolability of Elis was probably a fictitious story, possibly first told by Ephorus in the fourth century B.C.E. It was told that in the time of the return of the Heraclidae, Elis had acquired its status of inviolability. The story relates that the Eleans kept their inviolable status until they had to give it up to take up arms against those threatening them, and to enter into alliances with other city-states.¹⁸

Despite numerous epigraphic and numismatic sources, however, we do not know exactly how or why the Hellenistic version of territorial *asylia* began, or where. We can only look to the sources and available information to make an educated guess. Rigsby published the most recent compilation of these sources in 1996; it includes a brief introduction and contains 230 epigraphic entries dealing with territorial *asylia*. The epigraphic sources, ranging from the 260s B.C.E. to 22/3 C.E., come mainly from Boeotia and the Greek East. The epigraphic inscriptions were usually inscribed on a stele or block and placed in a sanctuary or place where many would see it, such as an *agora* wall. In addition, the area of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia offer many numismatic sources, all covered in Rigsby's corpus.

¹⁷ Polybius *Histories* 4.73 and Strabo 8.3.33, see Robert A. Bauslaugh, *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 42.

¹⁸ Bauslaugh, 42. Bauslaugh explains that the timing of this incident is unknown, see n. 10.

The Hellenistic period also saw an increase in Panhellenic games, and some of the *poleis* seeking *asylia* were also seeking recognition of such games within the same decree. The acquisition of *asylia* and recognition of Panhellenic games were very similar processes. Both included sending ambassadors to the *poleis* they wanted to accept and recognize the honor, and also to invite them to participate in the games. In his book on sport and spectacle in the ancient world, Donald Kyle explains that in the Hellenistic period, new *poleis* used athletics and festivals to declare their ethnicity because mainland Greece was no longer the center of the Greek world.¹⁹ He also explains that the new city-states “hosted or patronized games, creating new ones and subsidizing their competitors, in pursuit of publicity and status.”²⁰ The spread of all these new games could not have been possible without channels of mobility to spread the word. Robert Parker, on a chapter about Panhellenic festivals in Hellenistic Greece, stresses that festivals and games themselves were mobility-promoting institutions, as there were set forms of interaction that happened when festivals were proclaimed.²¹ The way in which ambassadors (*theoroi*) approached the assemblies of other *poleis* followed a strict diplomatic code that was familiar because the *poleis* participated in a shared civic culture. The methods of obtaining *asylia*, Panhellenic status for festivals, and even the proclaiming of the festivals

¹⁹ Donald G. Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 229.

²⁰ Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle*, 229.

²¹ Robert Parker, “New ‘Panhellenic’ Festivals in Hellenistic Greece,” in *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, ed. Renate Schlesier and Ulrike Zellman (Münster, Lit Verlag, 2004), 9.

themselves were all similar. This shared civic culture was dependent on connections and networks between *poleis* and can best be explained by the Peer Polity Interaction Theory.

The Peer Polity Interaction Theory was developed by John Cherry and Colin Renfrew in the 1980s.²² It examines socio-political processes within early complex societies and attempts to explain and conceptualize how independently functioning political cities or states came to be similar to each other and are even interconnected. While Hellenistic cities cannot be considered “early complex societies,” John Ma, proposed the idea that Hellenistic *poleis* could be considered within the Peer Polity Interaction framework. He explains the situation in the Hellenistic Greek world as “a system of autonomous communities, densely interconnected by a civic culture which sustained and depended on connections.”²³ Ma uses one *polis*’ *asylia* as one of his examples of the use of Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic period. This idea will be further elaborated and explained in the following chapters by examining *asylia* decrees as a whole.

The goal of this thesis is to suggest that the Peer Polity Interaction Theory can explain the spread of the title of territorial *asylia* and the reason it became so coveted in the Hellenistic Period. It will be demonstrated that the Peer Polity Interaction Theory can indeed be utilized for the Hellenistic period and that *asylia* is an example of such an

²² John F. Cherry and Colin Renfrew, eds., *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

²³ John Ma, “Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age,” *Past & Present* 180 (August 2003): 14.

interaction that used the networks created by the Greek *poleis* to deal diplomatically with each other. These were a vital part of the ways in which the Greek *poleis* kept their identity as city-states under the Hellenistic kings and, eventually, Rome.

The early sources do not reflect a reaching out to Rome for confirmation of their *asylia* or games. Around the early to mid second century B.C.E, however, Rome started playing a larger role within the Greek world. Beate Dignas, in her book on the economy of sacred institutions, explains that before the creation of the Roman territory of Asia, Rome's "activities concerning territorial inviolability ... can be characterized as attempts to meet Greek expectations, as gestures seeking and rewarding loyalty."²⁴ It seems that the Romans did not understand *asylia* in the same way as the Greeks. They understood *asylia* much the way we view asylum in modern terms: a place one could go to seek refuge from something.²⁵ Some Greek temples did indeed have asylum in this sense, however, they called it *hikesia*, and supplicants went to temples to seek refuge within a sacred space. This was not the *asylia* that the Greeks created, their territorial inviolability and had nothing to do with supplicants in most cases. Dignas comments that the misunderstanding of the Greek institution of *asylia* created an "unintended but almost inevitable uncertainty about the rights of the sanctuaries."²⁶ Even though their ideas on the title differed, the Romans continued to let the Greek *poleis* keep their inviolable

²⁴ Beate Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2002), 294.

²⁵ Rigsby, 28.

²⁶ Dignas, 289.

statuses when they became the rulers of Greek territory, however, new grants of *asylia* ceased around 22/3 C.E. At this time, Greek *poleis* were completely under Roman rule. Moreover, the Peer Polity Interaction Theory can explain the transition of Greek *poleis* eventually turning into Roman *coloniae*. The Greek *poleis* found it necessary to fit into the Roman world and no longer desired *asylia* as their highest title. The new civic title, *neokoros*, was the privilege to host a temple of the emperor, and it surpassed the title of *asylia* in importance.

Chapter Two introduces and discusses the Peer Polity Interaction Theory as it applies to Hellenistic *asylia*. It begins by comparing the theory in the context of the Archaic and Hellenistic periods. Hellenistic *asylia* is then reviewed alongside the framework put forth by the developers of the theory. A short discussion of Panhellenic festivals is also included, because a number of *asylia* decrees also wish for recognition of a crowned festival and because of the similarities in the use of networks to obtain their goals. Chapters Three, Four, and Five provide a chronological study and discussion of the epigraphic sources, beginning in the third century B.C.E., and ending in the first century C.E. These studies help to explain the progression of *asylia* and how it was spread through channels of Peer Polity Interaction.

© Kathleen Kirsch 2015

Fig. 1.1 Boeotia & Greek East: Hellenistic *Asyilia Poleis*

© Kathleen Kirsch 2015

Fig. 1.2 Cilicia, Phoenicia/Syria: Hellenistic *Asyilia Poleis*

CHAPTER 2:

THE PEER POLITY INTERACTION THEORY AND *ASYLIA*

The Peer Polity Interaction Theory does not seem to be an obvious theory to use in relation to the Hellenistic age because it originally was developed for the study of early civilizations.²⁷ However, in 2003, John Ma wrote a thought-provoking article, “Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age,” that looks at the interactions between the Greek *poleis* of the Hellenistic Period.²⁸ The first historian to apply Peer Polity Interaction to the Hellenistic period, Ma concludes that Peer Polity Interaction was a cultural phenomenon that could be used to write the history of Hellenistic Greece, bringing awareness to not just the *polis*, but the whole network of *poleis* interacting in the Greek world.

The Peer Polity Interaction Theory attempts to conceptualize how independently functioning political cities or states were similar to each other and were even interconnected. Cherry and Renfrew’s book, *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, contains ten case studies including Minoan Crete, Archaic Greece, the European Iron Age, and Anglo-Saxon England. A polity, according to Cherry and Renfrew, is an autonomous political unit which does not generally exist in isolation, but has neighbors

²⁷ John F. Cherry and Colin Renfrew, eds., *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

²⁸ John Ma, “Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age,” *Past & Present* 180 (August 2003): 9-39.

which are analogous in scale to it.²⁹ The core of the theory looks at how different structures of a society develop and change, for example, political institutions, languages, etc. through interactions between polities, such as imitation and emulation, competition, warfare, and the exchange of material goods and information.

Cherry and Renfrew's study aims to separate itself from the top-down, core-periphery, and diffusionist theories. Emphasis is placed on the intermediate-scale interactions between local but independent communities (opposed to long-distance contacts), which Cherry and Renfrew feel are the most informative and neglected channels of communication. They also explain that any pattern of interactions can be regarded or defined as a network, and the more complex the polity, the more complex the networks become. Cherry and Renfrew describe Peer Polity Interaction as being an intermediate between exogenous and endogenous models of change.³⁰ In an exogenous model, change within a polity occurs when an outside, more advanced society, imposes it. Conversely, the endogenous model looks at change within a polity in isolation, relying on the dynamics of internal subsystems to explain change. Cherry and Renfrew propose that Peer Polity Interaction provides an intermediary between these two models because it helps explore change by studying the interactions of neighboring polities of comparable scale and status.

²⁹ Cherry and Renfrew, 4.

³⁰ Ibid., 5.

Anthony Snodgrass conducted the initial study of the Peer Polity Interaction Theory pertaining to Greece regarding the Archaic period. Snodgrass uses the theory to examine how peer polities developed in parallel while still retaining their autonomy.³¹ To begin, Snodgrass explains the emergence of colonies as examples of Peer Polity Interaction and how these “ethnic colonists seem to have adopted without hesitation the model of the *polis* when establishing their new settlements...”³² Their successors then followed in their footsteps because the model had been seen to work. He suggests that the importance of the western colonies, in reference to the theory, is that they “are a valuable testing-ground for the concept of Peer Polity Interaction, in that they provided an area in which the members of different Greek polities came into contact.”³³

Some surprising similarities exist between the Archaic Greek examples and those that will be used for Hellenistic *asylia*. In the Hellenistic period also, kings put new colonizing ventures into motion throughout the Greek East whose newly-formed cities

³¹ Anthony Snodgrass, “Interaction by Design: The Greek City-State,” in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, ed. John F. Cherry and Colin Renfrew (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 47-58.

³² Snodgrass, 50.

³³ *Ibid.*, 51, uses as an example the burial practices of colonists and how they began using inhumation even though their mother-cities favored cremation. He suggests the idea came from the Corinthian colonists and spread to the other colonies as Corinth was the only colonizer that used the practice.

adapted the model of the *polis* as well. This suggests how they quickly assimilated into Greek culture and were allowed to participate within Greek networks.³⁴

Perhaps the most illuminating parallel between Snodgrass' Archaic Peer Polity Interaction and our Hellenistic *asylia* Peer Polity Interaction is the similarity in the role the sanctuary at Delphi and its oracle played in both. According to Snodgrass, the Delphic oracle was not only consulted as an advisor in colonizing endeavors, but it was also an initiator as well.³⁵ In Hellenistic times, obtaining an utterance from the Delphic oracle was a necessary qualification for the eligibility of *asylia*. The oracle not only granted *asylia*, but it also initiated quests for granted *asylia* as well. In the beginning of this process, the Delphic Amphictyony was the sole grantor of the title and played a large role in its dissemination. To answer the question as to why Delphi played such a major part in the context of the Peer Polity Interaction Theory, Snodgrass explains that "before 650 B.C.E., Delphi had acquired great prestige as an arbiter who in some sense stood above the authority of any single *polis*." Also, in the politically fragmented Archaic period, the Panhellenic sanctuary of Delphi provided a "common arena, in which the innovations, advances, and attainments of each individual *polis* could be rapidly communicated to others, when desired, or could, more simply, be displayed for admiration."³⁶

³⁴ See Kostas Vlassopoulos, *Greeks and Barbarians* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 8.

³⁵ Snodgrass, 53.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

One could make a similar argument for Hellenistic Greece. Perhaps the *poleis*, which were subject to hegemonic forces from the kings and Rome, needed a common arena in which to seek advances and achievements, stay connected to their fellow peer *poleis*, and simply act as *poleis* did. The difference we see in the Hellenistic period is a more direct interaction with other *poleis*. Delphi was still the most prestigious place from which to obtain and at which to display *asylia* grants, however, since the networks of communications were more advanced in the Hellenistic period they did not need to rely solely on Delphi for exchange of information.

Snodgrass also points out that other Archaic Panhellenic sanctuaries acted as impetuses for Peer Polity Interaction.³⁷ In this period, he explains, Olympia and Delphi were being cultivated despite their distance from the major Greek cities of the time. The practice of inscribed dedications increased, as well as dedications of armor. Allocating armor to the sanctuary instead of burying it with soldiers was a step toward loyalty to the *polis*. Lastly, there was the matter of the construction of treasuries within the sanctuaries. All of these had the effect of impressing ones peers, and also conveying information about ones own status. The *asylia* inscriptions show that it was important for the decrees to be inscribed in the sanctuary (or other important high-traffic areas) of the *polis* receiving the *asylia* and also that of the *polis* granting the *asylia*. Depositing the inscription in an important place set forth the title's prominence, and it had a better chance of being viewed by Greeks traveling from other *poleis*.

³⁷ Ibid.

Lastly, Snodgrass observes that the Greek way of Peer Polity Interaction indicates that it “could be a conscious process.”³⁸ He explains how the Greeks who founded colonies, formed hoplite armies, and competed with one another by building larger and more ornate treasuries and temples “must have been aware not only of the structure within which they were operating, but of the scope which it gave for internal comparisons.”³⁹ This idea rings true for the Hellenistic *asylia* decrees as well. By the Hellenistic period, interactions between *poleis* were so complex and developed that they had conventional ways to interact culturally and diplomatically, which will be explained more later. *Asylia*, was a title which gave *poleis* honor and portrayed their place within the networks of city-states. They wanted their peer polities to know they had the title. Why else would they inscribe the decrees for all to see? Why else would they invoke the recognition of their peers to grant the title? The acquisition of *asylia* seems to have been a conscious effect of Peer Polity Interaction.

Even though the Hellenistic *poleis* were under the ultimate rule of Hellenistic kings and in due course, Rome, those hegemonic powers did not necessarily inhibit the networks of interactions between *poleis*. Indeed, many times a king would initiate and/or allow the process of acquiring *asylia*. More and more historians are beginning to agree

³⁸ Ibid., 58.

³⁹ Ibid.

that Hellenistic Greek *poleis* participated in Peer Polity Interaction.⁴⁰ Ma uses the Peer Polity Interaction Theory to try to understand the theoretical and historiographical issues of Hellenistic history, and more importantly for us, the inter-workings of Hellenistic *poleis*.⁴¹ Rather than examining parallel change of peer polities over time like Snodgrass, Ma underlines the exuberant and progressing networks being shared by *poleis* in the Hellenistic Period.

In his article, Ma describes several interactions between Greek *poleis* that symbolize a shared culture and diplomatic interaction. One example is how the *polis* Magnesia-on-the Maeander, in 208 B.C.E., decided to canvass the Greek world to obtain *asylia* and sacred games for its Goddess Artemis as evidence of Peer Polity Interaction. The Magnesians sent at least twenty teams of *theoroi* (ambassadors) out into the Greek world to obtain acknowledgement of *asylia*, as well as Panhellenic games for their patron deity Artemis. Over two hundred *poleis* responded, including places as far away as Babylonia and Persis. Ma calls the act of inscribing decrees on the *agora* walls for all to see “a great display of the Magnesian’s civic esteem mapped out on the

⁴⁰ See Eric Robinson, *Democracy Beyond Athens* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Irad Malkin, *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Kostas Vlassopoulos, *Greeks and Barbarians* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Christoph Michels, “The Spread of *Polis* Institutions in Hellenistic Cappadocia and the Peer Polity Interaction Model,” in *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period: Narrations, Practices, and Image*, ed. Eftychia Stavrianopoulou (Boston: Brill, 2013).

⁴¹ Ma, 15.

world.”⁴² The Magnesians sent their *theoroi* out to specific cities, spoke in front of an assembly explaining the reasons they should have *asylia* and sacred games, many times using *syngeneia*, a shared kinship relation between the *poleis*, to connect the two *poleis*, and then obtained a decree in response.

Another example Ma uses is that of the Kytenions. In 205 B.C.E., they traveled to other Greek *poleis* and asked for monetary help to rebuild their walls and city. An existing inscription enables us to know about this venture, in which the Kytenians visit the *polis* of Xanthos; Ma includes a translation of the inscription in his article.⁴³ The Kytenians sent an envoy to Xanthos and demonstrated *syngeneia* through a mythological story, and then asked for monetary help to rebuild their city. The Xanthians answered by gifting them 500 *drachmai* (they explained how they were in debt and could not give a significant amount of money), a hospitality gift. They requested the answering decree (from the Xanthians) to be inscribed on a stone stele and set up at the shrine of Leto (the inscribed stele is the evidence we now have for this interaction). This interaction is an example of the actions necessary when one was looking for aid, but it is quite similar to the actions taken by the Magnesians seeking *asylia* and crowned games.

Yet a third example of diplomatic cooperation between *poleis* is that of inter-state arbitration. Ma cites the example of Iasos, in 196 B.C.E., which needed help to settle many unresolved, controversial judicial cases. The people of Iasos appealed to Priene

⁴² Ibid., 13.

⁴³ SEG 1476; Ma, Xanthian decree translation, 10-12.

that sent its judges and settled the cases. Iasos then issued an honorific decree for Priene to honor the work done by the judges. Priene answered with its own honorific decree for Iasos (acknowledging the honors), and they had the pair of decrees inscribed in marble together and displayed at the temple of Athena Polias in Priene.⁴⁴ Ma explains this interaction to be a “pre-scripted interaction,” or one that was customarily carried out a similar way each time. The *poleis* knew what to expect from one another during the interaction.

The Cappadocian city of Hanisa offers an interesting insight as to how a *polis* used Peer Polity Interaction to become a part of the networks of the Greek world.⁴⁵ According to Christoph Michels, Cappadocia emerged from the Persian satrapy of Katpatuka, and then came under Macedonian rule during the time of the *Diadochoi*.⁴⁶ An extant inscription from Hanisa gives evidence that the city began to adopt Greek *polis* institutions sometime in the second or first centuries B.C.E.⁴⁷ Hanisa was in an area far from any other Greek cities, yet it eventually conducted its civic administration in the Greek language, and adopted typical Greek political institutions.⁴⁸ Michels suggests that

⁴⁴ Ma, 16.

⁴⁵ Hanisa is mentioned briefly by Ma, 38, however, Christoph Michels offers a larger study of the city in “The Spread of *Polis* Institutions in Hellenistic Cappadocia and the Peer Polity Interaction Theory,” in *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period: Narrations, Practices, and Images*, ed. Etfychia Stavrianopoulou (Boston: Brill, 2013), 283-307.

⁴⁶ Michels, 284.

⁴⁷ *MbBerlin*, Michels, 286-287.

⁴⁸ Michels, 288. For the location of Hanisa, see Figure 1.1 on page 14.

Peer Polity Interaction had been used to obtain the *polis* model, possibly from interactions with the *poleis* in Cilicia, across the Tarsus mountain range. He further explains that the Peer Polity Interaction Theory can be used to recognize the motives of the Hanisans. Overall, they needed to educate themselves and adopt the *polis* model to find access to the networks being used by all the other Greek *poleis*, and that access would eventually lead them to “the elites at the royal courts that were also significantly characterized by Greco-Macedonian culture and consisted to a considerable degree of *polis* citizens...”⁴⁹ Essentially, they needed to learn how to interact diplomatically with the other *poleis*, and by taking on the *polis* model, they could learn the shared civic languages and forms already being used by Greek *poleis*. The people of Hanisa apparently felt that assuming the *polis* model for their city was useful and that access to the networks would gain them more prestige or influence within the royal courts.

Looking at these examples of diplomatic interactions between Greek *poleis*, it is evident the city-states had a system of interaction they could rely on for personal endeavors and when they were in need of help. There were certain processes they had to go through to reach out to other *poleis*, which in turn knew what to expect with each inquiry and vice versa. When looking at *asylia*, it is this shared civic culture, or Hellenistic diplomacy, that is of interest. It is possible that the institution of *asylia* emerged and flourished because of these types of peer polity interactions that were going on in the Greek world at the time.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 289-299.

Now that it is clear that the Greek city-states had a cultural and diplomatic interconnectedness that allowed certain institutions to thrive and be cultivated, *asylia* can be tested within the context of the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. Cherry and Renfrew have specific guidelines to follow while using the concept of Peer Polity Interaction; there is a framework and there are necessary conditions to consider before using it.⁵⁰ In its original form, this framework primarily dealt with early societies, however, it is possible for Hellenistic Greece to be considered within this system.

To qualify within the theory, the autonomous polities involved must be recognized by each other and be of a comparable size and scale. This was indeed the case with the Hellenistic Greek city-states. Since we are not dealing with early societies, the Hellenistic Greek city-states go beyond simply recognizing each other; they already had a shared language, shared cultural norms, and diplomatic customs. Although there was much turmoil over territory and sovereignty in the Hellenistic Greek world, the *polis* itself remained culturally strong and the center of Greek life. While politically dominated by Hellenistic kings, nevertheless their *polis* way of life and local authority made them quasi-autonomous.

Secondly, to fit within Cherry and Renfrew framework, when a significant change in organization or complexity arises in one polity, polities in the region should undergo the same transformation. In the Hellenistic period, all of the *poleis* were subject to the imperial struggles that ensued after the death of Alexander. The *poleis* had no choice but

⁵⁰ Cherry and Renfrew, 7-8.

to adapt to the new age of hegemonic kings while still trying to preserve their “*polis*” way of life. The institution of *asylia* provides a good example of a “change[s] in organization or complexity,” that we can use to test the theory. It will become apparent that when *asylia* became known to the Greek world in the Hellenistic Period, the polities in the region wanted to undergo the same transformation and obtain *asylia* for themselves.

The time frame that we are looking at here starts in the 260s B.C.E. and continues until 22/3 C.E.⁵¹ Although these *asylia* decrees did not all happen at the same exact time, the time it took to obtain the title and for the phenomenon to spread should be considered. The Peer Polity Interaction Theory argues that several new institutional features should appear at around the same time. In our case, territorial *asylia* was a new civic and diplomatic institution in the Hellenistic period. We also see that asking for recognition of Panhellenic festivals arises around the same time. Some festival recognitions were tied to *asylia* decrees, and these two new institutions spread at around the same time and in the same areas. Another new institutional feature stemming from granted *asylia* was coinage being stamped with the title “sacred and inviolable.” Cherry and Renfrew add that a conceptual system for communicating information may come about, and stamping “sacred and inviolable” on a circulating coin demonstrates a way to communicate information about that city via the coin.

⁵¹ Rigsby, 29.

Cherry and Renfrew also propose that the process of transformation is frequently brought about as a result of interaction between peer polities, which can be examined under various categories of competition, including warfare and competitive emulation, symbolic entrainment and the transmission of innovation, and lastly, an increased flow in the exchange of goods.⁵²

There is no question that the Greek *poleis* were competitive and practiced competitive emulation. They had been going to war with each other and against each other since the beginning of their existence as city-states. Aside from war, they competed against each other in the many Panhellenic games and festivals. An athlete represented his city-state, and at many of the games, it was the city-state from which one came that would reward the victor. For example, if a man were a victor in a crowned game, he would receive a crown from the hosting *polis*, and more material prizes from his own *polis*, such as money or a statue.⁵³ The treasuries that Greek *poleis* set up within the different Panhellenic sanctuaries offer another example of competitive emulation between the Greek *poleis*. Built quite close to each other in highly visible places, these treasuries were expected to be compared by on-lookers.⁵⁴

⁵² Cherry and Renfrew, 8.

⁵³ See Donald G. Kyle, "Winning at Olympia," *Archaeology* 49, no. 4 (July/August 1996), 34.

⁵⁴ See Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn, eds., *Archaeology: The Key Concepts* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 199.

Cherry and Renfrew describe competitive emulation as “another form of interaction where neighboring polities may be spurred to even greater displays of wealth or power in an effort to achieve higher inter-polity status.”⁵⁵ This can be seen all over the Greek world, from agoras, sanctuaries, temples, and treasuries being emulated by the different *poleis*. *Asyilia* was sought after as an honorable title, so it would be appropriate to assume that once one *polis* had the title of being sacred and inviolable, other *poleis* would want to emulate that honorable title for themselves.

The second point within the process of transformation, symbolic entrainment, is somewhat more complicated, but helps to explain the “how,” while competitive emulation helps explain the “why.” Renfrew explains symbolic entrainment as describing a process that develops in one center first, then subsequently transmitted to others. It is not necessarily competitive. His paragraph on symbolic entrainment is included below because of its important discussion on transmission and diffusion:

The transmission of innovation in a sense embraces symbolic entrainment within its scope, but refers [to the] innovations which are not, or do not at first seem to be, of a symbolic nature. Such innovations are perhaps ‘transmitted’ within the peer polities of the interacting group, and at first sight this would seem to be an example of ‘diffusion.’ Yet it differs from the standard view of that process, not only in that peer polities have the status of more-or-less equal partners (which is not the case in most studies of diffusion), but, as I have argued elsewhere (Renfrew 1978c) the crux of the matter, the true innovation, is not the original invention of the new feature or process but rather its widespread acceptance by the society or societies in question.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Cherry and Renfrew, 8.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 9.

Thus, Renfrew judges that the significance of innovation in the Peer Polity Interaction Theory lay in the fact that the innovation itself is not the important piece of information; rather it is the widespread acceptance of the innovation within the polities that matters. To put it in terms for this paper: *asylia* itself is not the important change here, rather its widespread acceptance and the desire for the title by the Greek *poleis*. The importance lies in *how* it was spread and *why* these *poleis* wanted to secure it. The innovation is in the fact that the Greek *poleis* went to great lengths to obtain a title that gave them honor and a sense of Greekness. Thus the *poleis* could be as important in the world as the others, enabling Peer Polity Interaction. Inviolability for temples and sanctuaries was not new, it was a natural Greek custom. It was the way the title of *asylia* spread around the Greek world that was the real innovation, and which is explained by the Peer Polity Interaction Theory.

Poleis were most likely introduced to *asylia* whether by word of mouth from other Greeks or by receiving a decree. When a *polis* asked a neighboring *polis* for its assent in receiving *asylia*, the *polis* asked probably wondered if it itself could receive the civic title of *asylia*. As Cherry and Renfrew mentioned, Peer Polity Interaction occurs with polities of more or less equal partners. If a polity considered itself on the same level of importance as one asking for *asylia*, then it too could entertain the thought of assuming the title of *asylia* for itself. This is the most obvious way in which *asylia* was transmitted from one *polis* to another, Greek *poleis*, subsequently asking one another to grant each

other *asylia*. We also see the title simply being awarded to *poleis* by the Hellenistic kings, and this was more or less to keep the favor of the *poleis* over which they ruled. However, many times, *poleis* still canvassed the Greek world for acceptance because it was important for their peers to accept the title as well.

Lastly, Cherry and Renfrew add that the transformations that are explicable in terms of the Peer Polity Interaction Theory may be elaborated to make further predictions. For this, one must examine the nature of these interactions between *poleis*, “who impresses whom, and how, and what effect does that have upon the future actions of both?”⁵⁷ In the Hellenistic Period, *poleis* were emulating each other, trying to impress each other, and wanted to be seen as honorable and Greek in the eyes of its peers. However, when the Romans gained power and started imposing it on the Greek city-states, their focus shifted from impressing other *poleis* to Rome. This is seen by the waning of importance of *asylia* and the increase in the popularity for the civic title of the neocorate, the privilege of hosting a temple for the Roman Emperor. Ultimately, it benefitted the Greek city-states more to strive to become Roman *coloniae* instead of Greek *poleis* in the Roman Empire. The Peer Polity Interaction Theory can predict this change in Peer Polity Interaction because the polities would strive to impress the highest power. When Roman power surpassed that of the Hellenistic kings, the interactions of the peer polities changed.

⁵⁷ Cherry and Renfrew, 18.

Those are but a few examples of “civic” interactions between the Greek city-states that explain how Hellenistic Greek city-states cooperated in Peer Polity Interaction. There are many more ways in which these Greek *poleis* interacted; for example their festivals and games. Looking at the extant *asylia* decrees available in Rigsby’s work, it is clear that quite a few *poleis* requested the recognition of games for their city’s patron deity. More interestingly, they wanted their games to be recognized as *stephanic*, or crowned, or more extravagantly, *isopythios*, *isonemeos*, *isoisthmios* or *isolumpios*, that is, equal to that of the great Panhellenic games: Pythic games, Nemean games, Isthmian games, and Olympic games, where all Greek males could attend. As an example, for a game to be recognized as *isophythios*, the *poleis* of the other competing athletes had to recognize it as such through diplomatic means. Then the winners of the game would be given the same prizes as those of the actual Pythian games. In these “crowned” games, victors received a crown from the *polis* hosting the games, wild olive leaves for Olympia, pine or celery for Isthmia, a crown of celery for Nemea, and laurel for the Pythian games, and the home *polis* would give other more substantial prizes.⁵⁸ The reasoning for the newly formed Hellenistic Panhellenic games to be ruled *isophythios*, *isolumpios*, *isonemeos*, or *isoisthmios* is not made explicit, but it can be theorized that since they were the most prestigious of the Panhellenic games, they were the ones that *poleis* wished to venerate. E. Norman Gardiner argues that the crowned games were the most honorable

⁵⁸ Oscar Broneer, “The Isthmian Victory Crown,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 66, no. 3 (July 1962), 259.

to win as men competed for honor and *arete* instead of prizes.⁵⁹ However, Slater and Summa, in their article on Magnesia's quest for crowned games, state quite the opposite:

Nonetheless prizes and money are serious matters for competitors. (One can hardly accept that Hellenistic victors were nobly content with only a crown of vegetation and what they might pick up from betting or a victory round). If all one gets from the festival city is a vegetal crown, then one will need to be sure in advance - as Olympic and Pythian victors doubtless were - that one is going to get something from the home city.⁶⁰

The requests by different *poleis* to have their games recognized as equal to one of the Panhellenic games may also have to do with honor, Greekness, and interconnectedness, as suggested by Kyle in the introduction. This is similar to the reasons *poleis* coveted *asylia*. To have a crowned game or Panhellenic recognized festival meant the *polis* was important enough to have that honor. It had to be agreed upon by fellow peer polities via a decree that the games could be named as such, and those *poleis* were agreeing that the *polis* was indeed fit to host a game with those honors. Many of the *poleis* asking for crowned games, and so forth, were cities from the Greek East, who were also asserting their "Greekness."⁶¹ Just like the acquisition of *asylia*, there was a diplomatic process necessary to obtain recognition of crowned games.

⁵⁹ E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics in the Ancient World* (Devon, UK: David and Charles, 2012), 36.

⁶⁰ William J. Slater and Daniela Summa, "Crowns at Magnesia," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 46 (2006): 292-293.

⁶¹ Known *poleis* seeking *asylia* and crowned games (or increased status in Boeotia): possibly Acraephia, possibly Thebes, Cos, possibly Miletus, Magnesia on the Maeander, Bargylia? (unidentified city), Pergamum, and Stratoniceia, found in Rigsby. Note that these are *poleis* who requested *asylia* and games within the same decree, many more Hellenistic *poleis* held Panhellenic games.

Slater and Summa explain that “Hellenistic stephanic games required a complex infrastructure of inter-city acceptances that made prizes, including perhaps principally cash prizes, the responsibility of the home city and not the festival city.”⁶² It is clear the *poleis* had to be in agreement for these titles to be accepted. Robert Parker, in a chapter on mobility and travel in antiquity, brings to light the inter-connectedness between *poleis* that enabled them to seek and hold festivals.⁶³ He includes a helpful list of festivals from before 400 B.C.E. down to c.120 C.E., many of them newly formed in the Hellenistic era. Looking at his list of festivals, it follows geographically the same direction reflected in the *asylia* primary sources. The newly formed festivals were mainly from Boeotia and the Greek East, while those on the Greek mainland stayed basically the same. *Asylia* decrees began in Boeotia and moved through the Greek East. The similarity of this pattern is striking as there are no literary sources tying *asylia* and the resurgence of Panhellenic games together, other than the epigraphic decrees that ask for a recognition of a festival along with *asylia*.

The Peer Polity Interaction Theory can help to explain the new popularity of Panhellenic games and festivals because of the ways in which they were announced, accepted, and spread. Aside from the acceptance of newly-formed festivals, each year a game or festival was held, the *polis* would send *theoroi* (sacred ambassadors) out to all

⁶² Slater and Summa, 298.

⁶³ Parker, 18-22. See the Appendix on page 98 for a chart of newly formed or renewed festivals in the Hellenistic period. Also, see Parker’s list for a more complete inventory.

the *poleis* it wanted to attend its games to proclaim the festival. The treatment of *theoroi* was a cultural institution known as *theorodokia*, or the hosting of ambassadors. Usually, prominent members of society would be tasked with hosting the *theoroi* at their residences. This included everything from feeding the ambassadors, entertaining them, and providing housing for them. It was considered an honor to be able to host *theoroi* from other *poleis*.⁶⁴

This treatment of another *polis*' ambassadors was expected to be reciprocated all over the Greek world, as it was a form of diplomacy. There is extant a list of *theorodokoi* from Delphi who proclaimed the Delphic festivals from the third century B.C.E., and it lists more than 330 places they visited. The Delphic *theoroi* would have traveled to these places to proclaim their festival, and the places that wanted to participate would have sent their own sacred embassy to Delphi to represent themselves. This is an example of major mobility and interconnectedness in the Hellenistic Greek world. Parker mentions that of those 330 places, two of them were from the coast of Syria, and seventeen from Sicilian cities; quite a distance from Delphi. Parker even goes so far as to call these Greek festivals "mobility-promoting institution[s]."⁶⁵

Parker mentions that the phenomenon of the expansion in number of Panhellenic festivals in the Hellenistic period has not been given a comprehensive study. It seems

⁶⁴ See Paula Jean Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: the Theorodokia in the Peloponnese* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), for a more in-depth study of the institution of *theorodokia*.

⁶⁵ Parker, 9.

plausible to look for that answer along with the phenomenon of *asylia* because there are some instances in which *asylia* decrees also ask for the recognition of new or enhanced festivals and games. There is also the fact that both *asylia* and the newly formed or enhanced games occur in similar regions, Boeotia and the Greek East. Again, it is possible that *asylia* and the increase in number of Panhellenic games can be tied to the theory of Peer Polity Interaction and the interconnectedness that Greek city-states shared in the Hellenistic period.

To conclude, it is arguable that not only were Hellenistic city-states participating in Peer Polity Interaction, but also that the act of acquiring *asylia* itself can be explained through the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. The whole concept of Peer Polity Interaction relates to states or cities that are equal to each other in organization and function through diplomatic and cultural interconnectedness. The *poleis* of Hellenistic Greece shared such intimate interconnectedness. In a world of Peer Polity Interaction, if one *polis* was not recognized by its peer *poleis*, it could not function within the vast networks recognized *poleis* could. The diplomatic, civic, and cultural interactions that have been explained above are but a few of the ways in which the network of the Hellenistic Greek *poleis* worked.

In his article, Ma labels the transaction of exchanging decrees the “traveling decree,” and that the “traveling decree, in mediating between city and city, embodies the nature of Peer Polity Interaction not only as a concrete set of relations, but also as a

symbolic and cognitive map.”⁶⁶ The act of obtaining *asylia* and crowned games can be considered traveling decree transactions; ambassadors were sent from *polis* to *polis*, asking each one to accept its decree, and those who accepted set up the inscribed decree in their own civic or sacred space. The act was much like that of the aforementioned diplomatic act of asking for help, or even the way in which a *polis* would announce its games, traveling from *polis* to *polis* inviting each to their festival. This “traveling decree” was a concrete set of relations. It was a way of communicating and interacting that worked and thrived; therefore it was used for different purposes. The symbolic and cognitive map that Ma discusses explains how a *polis* thought of itself and others in the grand scheme of things. A *polis* knew who its friends and enemies were, as well as with whom it wanted to associate itself. As Snodgrass might say, the *poleis* were conscious about the actions they were taking throughout the Greek world and wanted to present themselves in a favorable light before their peers.

From a theoretical perspective, it is reasonable to assume that the Hellenistic city-states were working within a Peer Polity Interaction network, and that *asylia* itself was a Peer Polity Interaction. As Cherry and Renfrew explain, an important outcome of Peer Polity Interaction was a change within the polities using it and encountering it. *Asylia* can be seen as a Peer Polity Interaction because it was spread by the interaction of *poleis*, transmitting the idea of a new civic title to each other, by means of a traveling decree. This interaction would bring new relationships between *poleis*, solidified others, and also

⁶⁶ Ma, 19.

continued competition and emulation. The next chapter shows that the *asylia* decrees follow a pattern that conforms to that predicted by the Peer Polity Interaction Theory.

CHAPTER 3:

THE BEGINNINGS OF *ASYLIA* IN THE THIRD CENTURY B.C.E.

In his study of *asylia*, Rigsby states, “from the old Aegean world we have grants, from the Greek East we have titles – inscriptions from the 260s to the 180s B.C.E., in the Aegean area, mostly coins from the 140s on in the East.”⁶⁷ It seems that from the beginning, the declaration of *asylia* was quite a special circumstance, and was granted by some legal authority. Later on, as more *poleis* began seeking *asylia* for themselves and the declarations and grants become more formulaic, they acted as a customary diplomatic feature. Finally, as Roman rule started to encroach on them, *poleis* relied on the Romans to keep their titles and sometimes even to obtain them. Ultimately, requests for *asylia* ended altogether.

The study in the previous chapter on the Peer Polity Interaction Theory suggests that the true innovation when it came to *asylia*, was the way it was spread and accepted by the peer polities, and not the actual title itself. It is true that the title for territorial *asylia* was new in the Hellenistic period; however, as has been mentioned, inviolability for all temples and sanctuaries had always been implied in Greek culture. It was not the norm for land other than that of the sanctuaries to be inviolable, but it had happened in the past with Plataea and possibly Elis, so that is not entirely an innovation either.

⁶⁷ Rigsby, 21. When citing the primary sources, the number given to the source in Rigsby’s corpus is added before the page number. Rigsby uses letters for numismatic sources, which is reflected in the footnotes as well.

The Peer Polity Interaction Theory helps explain how and why *asylia* spread throughout the Greek world. We have learned that the interconnectedness of the *poleis*, with their formally coded diplomatic and cultural exchanges, made it possible for *asylia* to spread throughout these peer polities. In addition, the title was possibly spread through competitive emulation, the desire of a polity to obtain the same honors as its peers and the necessity to stay connected to its peer polities.

Examining the sources chronologically gives us insight into as to how the title of *asylia* began, its development, and its spread by the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. Early on it appears to have been an honor designated by the Delphic Amphictyony alone, and as time passed it matured into a highly sought after title that developed its own diplomatic formulary decree, acknowledged and accepted by *poleis* around the Greek world.

The earliest extant epigraphical declaration of *asylia* comes from Boeotia and dates to the 260s B.C.E. It concerns the Temple of Athena Itonia in Coroneia. The Delphian Amphictyony, a religious and political authority, declared the temple inviolable. Our source consists of two joining fragments of a marble stele that were found in Delphi at the temple of Apollo. The two fragments were found over a half-century apart, one in 1895 west of the Syracusan Tripods, and the other found in 1957 south of the terrace of the Siphnian Treasury.⁶⁸ The stele states only that the grant occurred; unfortunately we do not have the actual grant or declaration that would have named the circumstances and connections of the title.

⁶⁸ *FD* III.4 358, Rigsby, no.1, 58.

The second earliest known piece of evidence on granted *asylia*, also from Boeotia and also granted by the Delphian Amphictyony, dates to the 220s B.C.E. This second *asylia* inscription gives more information than the first one. It was found at the Temple of Apollo in Acraephia in 1885 and is a plaque of blue-grey marble found reused in a Byzantine-era tomb.⁶⁹ The plaque has three different inscriptions on it, two of which pertain to the *asylia* of the Temple of Apollo Ptoius. The uppermost inscription is the Amphictyonic decree, which states

[(inviolability)...for five days] in coming [and as many in departing] and while the festival [takes place, both for themselves and their] attendants and their [property, everywhere.] If anyone contrary to this seize or rob anyone, let him be subject to persecution before the Amphictyons. The Temple of Apollo Ptoius in Acraephia is to be inviolable, as the boundaries define, as is the temple in Delphi; the other sacred land of Apollo Ptoius no one is to harm; if anyone does, he is to be subject to prosecution before the Amphictyons.....⁷⁰

The inscription defines the personal inviolability for the artists who competed in Apollo's games as well as inviolability for the temple. The rest of the inscription describes the day the sacred truce should start, in this case the fifteenth of Hippodromios, as well as the fine (2,000 *staters*) to anyone who does wrong contrary to the decree of the Amphictyons.⁷¹

⁶⁹ *IG VII 4136, LSCG 73, Syll.³ 635, Rigsby, no. 3, 65.*

⁷⁰ Translation by Rigsby, 65-66. [-----πενθ' ἡμέρα]ς πορευομένοις καὶ ἀπερχομένοις ἄλλας τοσαύ]τας καὶ ὡς ἂν ἡ πανήγυ[ρις γίνηται καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς] ἀκολούθοις καὶ ἃ ἂν ἔχωσι [χρήματα πανταχοῦ.] ἐὰν δέ τις [παρὰ] ταῦτα ἄγῃ τινὰ ἢ ῥύ[σιάζῃ, ὑπ]όδικος ἔστω ἐν Ἀμφικτύουσιν. εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἄσυλον τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωῖου τὸ ἐν Ἀκραιφίους ὡς ἂν αἱ στήλαι ὀρίζωσι καθάπερ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν χώραν τὴν ἱερὰν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωῖου μὴ ἀδικεῖν μηδένα. ἐὰν δέ τις ἀδικῇ, ὑπόδικος ἔστω ἐν Ἀμφικτύουσιν. See note above for source.

⁷¹ Rigsby, 66.

The second inscription on the marble plaque explains how the Temple of Apollo Ptoius came to receive the honor of being inviolable. As stated earlier, there needed to be a reason for a temple or land to be honored with inviolability so it had to be proven to others that it was indeed a city or temple worthy of the title. Here, the inscription explains, that a man named Calliclidas, a Locrian from Opus, went to the Oracle of Trophonius and was told that Acraephia was to be dedicated to Apollo Ptoius, and no one was to wrong its people. “They [we]re both to collect sacred funds, for the common good, in every land, and proclaim the holy contest.”⁷² It will be seen that it is quite common for a *polis* to use an oracle as justification for receiving inviolability. It is also important to note that this *asylia* dedication was tied to a festival. This becomes a growing trend in the Hellenistic period, though not all *asylia* decrees were tied to festivals.

The Temple of Dionysus Cadmeius in Thebes was also declared inviolable around the same time as the Temple of Apollo in Acraephia, the 220s B.C.E. The relevant inscriptions continued on five fragments of marble blocks that were once part of the wall of the Theban Treasury in Delphi. Among the fragments are three separate inscriptions (recording decrees after a council session) concerning the inviolability of the artists of

⁷² *IG VII 4135, LSCG 73, Syll.³ 635, Rigsby, no. 2, 63.* Rigsby mentions that boundary stones also attest the inviolability of the Temple of Apollo at Acraephia, but they are not mentioned again aside from the introduction on 59.

Dionysus and the inviolability of the temple of Dionysus at Cadmius.⁷³ Again, the Delphian Amphictyony was the authority in granting these titles and privileges. It was also to prosecute anyone who acted against the parameters given around the inviolability of the temple, or the artists attending the festival of Dionysus, known as the *trieteris*. The *trieteris* was a festival held every two years for Dionysus. The sources do not ask for it to become Panhellenic at this time, however they do want it to be “proclaimed to the cities.” Rigsby believes the Thebans perhaps wanted the festival to become “Pan-Boeotian.”⁷⁴ Again, this inviolability grant is tied to the artists and a festival, and in this case, probably also to increase the status of its festival.

The other sites in Boeotia known to have had *asylia* were the Temple of Amphiaraus in Oropus, the Temple of Zeus Basileus and of Trophonius, in Lebadeia, and possibly the Temple of Apollo Delius in Tanagra. Boeotia is the only area in mainland Greece known to have had *poleis* with *asylia* (apart from, most likely, Delphi), the rest are from the Eastern Greek world and beyond. City-states on the mainland granted *asylia* to these Eastern Greek *poleis* requesting *asylia* later on; however, according to extant evidence, they did not try to gain it for themselves. Why Boeotia was the only place on the mainland to seek *asylia* (apart from Delphi) is quite unknown, but it might have

⁷³ *CIG* 1689, *FD* III.1 351, *SGDI* 2532, Rigsby, no. 4, 70. Rigsby uses the text from Bousquet, *BCH* 85 (1961) 78-88.

⁷⁴ Rigsby, 73-74.

something to do with the evolution of *asylia* and the fact that Plataea was the first site the Greeks confirmed as inviolable.

Before leaving mainland Greece, Delphi's *asylia* should be considered. While no actual grant of *asylia* for the *polis* of Delphi or any of its temples is extant, evidence exists from Roman times that the *polis* considered itself sacred and inviolable. The evidence lies in Roman era documents assuring the Delphians that their temple was inviolable and their city free.⁷⁵ Considering that the Delphic Amphictyony was founded to protect the Greek people against barbarians and "a forum for resolving their differences and maintaining unity," Rigsby hypothesizes that the Delphians did not feel the need to seek the recognitions because it would have demeaned rather than increased the honor.⁷⁶ He even suggests that the Hellenistic Greek world might have "been prompted by the actual demonstration of Delphi's inviolability in the repulse of the Gauls in 279 B.C.E."⁷⁷ Also, the inscription from the Temple of Apollo Ptoius in Acraephia states: "the temple of Apollo Ptoius in Acraephia is to be inviolable, as the boundaries define, as is the temple in Delphi."⁷⁸ Considering that this is one of the first extant inscriptions of an actual *asylia* decree, it is hard to compare it to others, but it is plausible

⁷⁵ See Rigsby 46-48 for Delphi's *asylia* evidence. He does not include any of it within his corpus of numbered *asylia* decrees, probably because he considers Delphi as an historical precedent, and only affirmations of *asylia* from Roman times remain. He also describes them as "a strange mixture of grants and a strange phraseology."

⁷⁶ Ibid., 45.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ *IG* VII 4136, *LSCG* 73, *Syll.*³ 635, Rigsby, no. 3, 65. See Rigsby, 66 for a translation of the inscription.

to think that perhaps the temple at Delphi was the first, or one of the first, temples to gain *asylia*.⁷⁹ The temple of Apollo at Acraephia compared its *asylia* to that of Delphi, and the Delphic Amphicityony was, at the time, the only grantor of *asylia*. It seems that a grant from the Delphic Amphicityony was all that was necessary and that the Amphicityony would be the source of enforcing the security as well.

In the 240s B.C.E., the entire *polis* of Smyrna and its temple of Aphrodite Stratoniceis was granted inviolability. Up to this point, *asylia* grants had only been for temples. Plataea had been the only site that was not a temple or sanctuary that came close to being recognized as inviolable. Smyrna's case, as described by Rigsby, is important as it explains the circumstantial evidence for the grant and is the first evidence extant for inviolability of a whole city. The sources for this grant of *asylia* are twofold, an answering decree from Delphi, and the Smyrnaean decree inscribed on the so-called "Oxford Stone."⁸⁰ The inscription on the Oxford Stone explains how the Smyraeans were loyal and friendly to the king, Seleucus II, and that they had worshiped his father, Antiochus II, and his grandmother, Stratonice, as divine. Because of this loyalty, the stone explains, Seleucus II honored the people with autonomy and democracy, and he

⁷⁹ There are no sources available for the inviolability of the temple of Apollo at Delphi.

⁸⁰ *FD III.4* 153, *OIGS* 228, *SGDI* 2733, Rigsby, no.7, 102. The inscription on the Oxford Stone is known as *I.Smyrna* 573, Rigsby does not designate it a number in his corpus, it is found on pages 97-8.

wrote a letter to the Greek world to accept the temple of Aphrodite Stratoniceis as inviolable, and the city as sacred and inviolable.⁸¹

The autonomy mentioned in this inscription can be described as a sort of quasi-autonomy. Since the death of Alexander the Great, kings and dynasts had ruled the area, and if a *polis* were in royal favor, an honorable title of autonomy could be bestowed upon it. This is what is unique about the *poleis* in this era: they were still *poleis* in the classical sense, i.e. city-states that governed their own territory and people, made their own laws, and interacted with their peer polities, despite the fact that they also were subject to a higher ruler. A king giving a subject *polis* “autonomy” did not in actuality give the *polis* independence from the monarch; rather it more or less bestowed upon it a boost in its status, and sometimes freedom from some taxes.

The answering decree from Delphi on Smyrna’s inviolability is an inscription on the base of an equestrian statue, found at Delphi, west of the temple of Apollo.⁸² This inscription explains that at the bequest of the Smyrnaeans, Seleucus II sent a letter to Delphi asking that the temple of Aphrodite Stratoniceis and the city and people of Smyrna be sacred and inviolable. It also explains that Seleucus II was obeying an oracle, presumably that of Apollo, and in doing so he had granted the city to be free from tribute and that its ancestral land was to be restored. The inscription also names the ambassadors

⁸¹ Rigsby’s translation of the Oxford Stone 98-99.

⁸² For inscription see note 80 above, translation by Rigsby, 103.

the Smyrnaeans sent, Hermodorus and Demetrius, and explains that the king and also the Smyrnaeans asked that all this be inscribed in the temple.

Again, we see that the quest for the inviolability of Smyrna includes a validation from an authoritative source, in this case, the Delphic oracle of Apollo, conveying the wishes of the gods. It is also mentioned in the inscription that the Smyrnaeans requested that the decree be inscribed at the temple of Apollo. This is common in Hellenistic diplomatic situations as we have seen: when a decree is accepted by another *polis*, it was common for that decree to be inscribed in a place of importance for others to view. Rigsby states that the evidence from Smyrna “sets the immediate precedent (as opposed to the ancient one, Plataea) for the religious inviolability of a city.”⁸³

Once again, this *asylia* decree is addressed to Delphi, a seemingly important authority on this newfound activity of granting inviolability. The *asylia* decree of Smyrna is also the first time we see involvement from a Hellenistic king, and this becomes quite common in many subsequent *asylia* requests. In some cases, *poleis* acquired their *asylia* on their own, making their claims based on *syngeneia* and relationships with other *poleis*. In others cases, they relied on the sole backing of Hellenistic kings to obtain their honors, and some were able to secure both. This decree mentions that the Smyrneans had received a letter from Seleucus II and two ambassadors. Yet, the question arises: how far did they canvass the Greek world at this point in the history of *asylia*? This we do not know. As is the case on the Oxford Stone, it is

⁸³ Rigsby, 103-104.

mentioned only that Seleucus II “also wrote to the kings, dynasts, cities, and nations asking them to accept the temple of Aphrodite Stratoniceis as inviolable and the city as sacred and inviolable.”⁸⁴ We have no other answering decrees, except that of Delphi, so it is not known which other *poleis* accepted the *asylia* or how far they canvassed the Greek world at this point in the history of *asylia*. Therefore, it is not clear if, at this time, *asylia* was operating through the networks of Peer Polity Interaction.

With the *asylia* decrees of the Coans, in 242 B.C.E., we have another innovation attached, the addition of the request that their festival be considered Panhellenic along with their temple of Asclepius becoming inviolable. Here we also have the earliest extant archive of *asylia* decrees. Rigsby mentions over forty surviving decrees, however, many are not yet published. Within the archive is what are called “Royal letters”, or letters written by kings in response to the decree for inviolability sent by the Coans. The royal letters have been attributed to Ptolemy III, Seleucus II, Ziaelas of Bithynia, an unknown Spartocid King, and some other unknown kings. The letter from Ptolemy III consists of two joining fragments of a stele, the upper left part of the stele is only known from a squeeze (a facsimile impression), and nothing was recorded of its properties or discovery.⁸⁵ The letters from Seleucus II, an unknown king, and Ziaelas of Bithynia were all found on a blue-white marble triangular prism, found in the Asclepium of Cos in

⁸⁴ Rigsby, 98. From the Oxford Stone, (*I.Smyrna* 573): “ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς δυνάστας καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη ἀξιῶσας ἀποδέξασθαι τό τε ἱερὸν τῆς Στρατονικίδος Ἀφροδίτης ἄσυλον εἶναι τῇ πόλιν ἡμῶν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσθλον.”

⁸⁵ *Asylieurk.Kos* 2, *RC* 25, Rigsby, no. 8, 112.

1903.⁸⁶ One side of the prism was used as a threshold, so it is illegible. The acceptance from these kings were important, as they influenced many *poleis* and these *poleis* would have more readily accepted *asylia* if such influential kings had already done so.

Apart from the royal letters there are inscriptions found on various steles bearing the answering decrees from many different *poleis* around the Greek world, for example, Sparta, Messene, Thelphusa, Elis, Aegeira, and Homolium, among many others.⁸⁷ Each answering decree gives information as to what was asked of that particular *polis*. The *theoroi* would have tailored their *asylia* decrees to match the specific relationship the Coans had with each *polis*. For example, if they had *syngenia* (a common ancestry) or *oikeiotes* (a kindred-like relationship) it would have been mentioned in the decree. It became important for a *polis* to “prove” that it had some sort of reciprocal relationship with the other *poleis* it was dealing with, and this has become known as kinship diplomacy.⁸⁸ These reciprocal relationships between *poleis* were seen throughout many Hellenistic diplomatic actions, not just in the *asylia* decrees alone.⁸⁹ These were a part of the different channels of Peer Polity Interaction that *poleis* used to stay connected to, and to interact with, each other. We start seeing these acts in motion with the Coan *asylia*

⁸⁶ RC 26, Rigsby, no. 9, 114.

⁸⁷ *Asylieurk.Kos* 4, Rigsby, nos. 14-18, 126-130.

⁸⁸ “Kinship diplomacy,” is a term introduced by C.P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

⁸⁹ Apart from the actions Ma discussed in his article, see Sheila L. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), also, *Kinship Diplomacy* by C.P. Jones.

decrees and thereafter with the subsequent *asylia* decrees of other *poleis*. In his book on kinship diplomacy, Lee E. Patterson explains that “*sungeneia*...was a bond that opened doors, especially important as the Greek world was filled with enclaves of exclusivity know as *poleis*.”⁹⁰ He then states that citizenship and belonging was something the Greeks prized and “guarded like gold.”⁹¹ Just as a person needed to be recognized and belong to a *polis* to have citizenship, a *polis* needed its own recognition and place within the Greek world to be seen as legitimate in the eyes of its peers. Obtaining *asylia* was one way in which *poleis* could interact and obtain “international” recognition, which eventually developed into a shared civic culture.

The Coan archive of *asylia* decrees contains much diversity, and as Rigsby explains, it is most likely because the institution was still quite new.⁹² Later on it will be seen that the *asylia* decrees become quite formulaic, as the Peer Polity Interaction Theory predicts. There are even two decrees within this archive that Rigsby thinks show some surprise to the request of the Coans, the decrees from Aegeira and Pella. From Pella we find the phrase, “inviolability for the temple as for other temples,” and Rigsby takes this

⁹⁰ Lee E. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2010), 13. Patterson translates *sungeneia* more literally than the usual rendering of *syngeneia*.

⁹¹ Patterson, 13.

⁹² Rigsby, 110, here Rigsby explains the differing requests the Coans sent abroad to kings, colonies, and *poleis*.

as if the Pellans seemed surprised at the request.⁹³ The Aegeirans answer: “as it is a belief of the city and of the Achaeans that temples are inviolable,” and again Rigsby believes it is an expression of bewilderment.⁹⁴ Perhaps these *poleis* reasonably were confounded by such a request, because as has been noted, all temples and sanctuaries would have already been considered inviolable. Considering that the institution of *asylia* was still quite new, perhaps these *poleis* had not yet been approached about recognizing *asylia*.

Festivals and games were experiencing a sort of renaissance in the Hellenistic period around the same time. This is reflected in requests for *asylia* and Panhellenic games within the same decrees.⁹⁵ Not every call for *asylia* included a request for Panhellenic games (or vice versa), however, for those who wanted *asylia* and Panhellenic games, it must have been quite convenient to group the two together. If we follow Ma in calling the *asylia* decrees “traveling decrees”, those seeking recognition for their games to be given a title such as Panhellenic or crowned, were asking for recognition in the same way. Therefore, they could also be called traveling decrees.⁹⁶ It made sense to group the two together if a *polis* was interested in both honors.

⁹³ *Asylieurk.Kos* 7, Rigsby, no. 23, 134. “τὴν ἀσυλίαν τῶι ἱερῶι καθάπερ και τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱεροῖς.”

⁹⁴ *Asylieurk.Kos* 4, Rigsby, no. 18, 130. “[κα]θὼς και [δόγ]μα ἐστὶ τᾷ τε πόλει καὶ τοῖς [Ἀ]χαιοῖς ἅ[συ]λα εἶμεν τὰ ἱεπα.”

⁹⁵ Parker, 9-22.

⁹⁶ Ma, 19.

This connection is seen early on, with the *asylia* recognition for the Temple of Apollo in Acraephia. The Acraephians were not asking for their festival to become Panhellenic or crowned, but they were reiterating a request for a “holy contest.” Likewise, the Temple of Dionysus Cadmeius in Thebes sought an increase in the status of its *trieteris*, however, the increase in status was not Panhellenic or crowned yet, but still tied to a festival. Both were ways in which a *polis* could elevate its status and that of its god. Coans was the first *polis* to specifically ask for Panhellenic games to be recognized within an *asylia* decree. It should be noted that because Acraephia and Thebes were asking for recognition early on in the process, perhaps Peer Polity Interaction networks had not yet begun to work in unison with *asylia* decrees. After all, Acraephia and Thebes only pursued the Delphic Amphictyony for recognition, so it would not have been sufficient to ask the Delphic Amphictyony for Panhellenic games. However, at the time, Cos was seeking *asylia* and Panhellenic games, it seems to have been more connected to the kings and *poleis* around it. The sources show this clearly by the enlarged number of answering decrees within the Coan archive. Panhellenic games and festivals needed to be recognized by those who would attend them.

Our sources suggest that territorial *asylia* started in the Boeotian area around the 260s B.C.E. Some *asylia* decrees were tied to the local festivals in pursuit of increasing their statuses. These early titles were only recognized by the Delphic Amphictyony at this time, and the *poleis* cited oracular grants as evidence of worthiness for the title. Since Hellenistic Peer Polity Interaction does not yet function in these early grants, we

can only hypothesize that the idea was spread by what Snodgrass suggested for Archaic Peer Polity Interaction: Delphi served as some sort of informational hub in which *poleis* spread innovation. Given the number of temples in Boeotia that claimed inviolability, it probably started and spread as a regional phenomenon as well. How *asylia* found its way to the Eastern Greek world remains unclear, a route through Delphi seems reasonable.

The grants for Smyrna and Cos are grouped in the early *asylia* category as well, because they do not yet show evidence for a strong grasp of the networks of Peer Polity Interaction or the diplomatic formulary for the title of *asylia*. Smyrna received inviolability in the 240s B.C.E., however there is no evidence of grants from any entity other than that of Delphi and Seleucus II. Cos' sources suggest that these networks of Peer Polity Interaction were developing, as it received many answering decrees, though there was still some surprise shown on behalf of the answering *poleis*. In addition, the formulary for the title had not been set quite yet.

CHAPTER 4:

MAGNESIA AND TEOS: TWO CASE STUDIES ON *ASYLIA* AND PEER POLITY INTERACTION

At the end of the third century B.C.E. we see a firm diplomatic formulary for *asylia* that indicates the development of Peer Polity Interaction networks. Magnesia-on-the Maeander provides, by far, the best evidence of the use of the Peer Polity Interaction networks by showing the diplomatic formulary. It is also the most well-known *polis* when it comes to *asylia* decrees. This city-state had its *asylia* decrees inscribed on the perimeter walls of its *agora*, and today it is the largest extant archive of *asylia* requests. Rigsby explains that the over sixty extant decrees inscribed may only be little more than two-thirds of what originally had been present. The *asylia* decrees are inscribed on the southern and eastern walls of the *agora* and faced the inside of it. Rigsby also notes that the lettering is mostly in one hand, and the royal letters at the start of the archive are slightly larger than the rest.⁹⁷ There are also some inscriptions regarding Magnesian *asylia* found in Thermus and Delphi that are not subsequently found at Magnesia. These consist of a limestone stele of the Aetolian recognition of *asylia* dated to 221 B.C.E.,⁹⁸ and a stele found at Delphi, badly worn and only complete on the left which explains that the

⁹⁷*I.Magnesia* 16-87, Rigsby, nos. 66-131, 185-279. The royal letters are also found in *RC* 31-34, *OGIS* 282, 231, 232, or Rigsby, nos. 68-71. The majority of the blocks are now in the Pergamon museum in Berlin, only a few were left on site.

⁹⁸ *I.Magnesia* 17, *IG IX.1*²⁴, *Syll.*³ 554, Rigsby, no. 67, 190.

Aetolians accepted only the crowned games of Magnesia.⁹⁹ The remainder of the archive is from the *agora* walls at Magnesia.

The first inscription on the *agora* walls was the Magnesians' own account of their quest for *asylia*.¹⁰⁰ It explains their personal journey to obtain *asylia*, and reveals a certain predicament in that quest. Rigsby believes the sources explain that Magnesia had a failed attempt in the quest for *asylia* in 221 B.C.E., and then a successful quest in 208 B.C.E. The inscription explains the oracle and a manifestation of Artemis were the reason the Magnesians sought the honors and games, but "when having undertaken this they were fobbed off."¹⁰¹ Rigsby theorizes they had a failed attempt in 221 B.C.E. because of his own understanding of the translation of the above quotation, which in Greek is: "ὡς δὲ ἐπιβ[α]λόμενοι παρηλκύσθησ[αν]." He thinks this should be translated to mean "were turned aside" or "fobbed off," while other scholars before and after him translated it to mean "were slow in their undertaking," or "were delayed."¹⁰²

⁹⁹ H.van Effenterre, *BCH* 77 (1953) 168-176, Rigsby, nos. 78-79, 203-205.

¹⁰⁰ *I.Magnesia* 16, *Syll.*³ 557, Rigsby, no. 66, 185. Rigsby uses the text of Ebert, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 198-216 (squeeze) [*SEG* 32.1147].

¹⁰¹ Rigsby, 187. The translation is Kern's.

¹⁰² Kern, *I.Magnesia* 16; J.Ebert *Philologus* 126 (1982) 198-216; Joshua D. Sosin, "Magnesian Inviolability," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139, no. 2 (Autumn 2009): 369-410; Rigsby, no. 66, 188-189. In the text Rigsby agrees with Kern that it means "fobbed off." He explains that Ebert took "παρηλκύθησαν" to mean that the Magnesians were "slow in their undertaking," Sosin also accepts Ebert's reasoning.

Rigsby also thinks that there is a text that stands apart from the rest, a decree from the Aetolian League inscribed at Thermus and Delphi. This decree is distinctive because it does not mention the games or Artemis, though it does recognize *asylia*. Rigsby believes that in its first attempt at *asylia* in 221 B.C.E., Magnesia requested *asylia* only and he deduces that this was met with refusal (apart from the Aetolian acceptance). Then, in 208 B.C.E., they requested *asylia* and crowned games for Artemis Leucophryene, and they themselves claimed that in 208 B.C.E., all who were asked accepted their proposals. However, even though Magnesia claimed everyone accepted the games and the inviolability, there were a number of *poleis* that did not mention the *asylia*, or simply said that they accepted the games “and the other things” within their decrees.¹⁰³ Rigsby analyzes the sources to understand if these kings and *poleis* deliberately left out *asylia* or if they were just glossed over within the decree, with the crowned games taking over in precedence in the opinion of the *poleis*. He offers multiple examples for the omission of *asylia* in the decrees, and claims the most likely explanation is that the *poleis* had already granted the Magnesians *asylia* in 221 B.C.E. and the evidence for it no longer exists.

In 2007, Peter Thonemann wrote an article which attempts to explain the peculiar outcome of Magnesian’s so-called failed attempt.¹⁰⁴ Regarding Magnesia’s own

¹⁰³ Rigsby, 182. Those who did not explicitly accept *asylia* were Attalus, the Seleucid Kings, Argos, Sicyon, Chalcis, Delos, Rhodes, Antioch in Persis, probably the Aetolian League, and Delphi.

¹⁰⁴ Peter Thoneman, “Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia: (*I.Magnesia* 16.16),” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007): 151-160.

inscription on when and why it obtained *asylia*, Thoneman asked three interesting questions: why would Magnesia want to document an embarrassing memory of rejection, why the extremely precise dating for it, and why would they ask to hold a contest “for those dwelling in Asia?”¹⁰⁵ Thoneman suggests changing a single restored letter in the sentence “πρῶτ[ον στέφανι]την ἀγῶνα...” to “πρῶτ[οι στέφανι]την ἀγῶνα....” This changes the reading from “they first voted to hold a [stephanic] contest for those who live in Asia” to “they were the first of those dwelling in Asia to vote in favor of establishing a stephanic contest.”¹⁰⁶ This changes the meaning quite a bit, and Thoneman acknowledges that “claims, justified or otherwise, to be the ‘first’ from a particular city or region to have achieved a particular distinction have a long history in the Greek world.”¹⁰⁷ This statement shows that the Magnesians wanted everyone to know that even though their games and inviolability had not been solidified in 221 B.C.E., it was their intention to have it that way; that they were indeed the first to have had the idea to host stephanic games in the region.

If this emendation is correct, this whole debacle could be considered an example of competitive emulation within the sense of Peer Polity Interaction. By 208 B.C.E.,

¹⁰⁵ For Magnesia’s own inscription, see Rigsby, 187. Questions by Thoneman, 153-154. Thoneman asks “why hold a contest for those dwelling in Asia” because a stephanic contest would not generally limit contestants in this way.

¹⁰⁶ Thoneman, 155. Also note that Thoneman proposed this change at a workshop paper on *I. Magnesia* 16 in Oxford by W. Slater in 2006 and it was rejected by Slater and Summa in *Crowns at Magnesia*, 189, with no argument.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

Magnesia's neighbor and adversary, Miletus, had recently been granted inviolability and its own stephanic contest, the Didymeia. Magnesia would have felt the pressure to compete with its rival neighbor and perhaps prove that the oracle granted its *asylia* and stephanic contest first, even though it was not official until 208.¹⁰⁸ Thus, the changing of the single restored letter resolves some, albeit not all, problems with Magnesia's *asylia*. The Magnesians were not making clear that they failed, they were pointing out that they were first, and the reason they used such specific dating within the inscription, "when Zenodotus was *stephanephorus*, Thrasyphon archon in Athens, first year of the [Pythi]a in which [—] the Boeotian won as cithara-singer, one year before Olympiad 140 when Hegesidamus the Messenian won in *pancratation*," was to prove that they were indeed first.¹⁰⁹ It is also worth noting that even though Magnesia and Miletus both had inviolability, they fought a war against each other in the 180s B.C.E., "settled without reference to the *asylia* of either Miletus or Magnesia."¹¹⁰

In an article titled "Magnesian Inviolability," Joshua D. Sosin argues that the Magnesians did not send an *asylia* quest that failed in 221 B.C.E., and did not even begin canvassing the Greek world until 208 B.C.E.¹¹¹ Sosin argues that the Magnesians

¹⁰⁸ Rigsby dates Miletus' Didymeia as Panhellenic between 218/7 and 206/5, but thinks it is probable that Miletus' honors preceded Magnesia's in either 215 or 211.

¹⁰⁹ Rigsby, 187 for the translation of the specific dating in the inscription, see note 100 for citation.

¹¹⁰ Rigsby, 173.

¹¹¹ Joshua D. Sosin, "Magnesian Inviolability," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139, no. 2 (Autumn 2009): 369-410.

received an admonition from the oracle at Delphi in 221 B.C.E. that claimed they should seek inviolability for their temple, but that they delayed in actually canvassing the Greek world until 208 B.C.E. Sosin delves quite deeply into the inscriptions of the different *asylia* decrees, and this is where we see the Peer Polity Interaction Theory best reflected within the sources. Sosin argues in his article that there were no rejections of *asylia* or games in response to Magnesia, rather that the differentiation in wording in the acceptance decrees was due to variations in different versions of asking decrees put forth by the Magnesian *theoroi*. As mentioned earlier, there were twelve entities that had accepted the crowned games but did not make mention of *asylia*.¹¹² The looming question has been whether or not the responses rejected *asylia* or were merely glossing it over. Sosin explains that “the decrees... do not reveal a universe in which all responses were flat acceptance or refusal, but one in which even accepting authorities could be coy, subtle, bewildered, or even peeved.”¹¹³

Sosin painstakingly went through each answering decree to see if there was common language and phrasing in the formatting of each decree. He then grouped these together by exactly what was being asked of the *polis* or authority to accept. The result reveals “variation bound by a strict pattern hitherto unrecognized.”¹¹⁴ As previously mentioned, the ambassadors or *theoroi* traveled to their destinations with decrees tailored

¹¹² Sosin, 378, see note 103 above for those who accepted the games but did not mention *asylia*.

¹¹³ Ibid., 385.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

to each *poleis* (or higher authority) and proceeded to make a speech in front of a council putting forth their requests. According to Sosin, the ambassadors then handed over a written copy of the request for the *poleis* by which to make their decision. A general overview of the decree would be as follows: an explanation of the oracular utterance, a request to recognize Magnesian *asylia*, a declaration of some kind of reciprocal relationship between the two parties (for example, *syngeneia* or *eunoia*), examples of Magnesian benefactions to Greeks, and lastly, an invitation to participate in the newly crowned games.¹¹⁵ Within this framework the decree could be tailored to a specific *polis* or other authority. Sosin does not believe that there was one master copy of the asking decree for Magnesia, otherwise the answering decrees would have been much more uniform. However, the sources indicate many similarities within certain decrees, so there must have been some script from which the ambassadors derived their decrees.

Sosin discovered that the answering decrees “fall into two clear categories of utterance, which we might designate ‘suggestive’ and ‘direct.’”¹¹⁶ Following Sosin’s findings, the decrees that fall under the “suggestive” version were not directly asked to recognize the *asylia*, instead the oracle was quoted saying that the god had proclaimed the inviolability of Magnesia an “agreeable” thing.¹¹⁷ Sosin goes on to explain that the suggestive version has two clear types, both which do not explicitly ask for acceptance to

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 386. This information is gathered from Sosin’s text and also the footnotes.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 387.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

asylia, with one “request[ing] acceptance of the sacrifice, and/or truce and/or games etc., which they established for Artemis Leukophryene,” or the other type, “request[ing] acceptance and/or enhancement of the honors voted to Artemis Leukophryene.”¹¹⁸

The direct version receives the festival and accepts the city and territory to be inviolable, and was not used as widely as the suggestive version of the asking decree. Sosin clarifies this by explaining that by using the suggestive version, the Magnesians were acting “simply to invoke and quote the oracle, [which] was to ask without asking, a diplomatic nicety.”¹¹⁹ However, of those to whom the direct version of the asking decree was presented, all consented to the *asylia*, whereas sometimes it was unclear whether those answering the suggestive version accepted the *asylia* or not.

The Magnesian asking decrees show the degree to which a *polis* might go to obtain the title for itself. It is clear a *polis* had to go about asking its peers for *asylia* in different ways, whether asking for it directly, or indirectly. Most importantly, Magnesia needed to include its relationship with a *polis* within its inquiry. Kinship diplomacy was touched on briefly in the previous chapter, and is an important component in *asylia* and Peer Polity Interaction. In the case of *asylia*, *poleis* used this kinship diplomacy to remind their peers about past and present relationships and persuade them respectfully to concede to their request.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 388.

Greeks discussed their kinship with other Greeks many times with reference to the heroic age, “when gods and heroes walked the earth and mingled with mortals.”¹²⁰ The Epic Cycle, the return of the Heraclidae, King Minos, and the many Greek founding heroes and gods in their mythology were the sources for a city’s genealogy. Of course the Greeks did not understand these stories as “myths” as we do now, “the heroic mythology was their ancient history.”¹²¹ A famous passage from Herodotus tells the story of how Alexander the Great tried to participate in the Olympic Games, but the Greeks said he was a barbarian and only Greeks could compete in the games. Alexander went on to prove that he indeed descended from Argos, as his ancestors were descendant of Heracles, who was from the Argolid, and this was generally accepted.¹²²

Some of the *poleis* from the Greek East seeking *asylia* originated as colonies from mother cities on the Greek mainland, and were able to use those ties to their advantage. For example, Magnesia’s mythical history includes ties with Delphi, and in its decrees to cities in the Arcadian League, they appeal to them as “‘relatives and friends,’ (*syngenesis kai philoi*).”¹²³ Of the Arcadian cities, the decree from Megalopolis was the only one inscribed while the rest were listed underneath. Within the decree, they accepted the *asylia* and crowned games, and they also recalled a favor that the Magnesians had done

¹²⁰ Jones, 8-9.

¹²¹ M.P. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1972), 12.

¹²² Herodotus *Histories* 5.22. See also Jones, 15 and 41, and Vlassopoulos, 75.

¹²³ Jones, 33.

for them in the past; the Magnesians had given funds to build a fortification wall, which Rigsby guesses can only be the famous walls of Megalopolis.¹²⁴ This had surely been mentioned in their asking decree. The Megalopolitans insisted that they wanted to “return favors to kinsman and friends with a view to showing [them]selves to be unstinting friends...”¹²⁵ This statement in the decree is an excellent example of the kinship diplomacy, reciprocity, and the remembrance *poleis* held for one another. Why was the decree from Megalopolis the only one of the Arcadian *poleis* to be inscribed? Perhaps the acceptance, the kindred relationship between the two, and the loyalty shown was the type of message Magnesia wanted to convey.

In his book on kinship diplomacy, Lee Patterson thoroughly examines the question of the eponymous ancestors of Magnesia and the *polis* Same-on-Cephalenia.¹²⁶ He explains how the Magnesians considered Magnes, who was a son of Aeolus, their founder through local myth. Aeolus had another son, Deion, who himself had a son, Cephalus. Cephalus was the eponym of Same-on-Cephalenia, therefore the two *poleis* were linked through *syngeneia* with Magnes being the uncle of Cephalus. Patterson attempts to comb through the Greek myths to find if he can follow the path of Magnesia’s and Cephalenia’s local myths; yet this daunting task left questions unanswered. The most interesting aspect of the local myth of Magnesia is that it was probably invented

¹²⁴ *I.Magnesia* 38, *Syll.*³ 559, Rigsby, no. 88, 217-219.

¹²⁵ See above, note 124, translation by Rigsby, 219.

¹²⁶ Patterson, 114-117.

specifically for this *asylia* quest. Patterson suggests these fictions were common, “other examples from the Hellenistic Period show that the invention of genealogical stemmas on the occasion of a diplomatic venture not only was practiced, but readily embraced.”¹²⁷

No matter if the Magnesians invented their myth or not, the Cephallenians accepted Magnes as Cephalus’s uncle and thereafter their *poleis* were connected by *syngeneia*, which opened the door to successful diplomacy and Peer Polity Interaction.

Yet another example of the use of kinship diplomacy comes from an answering decree for Magnesia from Antioch-in-Persis. The exact location of Antioch-in-Persis is unknown, however, it is thought to be on the east side of what is now the Persian Gulf, in Iran. Rigsby explains that Antioch-in-Persis was a subject city founded by the Seleucid crown, but within the decree the *polis* mentions that the Magnesians had sent colonists to its city. Thus, they would have been considered kinsman and they mention that “they too worship Dionysus.”¹²⁸ In his book on the interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks, Kastos Vassopoulos explains how if non-Greek communities adopted the *polis* model, they could in turn participate in Peer Polity Interaction and the networks within those interactions, as seen in Chapter Two with reference to Hanisa.¹²⁹ Here, Antioch-in-Persis, a city 1,600 miles east of Athens, was able to make its way into the Peer Polity Interaction network. This is most likely because Antioch-in-Persis was a royal city that

¹²⁷ Patterson, 116.

¹²⁸ For the epigraphic inscription, see *I.Magnesia* 61, *OGIS* 233, Rigsby, no. 111, 258-259. Rigsby’s commentary on 259-260. See also Vlassopoulos, 297.

¹²⁹ Vlassopoulos, 297.

was introduced to the *polis* model, but also because it had Greek connections through its *metropolis* (mother-city) Magnesia.

As mentioned earlier, even though Magnesia and Miletus both held titles of inviolability, both ended up going to war with each other in the 180s B.C.E. The peace treaty between the two survives, yet it does not mention a single word about the *poleis* recognizing each others' *asylia*.¹³⁰ This seems rather strange that both *poleis* gained their *asylia* titles around twenty-eight years before the war and yet there was no mention that both cities were inviolable. Rigsby uses this as evidence that the titles of *asylia* meant nothing but honor to the *poleis* competing for it. The one problem with this argument, however, is that it makes the *poleis* in the Hellenistic period sound quite peaceful as they canvassed the Greek world and granted each other *asylia* and crowned games.

There is a substantial problem within the Hellenistic period regarding the sense we get from *asylia* decrees as it relates to the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. The shared networks and interactions between *poleis* which the Peer Polity Interaction Theory posits seems to reflect mutual agreement and friendliness towards each other. However, there was a great deal of fighting between *poleis* in the Hellenistic period, and even more between the hegemonic powers. Arthur Eckstein, in his book about Mediterranean Anarchy, depicts a deeply hostile world in which the Hellenistic Greeks were living.¹³¹

¹³⁰ *Syll.*³ 588, Rigsby, 22 (he does not include the inscription in his book).

¹³¹ Arthur Eckstein, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

Eckstein describes the international politics of the ancient Mediterranean as a heavily militarized anarchy in which international law was minimal and unenforceable.¹³² He uses *asylia* as an example of the weakness of interstate relations in the Hellenistic period and claims that “no collective physical defense of any such sacred site was ever mounted.”¹³³ Eckstein does mention that Hellenistic sources reveal an increase in friendly diplomatic relations between *poleis*, which he calls “the prevailing primitiveness of diplomatic practice.”¹³⁴ He concludes that these friendly diplomatic relations made little impact and interstate diplomatic procedures continued to be highly militarized and anarchic. Eckstein argues that a working system of international law is only possible when there is an effective means of enforcement. This is the problem with viewing *asylia* decrees as means of security. The decrees do not contain an effective means of enforcement, so were they ever really at all deliberately invented for security measures? Kirsten Kvist argues that they were.

Kvist, states that Rigsby “refuses to see the grants of *asylia* as diplomatic measures aimed at real protection from violence.”¹³⁵ Rigsby maintains that *asylia* was only an honorary title, because there is no literary or epigraphic evidence that any *polis* actually protected another whom it granted *asylia*. In addition, *poleis* holding the title

¹³² Eckstein, 1.

¹³³ Ibid., 80.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 97.

¹³⁵ Kirsten Kvist, “Cretan Grants of *Asylia* - Violence and Protection as Interstate Relations,” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 54 (2003), 194-5.

went to war with each other, as noted above with Magnesia and Miletus. Kvist also regrets that Rigsby does not explore the fact that some grants of *asylia* included in his corpus include grants of territorial inviolability as well as personal inviolability, (that is *hikesia* or supplication). In his introduction, Rigsby does make clear that his corpus focuses on territorial inviolability of places and not of persons. The phrase that bothers Kvist is: “it must nonetheless be admitted that some grantors themselves confuse the two: The Aitolians and Cretans, with their active use of personal inviolability, seem more than once to have granted this when in fact they had been asked to recognize the inviolability of a place.”¹³⁶

Kvist argues that the *polis* of Teos initiated *asylia* decrees with the Cretans in order to protect itself because the Cretans were “well known soldiers, mercenaries, plunderers, and pirates and these various types of violent activities contributed directly as well as indirectly to the Cretan economy and interstate relations.”¹³⁷ He suggests these formal requests for *asylia* “denote an initial level of ceremony,” but were in actuality requests for security.¹³⁸ Kvist argues this by citing a line from the Cretan decree of Lato, which reads: “And if anyone (...) harms the Teans (...) against the written decision regarding *asylia* to the city and territory, it shall be permitted any Tean who is present to

¹³⁶ Rigsby, 19-20 and Kvist, 194.

¹³⁷ Kvist, 194.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

seize back both people and property, if they have been taken.”¹³⁹ Kvist believes that because people and property being taken was addressed in the decree, the seizures were actually happening in Teos and that it was hoped a decree of *asylia* between the two might solve it. Rigsby does admit that these decrees use “a formula from defensive alliances, although here not backed up by any oath, ” and also mentions that scholars have suggested that the Tean quest was selective in the cities it asked, addressed to pirates.¹⁴⁰ Rigsby, however, suggests that the Teans could have asked their military allies.¹⁴¹

Kvist is postulating that Teos used granted *asylia* as a vehicle not only to obtain *asylia*, but to also request a promise of security from the Cretans, a people whom they considered dangerous, and who had possibly been conducting piratical acts towards them. Kvist specifically claims: “the Teans' embassy requested (at least) two things from the Cretans. On the surface they applied for formal territorial *asylia*. However, beneath the cover of respect for Dionysus there was also a request for personal security from violent attacks.”¹⁴² The fact that a *polis* had to add a defensive alliance-like formula to further its inquiry for protection suggests that primary grants of *asylia* alone did not offer enough

¹³⁹ Translation by Kvist, lines 24-9, 194, decree is: *I.Cret.* I XVI 2, Rigsby, no. 142, 304.

¹⁴⁰ Rigsby, 289, the formula for defensive alliances includes, for example, “if anyone harm the Teans or their land, the grantor will come with such military aid as is possible,” essentially what was quoted from the decree from Lato above.

¹⁴¹ See Rigsby, 288, note 30 for the the scholars who think Teos appealed to only pirates.

¹⁴² Kvist, 207.

protection, if any at all. Teos's, own account of its quest for *asylia* claims Antiochus III helped it achieve the status as it was weakened "on account of continual wars and the burden of contributions [they] were paying."¹⁴³ There is no mention of specific piratical acts against them; however, in a second decree from Teos again speaking of royal benefactions, Teos claims "he has made work and agriculture in the countryside profitable by virtue of security..."¹⁴⁴ So, it seems security was of some issue to the Teans, for they mentioned paying tribute to Attalus several times, and that seems to be the largest burden within Teos' own decree. Ultimately, Antiochus relieved them of tribute.¹⁴⁵

Another interesting addition to the Tean *asylia* decrees is that there was a second round of grants obtained by Teos, and the ones that survive are mainly from Crete, though a few are from unknown locations. This second round happened approximately thirty years later, according to Kvist, and the ambassadors canvassed the whole island, requesting renewals "of their privilege of *asylia* in honor of Dionysus and in the name of existing good relations and friendship. However, this time they added requests of other privileges and of military aid."¹⁴⁶ The other privileges include military alliance, citizenship from the granting *polis*, and a guarantee of inscribing the grant. Why did Teos

¹⁴³ The inscription he uses is from Herrmann, "Antiochus" 34-35 no. 1.6-29, translation: Rigsby, 281-282.

¹⁴⁴ Again, Herrmann, "Antiochus" no. 2.50-53, Rigsby 283.

¹⁴⁵ Rigsby, 282 & 283.

¹⁴⁶ Kvist, 208.

need or want to renew the previous grants of *asylia*? There has been speculation that the Cretans violated their initial grants of *asylia* and that is why Teos went back, hoping for reconciliation.¹⁴⁷ On this subject, Rigsby offers nothing else other than commenting that the Cretans themselves do not mention violating their grants and several mention that the *asylia* has not lapsed.¹⁴⁸ Kvist postulates that this time around, perhaps the Teans were looking for military allies because the second asking decrees do not add in the previous plea for security for the people and property and the right to take them back.¹⁴⁹ Kvist explains that the second round grants of *asylia* grant military aid to the Teans if anyone should attack them. He believes the Cretans thought they would gain something by becoming allies of Teos, as they could, in essence, go to war with anyone who assaulted the Teans.

Overall, the uniqueness of the *asylia* grants of Teos leave us with many questions. Was Teos strategically using grants of *asylia* as a vehicle to procure more security for itself? If so, does this mean that a grant of *asylia* really did mean nothing in respect to securing an actual inviolate status of the territory for which it was granted? All of this information does indicate, that *asylia* itself could be used as a channel of communication, it was a way to interact with other *poleis* via an established network, as proposed by the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. By the time Teos was granted *asylia* (204/3 B.C.E.), the

¹⁴⁷ See note 36 in Rigsby, 289.

¹⁴⁸ Rigsby, 290.

¹⁴⁹ Kvist, 209.

diplomatic formulary for obtaining the title was already in place. A *polis* knew what to expect when another *polis* asked them for *asylia*, and vice versa, therefore the networks for obtaining the title were already in place. With Teos, we see cities using this network in a different way, to obtain more securities for itself as it was a reliable network. Teos knew that the Cretans probably would not deny it *asylia*: indeed there is no evidence of any *polis* denying *asylia* to a god, as that is essentially who the title honored. Since Teos knew the Cretans would allow it to state its case for *asylia*, it included the other requests within its *asylia* decree. As we have seen, it was common for *poleis* to use these channels to ask for crowned games along with *asylia* as that too was an honor for the god, but it is odd to see a secular request within an *asylia* decree.

Magnesia was selected for a case study because it presents *asylia* at its maturest form. By this time, the decree for *asylia* had become recognizable as a diplomatic formulary. *Poleis* knew what to expect when they were approached by another *polis* requesting *asylia*, would recognize the language in an asking decree, and would know how to answer it. Ambassadors were received and taken care of, they presented the decree to a council, and the council, in turn, offered their answering decree back. Promises of inscriptions were made, and the *poleis* both came away linked in a reciprocal relationship. This communication and response established parity and ensured the openness of networks upon which diplomacy and information could flow: a classic Peer Polity Interaction.

CHAPTER 5:

ASYLIA FROM THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.E. TO THE FIRST CENTURY C.E.

Most of the *asylia* decrees from the second century B.C.E. have something in common: Rome. Around the early second century B.C.E., the Romans started getting involved in the affairs of *asylia*. Beate Dignas states that early on, Roman participation could probably be “characterized as attempts to meet Greek expectations.”¹⁵⁰ Of the twelve known epigraphic sources of *asylia* from Rome included in Rigsby’s corpus, most are recognitions or renewals.¹⁵¹ New grants of *asylia* from Rome were unusual, but there are exceptions, such as Stratoniceia and Aphrodisias. What follow are some of the extant *asylia* sources from the second century B.C.E. with which Rome had affiliation.

Rome recognized Tean *asylia* in 193 B.C.E.; its decree was different from the decrees of the Greek *poleis*. It stated, “we shall try to join in increasing honors for the god and privileges for you, if you also hereafter preserve your loyalty to us.”¹⁵² Rigsby tells us, that in 190 B.C.E., Teos was storing supplies for Antiochus III and Rome came in and pillaged Teos’ territory to get these supplies.¹⁵³ Apparently the *asylia* decree between

¹⁵⁰ Dignas, 294.

¹⁵¹ Sources from Rome are Rigsby, nos. 6, 61, 153, 173, 180-184, 186, 210-212, 214, 216, and 217.

¹⁵² *CIG* 3045, *IGR* IV 1557, *Roman Doc.* 34, *Syll.*³ 601, Rigsby, no. 153, 314.

¹⁵³ Livy 37.27-28, see Rigsby, 286.

the two was considered null and void since Teos was aiding Antiochus III instead of being loyal to Rome.

Pergamum actually obtained *asylia* for two different temples in its territories at two different times; the Nicephorium in 182 B.C.E., and the Asclepieum somewhat later (the date is unknown, but before 88 B.C.E.).¹⁵⁴ Rigsby declares that this “ostentatious” effort by the Attalid kings reflects their ambitions and prominence in the second century B.C.E. Eumenes II also requested that the Pergamene festival, the Nicephoria, become Panhellenic. According to the letter written by Eumenes II to the Coans, the new Panhellenic festival was to honor Athena and give thanks for their recent victories in battle. The sources for the Temple of Athena Nicephorus consist of two “letters” from Eumenes II, one on a fragmented white marble stele from Cos, the other from Iasus, a white masonry building block found somewhere in Ionia.¹⁵⁵ The other inscriptions are from a base of a statue of Eumenes II, discovered in Delphi and dedicated by the Aetolian League, and another base of a statue of Attalus I, also found at Delphi, dedicated by the Delphic Amphictyony.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ Rigsby, 362.

¹⁵⁵ The Letter from Eumenes II, decree of Cos: *RC* 50, and Rigsby, no. 176, 366-368. The letter of Eumenes from Iasus: *I.Iasos* 6, *RC* 49, and Rigsby, no. 177, 369-370.

¹⁵⁶ Eumenes base from Aetolian League: *FD* III.3 240, *IG* IX.1² 179, *SGDI* 1413, *Syll.*³ 629, Rigsby, no. 178, 371-373. Eumenes base from Delphic Amphictyony: *FD* III.3 261, *Syll.*³ 630, Rigsby, no. 179, 375-376.

The second temple in Pergamum that obtained *asylia* was the Temple of Asclepius Soter (or the Asclepieum). Rigsby explains that there is no actual primary grant that survives, only the fragment of a Roman confirmation from around 45 B.C.E. It is almost certain that Pergamum's titles were abolished after the massacre known as the Roman Vespers in 88 B.C.E. because the Pergamenes had killed Romans after they had taken refuge in their temples. When Mithridates of Pergamum saved Julius Caesar's life in Alexandria (48/7 B.C.E.), he persuaded Caesar to re-instate the inviolability of the Asclepieum.¹⁵⁷ The Roman sources available to us include fragments (now lost) of a dossier of Roman acts inscribed on marble building blocks in the agora of Smyrna.¹⁵⁸ The fragment was particularly poorly preserved, what can be read from the text speaks of "restoration", "the city of Pergamum and territories", "*asylia*", and "sacred."¹⁵⁹ The other Roman sources are from statues at Pergamum of Caesar, Mithridates, and Publius Servilius Isauricus, who had carried out Caesar's restorations. The inscriptions on the statue bases describe these men as saviors who had given back to the city its ancestral constitutions.¹⁶⁰

Stratoniceia was another *polis*, like Pergamum, that declared two temples within the same *polis* inviolable, which was a rare feat. The city had Rome's favor early on,

¹⁵⁷ Rigsby, 377-378.

¹⁵⁸ *I.Smyrna* 590, *Roman Doc* 54, Rigsby, no. 180, 380.

¹⁵⁹ Rigsby, 381-382.

¹⁶⁰ Rigsby, 378, the statues do not specifically mention *asylia*, so they are not included in Rigsby's corpus.

because it had opposed Mithridates VI, and this certainly could have helped Stratoniceia with its honors. The Temple of Hecate at Lagina gained *asylia* in 81 B.C.E., and has some unusual components. By this time, Stratoniceia was under Roman rule, so the *polis* was granted *asylia* by Rome, and it canvassed the Greek world for acceptance of *asylia* and Panhellenic games. However, only the Roman grant of *asylia* was inscribed on the temple wall, while acceptances of all the Greek *poleis* were simply listed by name. This gesture indicates that although Roman acceptance was of the utmost importance, a *polis* still wanted to be accepted as inviolable in the eyes of the Greeks and be included in the networks of Peer Polity Interaction. The source, as mentioned, once inscribed on the Temple of Hecate, was reduced to fragments of thirteen blocks containing five columns of writing. It reflects two letters of Cornelius Sulla to Stratoniceia, a *Senatus Consultum*, and a decree of the city.¹⁶¹

The second temple in Stratoniceia to obtain *asylia* was the Temple of Zeus at Panamara. Its date is unknown, but Rigsby suggests sometime after the Parthian invasion in 40 B.C.E. Rigsby lists three possible decrees of Stratoniceia, but the dates and whether or not they pertain to *asylia* are unknown (with C as the exception), therefore they are not included in the corpus.¹⁶² The only source Rigsby includes in his corpus is a

¹⁶¹ *I.Stratonikeia* 505, *OGIS* 441, *Roman Doc* 18, Rigsby, no. 210, 420-422.

¹⁶² The possible decrees are A-C, Rigsby 424-426.

badly worn inscription from Rome on two fragments of a white marble stele at Panamara.¹⁶³

The Temple of Aphrodite in Aphrodisias was also granted inviolability under Roman rule, like that of Stratoniceia. The temple was inside the city, so according to Greek conventions, the whole city would have had *asylia*. Since inviolability was granted during Roman rule, it made sense for only the temple to have this status as Romans only recognized asylum for temples. As mentioned, the Romans were wary of the whole *asylia* phenomenon, since their definition of asylum was more like our modern understanding. Like Stratoniceia, Aphrodisias held Roman favor as well, and the primary source on its *asylia* comes from a senatorial confirmation written by Octavian as triumvir in 39 B.C.E., which was inscribed on the theater wall.¹⁶⁴ Within the inscription, the city is said to be an ally to Rome and therefore immune from taxes and requisitions. The temple is also proclaimed to have the same laws and religion of those at the Temple of Artemis in Ephesus and a perimeter of 120 feet is established for its inviolability. Rigsby mentions that only in the *asylia* grants from Egypt do we see parameters for inviolability set for temples, so therefore this is another clue that Aphrodisias obtained its *asylia* from Rome. There is no evidence that Aphrodisias canvassed the Greek world.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶³ *I.Stratonikeia* 12, *Roman Doc* 30, Rigsby, no. 211, 426.

¹⁶⁴ *OGIS* 453-5, *Roman Doc* 28, Rigsby, no. 212, 429-430.

¹⁶⁵ Rigsby, 430.

The *polis* of Sardis in Lydia had a temple of Artemis that was declared inviolable, however, the original date for its grant is unknown. What survives in the sources is an edict from Julius Caesar, inscribed on a stele found just outside of the Temple of Artemis on a road right outside the sanctuary. The edict proclaims an expansion of the boundaries of the *asylia* for the temple that already exists: “Of Sardis the sacred [and] inviolable boundary added to by Gaius Caesar Roman *autokrator* and high-priest....”¹⁶⁶ Also, this should be a noticeable pattern, Sardis was in favor with Rome because they opposed Mithridates in 88 B.C.E. Therefore, they either probably never lost their *asylia* title or they were granted it back for being Roman allies. The temples in Miletus and Hieracome-Hierocaesarea also had their boundaries expanded by Caesar.

The *asylia* sources in the second century B.C.E. show the growing status and power of Rome, as many *poleis* found it desirable to have Rome’s recognition, and even in some cases an actual new grant was initiated. By the first century B.C.E., it was not simply desirable for *asylia* decrees to be recognized by Rome, it was now a necessity. By this time, Rome ruled over much of the Greek world, however, the Romans seemed eager to please the Greek *poleis* and rewarded those *poleis* who had been loyal to them during the Mithridatic War. We see Sulla confirming *asylia* in the 80s B.C.E., and in the 40s B.C.E. confirmations from Caesar and his colleague Isauricus. However, there must have

¹⁶⁶ P. Herrmann, *Chiron* 19 (1989) 127-164, Rigsby, no. 214, 434-435. “ὅρος ἱερὸς ἄσυλος Ἀρτέμιδος Σαρδιανῆς, ὃν προσώρισεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ Γάιος Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς...” Rigsby states the date of the edict is eleven days before the murder of Caesar, so 44 B.C.E.,

been some serious issues with the title, because in 22/3 C.E., Tiberius had the Senate investigate the *asylia* of the Greek *poleis*. As Beate Dignas states: “the way in which the Roman rulers dealt with the *asylia* of Greek sanctuaries in Asia Minor makes me suspect a misunderstanding between the Greek subjects and their Roman rulers concerning the meaning and the implications of the right.”¹⁶⁷ As noted in the introduction, the Romans had a different view of *asylia*: a place that held asylum offered refuge to a person from civic law. Rigsby has also made it clear that territorial *asylia* was much different and the Greeks had their own version of what Romans considered asylum, know as *hikeisia*, or supplication. This Roman view on *asylia* is easily seen through Tacitus’ account of the Senate review of *asylia* in 22/3 C.E.

Literary sources concerning *asylia* are few and far between, and Tacitus’ account is the only one that deals in some detail with actual Greek territorial *asylia*. In his *Annals*, he recalls how in 22/3 C.E., Tiberius allowed the Senate to hear “certain demands of the provinces.”¹⁶⁸ Tacitus writes with great disdain of the Greek *poleis* who wished to gain back their *asylia*. His contempt was certainly over the supplicants housed in the temples, as according to him, they “were thronged with the vilest of the slaves; the same refuge screened the debtor against his creditor as well as men suspected of capital offenses.”¹⁶⁹ Ultimately, the *poleis* were ordered to bring evidence to the Senate of their

¹⁶⁷ Dignas, 289.

¹⁶⁸ Tacitus *Annals* 3.60.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

claims to the title of inviolability. Those that were granted their titles back enjoyed a seemingly revised title, as they were “prescribed [with] certain limits,” and bronze plaques were to be installed at the temples to remind them not to “sink into selfish aims under the mask of religion.”¹⁷⁰ The anecdote by Tacitus indicates the Roman disapproval of *asylia* and the *poleis*’ efforts to keep claim to a title that was important to them. Perhaps some of their temples and their custom of *hikesia* had gotten out of hand, or perhaps Tacitus was embellishing the facts. Either way it was an important matter to both Romans and Greeks alike.

Ephesus, one of the more prominent *poleis* in the eastern Greek world, housed the highly venerated Temple of Artemis. There are no records of any Hellenistic *asylia* grants that survive, but there is a literary record of its *asylia* during Roman rule. We learn through Tacitus that during the Roman Senatorial review in 22/3 C.E. Ephesus was the first Greek *polis* to prove its case that it should regain its inviolability.¹⁷¹ Tacitus reiterated the Ephesian claim:

First of all came the people of Ephesus. They declared that Diana and Apollo were not born at Delos, as was the vulgar belief. They had in their own country a river Cenchrius, a grove Ortygia, where Latona, as she leaned in the pangs of labour on an olive still standing, gave birth to those two deities, whereupon the grove at the divine intimation was consecrated. There Apollo himself, after the slaughter of the Cyclops, shunned the wrath of Jupiter; there too father Bacchus, when victorious in war, pardoned the suppliant Amazons who had gathered round the shrine. Subsequently by the permission of Hercules, when he was subduing Lydia,

¹⁷⁰ Tacitus *Annals* 3.63.

¹⁷¹ Tacitus *Annals* 3.60-3, Rigsby 386.

the grandeur of the temple's ceremonial was augmented, and during the Persian rule its privileges were not curtailed. They had afterwards been maintained by the Macedonians, then by ourselves.¹⁷²

This was supposedly the history on which Ephesus laid its claims of *asylia*. Tacitus goes on to name quite a few more familiar *poleis* that were very serious about obtaining their *asylia* back or retaining it, including Magnesia, Aphrodisia, Stratoniceia, Hierocaesarea, Pergamum, Smyrna, Sardis, and Miletus.

It is unknown what officially caused the Senatorial review in 22/3 C.E. There had to be a certain amount of unrest within the Greek *poleis* and the Romans were willing to compromise on the matter. Rigsby believes, after reviewing and interpreting the Roman primary source material, that after the renewals of the review in 22/3 C.E., there were no more new grants of *asylia*. As time went by, and with Rome now the ruling entity, *asylia* started to lose popularity to a different title: *neokoros*. The neocorate temples housed the cult of the emperor, had asylum (in the Roman sense), and became the new honorable title to seek. *Poleis* wanted “to be selected as the province’s host for the provincial temple of the emperor, a cult of more than local patronage for a god honored by all the

¹⁷² Tacitus *Annals* 3.61, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb, “Primi omnium Ephesii adiere, memorantes non, ut vulgus crederet, Dianam atque Apollinem Delo genitos: esse apud se Cenchreum amnem, lucum Ortygiam, ubi Latonam partu gravidam et oleae, quae tum etiam maneat, adnissam edidisse ea numina, deorumque monitu sacratum nemus, atque ipsum illic Apollinem post interfectos Cyclopos Iovis iram vitavisse. mox Liberum patrem, bello victorem, supplicibus Amazonum quae aram insiderant ignovisse. auctam hinc concessu Herculis, cum Lydia poteretur, caerimoniam templo neque Persarum dicione deminutum ius; post Macedonas, dein nos servavisse.”

Greeks.”¹⁷³ As discussed previously, the Peer Polity Interaction Theory model can explain the decline in popularity of *asylia*. As the exercise of power shifted to the Romans, honor and recognition were desired from them, and Greek *poleis* instead sought titles that would please the Romans.

The second century B.C.E. also yielded a different kind of source for *asylia*, coinage. The phenomenon of putting civic titles on coins started in the Syro-Phoenician region, and was adapted by some neighbors. It never really caught on throughout the rest of the Hellenistic or Roman worlds. The most important title would ultimately end up on the coin being minted at the time: among *asylia* and autonomous there was also *neokoros*, metropolis, and others.¹⁷⁴ The problems associated with the *asylia* coins are a lack of information and the evidence that is difficult to interpret. To begin with, coins are for the most part small, and used abbreviations ranging from *polis* names to civic titles to gods and goddesses. For example, a coin could have any of the following abbreviations on it to promote its status of sacred and inviolable: IEP, IEPΑΣ, IEPΑΣY, or IEPΑΣYΛ. There is a question whether IEPΑΣ stands for just simply ιερᾶς or ιερ(ᾶς) ἄσ(ύλου). Nevertheless, the title of *asylia* ultimately meant “sacred and (therefore) inviolable,” so even if a coin just had IEP inscribed upon it, it probably still meant “sacred and inviolable.” Apart from not knowing when the *asylia* was granted, we are not sure for

¹⁷³ Rigsby, 29.

¹⁷⁴ *Neokoros* means a *polis* had the status of keeping a temple, usually to a Roman emperor; *metropolis* was the status of being a mother city to a colony.

which cult figure the *asylia* was granted, nor whether it was a temple that was inviolate or the whole city and countryside. Many coins, however, do provide a *terminus ante quem* for dating the *asylia* for some *poleis*. As Rigsby relates, it is unclear why there is no temporal overlap in grant inscriptions and coinage, that is, so far we do not know of a written grant of *asylia* for a *polis* and a coin from that *polis* on which *asylia* is inscribed from the same time period.¹⁷⁵

The coinage available for study is mostly from the Roman imperial period, however there are a few examples from the late Hellenistic period. One of the regions that produced a lot of coinage with civic titles was Cilicia, along the south coastal region of Anatolia. This area had been thoroughly Hellenized and was also a battleground for rival Hellenistic kings; it ultimately became a Roman province. The cities whose coinage had *asylia* inscriptions in the area of Cilicia were Aegeae, Hieropolis-Castabala, Elaeusa-Sebaste, Mopsuestia, Rhosus, Epiphaneia, Tarsus, Seleuceia on Calycadnus, and Selinus-Trajanopolis.¹⁷⁶

One of the first known *poleis* to have had coinage with the *asylia* title, apart from Tyre, was Aegeae. Aegeae's coinage with the title was from the late Hellenistic period, bronze, and has the inscription: "of Aegeae the sacred and inviolable."¹⁷⁷ Some had a bust of Tyche on one side and a horse's head on the other; and another with the same

¹⁷⁵ See Rigsby, 34-36 for an even more thorough explanation of identifying the *asylia* title upon coinage.

¹⁷⁶ See Figure 1.2 on page 15 for locations of these *poleis*.

¹⁷⁷ Rigsby: A-B, 461; Bloesch nos. 103-108, "Αἰγεαίων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ασύλου."

inscription had an Athena bust on one side and a goat on the other. The other coinage that Rigsby includes are bronze coins from the same late Hellenistic time period, they have similar images: Tyche, Athena, a horse's head, Heracles, or a club and bow. The inscription however changes to: "of Aegeae the sacred and autonomous."¹⁷⁸ Some time in the late Hellenistic period the *polis* gained quasi-autonomy, probably after the Seleucids lost control around 90 B.C.E.

Another *polis* in Cilicia, Elaeusa-Sebaste, issued late Hellenistic silver tetradrachms documenting *asylia*, as well as Imperial dated coinage. The late Hellenistic coinage reads: "of Sebaste the sacred (and inviolable) and autonomous," while the Imperial coins have an array of civic titles, such as: "of Sebaste the sacred and inviolable and autonomous and flagship."¹⁷⁹ Another example of a title-filled coin reads: "of Sebaste the sacred and inviolable, autonomous, flagship, loyal ally of Romans."¹⁸⁰

Mopsuestia, another *polis* in Cilicia, did not have a Greek god or goddess as the recipient of *asylia*. A Roman inscription signifies the granted *asylia* was for Isis and Serapis. It is a marble block now in the Adana museum that explains that Lucius Licinius Lucullus (*quaestor* in 88 B.C.E.) recommended the inviolability of the temple of Isis in

¹⁷⁸ Rigsby: C-D, 461; Bloesch nos. 113-212, "Αἰγεαίων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ αὐτονόμου."

¹⁷⁹ Rigsby: A, 465; Houghton, 86; Imhoof-Blumer 39 no. 42, "Ἐλαιοθσίων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ αὐτονόμου." Rigsby: B, 465; *BMC Lycaonia* 235 no. 13, "Σεβαστὴ ἱερ(ᾶ) ἄσ(υλος) αὐτ(ονομος) ναυ(αρχίς)."

¹⁸⁰ Rigsby: E, 465; Imhoof-Bloomer no. 45; Zeigler no. 577, "Σεβαστὴ ἱερ ἄσ αὐ ναυαρχίς π σ 'Ρ δ ἐ τ," - in Greek reading: Σεβαστὴ ἱερ(ᾶ) ἄσ(υλος) αὐ(τονομος) ναυαρχίς π(ιστή) σ(ύμμαχος) 'Ρ(ωμαίων) δ(ωρεαίς) ἐ(ξαιρέτοις) τ(ετειμημένη)

Mopsuestia.¹⁸¹ This inscription is quite valuable because as mentioned previously, it is very hard to tell the deity for whom the *asylia* was granted. For example, the *asylia* coinage that is extant for Mopsuestia has many different deities upon it, Zeus, Athena, Apollo, and others, so it could not easily have been known that the *asylia* was for the temple of Isis and Serapis by just looking at the coinage.¹⁸²

The *polis* of Tyre, in Phoenicia, was the first known *polis* to have obtained *asylia* outside the old Aegean world. It was known for its temple to Heracles-Melqart and Astarte, said to have been built in the tenth century B.C.E. The evidence for *asylia* comes from coinage and a few inscriptions. Rigsby explains that there was a royal mint in Tyre during the second century B.C.E. when it was ruled by the Seleucids. There were no titles on any of the minted coins until 141 B.C.E., when on a silver tetradrachm of Demetrius II, “of the Tyrians the sacred and inviolable” was inscribed.¹⁸³ Henri Seyrig, a numismatic historian specializing in Syria and Lebanon, understood the minted coin as a bold statement and probable evidence that it was at that time that Tyre gained *asylia* and was not just a *terminus ante quem*, as no other coin in Tyre with *asylia* on it was minted in such a way.¹⁸⁴ Subsequently, the Tyrian coins were minted without the *polis*’ name in

¹⁸¹ M.H.. Sayar, P. Siewart, and H. Taeuber, *Tyche* 9 (1994), 113-130, Rigsby, no. 217, 466.

¹⁸² For a list of coins from Mopsuetia, see Rigsby 469-470.

¹⁸³ Rogers, nos. 39-40 as cited by Rigsby, 482, “Τύρου ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου.”

¹⁸⁴ Henri Seyrig, *Notes on Syrian Coins*, (New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1950), 19-20.

full and two groups of letters that were not found earlier, which are abbreviations of the titles *ἱερά* and *ἄσυλος*. So, for the very first minting of the newly appointed title, the phrase was written out in full, and thereafter it was abbreviated.

Among the other *poleis* in the Syro-Phoenician area with known *asylia* are Seleuceia-in-Pieria, Ptolemais, Sidon, Beirut, Tripolis, and Antioch. Seleuceia was the capital city founded by Seleucus I Nicator in 301 B.C.E. The city closely followed Tyre in receiving its *asylia*, and Rigsby dates this to around 139/8 B.C.E. From Seleuceia there is existing coinage that states: “of Seleuceia the sacred (and inviolable) and autonomous,” and the actual incident for the “autonomy” is known.¹⁸⁵ There is an existing inscription, a letter that Antiochus VIII (or IX) wrote to Ptolemy IX announcing the “liberation” of Seleuceia in 109 B.C.E.¹⁸⁶ From then on, the coinage and inscriptions on stone associate Seleuceia as sacred and inviolable and autonomous throughout imperial times.¹⁸⁷

Grants of *asylia* also made their way to Palestine. There is evidence for *asylia* at Ascalon, Gaza, Sepphoris-Diocaesarea, Caesarea-Panias, Joppa, Raphia and, possibly, for Jerusalem. This seems to have been a phenomenon of the second century B.C.E., as Ascalon gained inviolability around 112/1 B.C.E. from Antiochus VIII, and its neighbor, Gaza, received it a few years later in 103/2 B.C.E. when Ptolemy Lathyrus helped defend

¹⁸⁵ Rigsby: A, 486; *ZFN* 29 (1912) 99 no. 27, “Σελευκέων τῆς ἱερᾶς αὐτονόμου.”

¹⁸⁶ Rigsby: C, 486; *RC* 71.

¹⁸⁷ See Rigsby, 486-488.

the cities from the Hasmonean Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus. Autonomy was also granted to some *poleis* at this time.¹⁸⁸ It is apparent that granting *asylia* in the area of Palestine did not take on the same formation of acquisition. The evidence shows that the *poleis* were granted inviolability by the Hellenistic kings, most likely because it was a desirable title and the kings wanted support from these cities. Coinage is the primary source of evidence for *asylia* in these *poleis*, however, there is a statue base inscription from Gaza of Gordian III that names Gaza as sacred and inviolable and autonomous.¹⁸⁹

According to Rigsby, Jerusalem's *asylia* is questionable due to the language of early Jewish literature, among other things. He believes that this early Jewish literature "contained expressions that learned readers of a later age might have taken as evidence for the declared inviolability of Jerusalem or the Temple."¹⁹⁰ He uses the example from the Septuagint that the Temple is called "ὁ ἅγιος τόπος" (the holy place) and Jerusalem is often called "ἡ ἁγία πόλις" (the holy city).¹⁹¹ There are, however, no surviving grants and no coins struck in the Hellenistic period in Jerusalem. What does exist that could possibly be attributed to *asylia* Rigsby considers "patriotic fiction composed after the time when inviolability acquired its vogue in this region and when its role as a

¹⁸⁸ Rigsby, 519-531 for *poleis* in Palestine.

¹⁸⁹ *I.gr.Ital.Porto* 5, Rigsby mentions the inscription, but does not assign it a number or letter within the corpus, 523.

¹⁹⁰ Rigsby, 527.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 527. Exod. 29:31 from the Septuagint, and in the later books of the Bible, Isa. 48:2; Joel 3:17.

philanthropon in dynastic struggles was common enough knowledge to be made an item in literary propaganda.”¹⁹² While it seems that Jerusalem did become quite Hellenized, nevertheless it chose not to emulate the civic title of *asylia*, possibly because *asylia* had roots in Greek paganism and Jerusalem was thoroughly Jewish in all religious aspects.¹⁹³ The Peer Polity Interaction Theory conveys the idea that it was a conscious process, and perhaps Jerusalem consciously choose not to emulate this specific Hellenistic institution.

Lastly, there were grants of *asylia* found in Greco-Roman Egypt, all dating from around the first century B.C.E. *Asylia* in Egypt was different than that being granted around the rest of the Greek and Roman world. Egyptian *asylia* was more similar to the Roman idea of *asylia*: the religious protection from secular authority. Indeed, Rigsby believes that this is from whence the Romans actually borrowed their sense of *asylum*.¹⁹⁴ According to Rigsby, *asylia* in Egypt was granted by the “crown and is a matter of internal administration; there is no invocation of Greek public opinion as the grant is not an affair of international law.”¹⁹⁵ Considering that Egyptian *asylia* is a different and separate phenomena from Greek *asylia*, it will be left at that, adding the information only to be all inclusive.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹² Rigsby, 531. See the “Jerusalem” chapter in his book for all the reasons he believes Jerusalem did not acquire *asylia*, 527-531.

¹⁹³ Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 93.

¹⁹⁴ Rigsby, 540.

¹⁹⁵ Rigsby, 541.

¹⁹⁶ See Rigsby, 540-573, for the sources of Egyptian *asylia*.

As unclear as the numismatic evidence might be, a few conclusions still can be made. *Asyilia* was obviously an important title that *poleis* wanted inscribed on their coinage for many people to see. Considering that the minting of coins with this title spread throughout a region, it could be an example of competitive emulation. Different *poleis* wanted to compete with their neighbors to obtain the title to establish an equal stature.

As mentioned above, the literary sources concerning *asyilia* are, unfortunately, not plentiful. Aside from the passages mentioned in the introduction on Plataea, and Tacitus' discussion of the Senatorial review in 22/3 C.E. in this chapter, there are a few remaining literary passages which mention inviolability. Plutarch mentions the inviolability of temples briefly in his *Life of Pompey*. In his discussion of the civil war in Rome, he notes it led to rampant piratical acts that in turn led to temples that had (supposedly) never been violated before to being sacked.

Besides, they attacked and plundered places of refuge and sanctuaries hitherto inviolate, such as those of Claros, Didyma, and Samothrace; the temple of Chthonian Earth at Hermione; that of Asclepius in Epidaurus; those of Poseidon at the Isthmus, at Taenarum, and at Calauria; those of Apollo at Actium and Leucas; and those of Hera at Samos, at Argos, and at Lacinium.¹⁹⁷

Polybius also mentions, in a speech berating the Aitolians, that inviolable temples were

¹⁹⁷ Plutarch *Pompey* 24.5, trans. Bernadotte Perrin, “τῶν δὲ ἀσύλων καὶ ἀβάτων πρότερον ἱερῶν ἐξέκοψαν ἐπιόντες τὸ Κλάριον, τὸ Διδυμαῖον, τὸ Σαμοθράκιον, τὸν ἐν Ἑρμιόνη τῆς Χθονίας νεῶν καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἴσθμοι καὶ Ταινάρῳ καὶ Καλαυρία τὸν Ποσειδῶνος, τοῦ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν ἐν Ἀκτίῳ καὶ Λευκάδι, τῆς δὲ Ἥρας τὸν ἐν Σάμῳ, τὸν ἐν Ἀργεῖ, τὸν ἐπὶ Λακινίῳ.”

plundered:

Was it not you? What nation ever sent out military commanders duly accredited of the sort that you have? Men that ventured to do violence to the sanctity of asylum itself! Timaeus violated the sanctuary of Poseidon on Taenarum, and of Artemis at Lusi. Pharylus and Polycritus plundered, the former the sacred enclosure of Here in Argos, the latter that of Poseidon at Mantinea. What again about Lattabus and Nicostratus?¹⁹⁸

Strabo wrote of the various changes that the inviolable boundaries of Ephesus went through during the rule of Alexander, Mithridates VI, Antony, and Augustus Caesar.¹⁹⁹

The temple retains its rights, but some to a lesser degree. It remains inviolable now as before, but the boundaries of the inviolability have often been changed. Alexander increased them by a *stadion*. Mithridates shot an arrow from the corner of the roof and reckoned that it had gone somewhat beyond that *stadion*. Antony doubled this and thus encompassed in the right of inviolability a part of the city; but this was deemed harmful, making the city over to wrongdoers, and Augustus Caesar revoked it.²⁰⁰

Although the lack of literary sources for *asylia* is frustrating, nevertheless the epigraphic information provides good insights and from it much has already been learned

¹⁹⁸ Polybius Histories 9.34, trans. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, “οὐχ ὑμεῖς; τίνες δὲ κατὰ κοινὸν τοιούτους ἡγεμόνας ἐξέπεμψαν οἷους ὑμεῖς; οἳ γε καὶ τοῖς ἀσύλοις ἱεροῖς ἐτόλμησαν προσάγειν τὰς χεῖρας. ὦν Τίμαιος μὲν τό τ’ ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐν Λούσοις ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος ἐσύλησε, Φάρυκος δὲ καὶ Πολύκριτος, ὁ μὲν τὸ τῆς Ἥρας ἐν Ἄργει τέμενος, ὁ δὲ τὸ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐν Μαντινείᾳ διήρπασε.”

¹⁹⁹ Strabo *Geography* 14.1.23, Rigsby, 389.

²⁰⁰ Translation by Rigsby, 389-390. Greek from Strabo, *Geography*, 14.1.23. “νυνὶ δὲ τὰ μὲν φυλάττεται τῶν νομίμων τὰ δ’ ἦπτον, ἄσυλον δὲ μένει τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ νῦν καὶ πρότερον: τῆς δ’ ἀσυλίας τοὺς ὅρους ἀλλαγῆναι συνέβη πολλάκις, Ἀλεξάνδρου μὲν ἐπὶ στάδιον ἐκτείναντος, Μιθριδάτου δὲ τόξευμα ἀφέντος ἀπὸ τῆς γωνίας τοῦ κεράμου καὶ δόξαντος ὑπερβαλέσθαι μικρὰ τὸ στάδιον, Ἀντωνίου δὲ διπλασιάσαντος τοῦτο καὶ συμπεριλαβόντος τῇ ἀσυλίᾳ μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως: ἐφάνη δὲ τοῦτο βλαβερὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς κακούργοις ποιοῦν τὴν πόλιν, ὥστ’ ἠκύρωσεν ὁ Σεβαστὸς Καῖσαρ.”

about *asylia*. The civic title of *asylia* persisted through Imperial Rome and officially ended along with paganism. Considering that Panhellenic recognition of *asylia* stopped sometime in the first century B.C.E., it would be safe to say that the networks of *asylia* faded along with the Hellenistic period, but were probably not completely lost. Peter Rhodes explains that the province of Achaia had been created under the principate of Augustus, and the Greek *poleis* finally became municipalities of Rome; however, “even after that, city-state and league institutions survived; but there was no longer any possibility of an independent policy...”²⁰¹

The implications of these networks introduced new polities into a web of networks in which *poleis* were recognized as *poleis* and were therefore included in the diplomatic interactions in the Hellenistic world. *Asyilia* was one of these interactions that used the networks formed by peer polity interactions. The new age of Roman rule brought on new competition for different honors, which signifies a shift from Greek Peer Polity Interaction to a new Roman Peer Polity Interaction. This was mentioned above with cities desiring the new title of “*neokoros*.” The neocorate temples housed the cult of the emperor and *poleis* wanted “to be selected as the province’s host for the provincial temple of the emperor, a cult of more than local patronage for a god honored by all the Greeks.”²⁰² The Peer Polity Interaction Theory model translates this as being the nature of these interactions. In the Hellenistic period the Greek *poleis* wanted to impress and

²⁰¹ Rhodes, 276.

²⁰² Rigsby, 29.

stay connected to each other and the Hellenistic kings, and this endeavor shifts to the Romans once they established power.

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSION

The Hellenistic period was not simply the age of the spread of Greek culture. This thesis has demonstrated that it also was the age of networking and communication between *poleis*, kings, Rome, and those aspiring to become *poleis*. The Peer Polity Interaction Theory helps set the scene for the Hellenistic period. The *poleis* of the Greek world and beyond created an abundance of networks through which they could communicate culturally and diplomatically with each other as well as compete with and emulate each other. Being a part of these networks meant that a city was recognized and important enough to be included in these interactive channels. This paper suggests that the Peer Polity Interaction Theory explains how and why the civic title of territorial *asylia* spread throughout the Hellenistic world.

The Hellenistic period has a rich abundance of epigraphic inscriptions available, and more are being discovered every year. The civic title of *asylia* owes its known existence to these inscriptions, as the evidence for it in literary sources is scarce. Perhaps the main question regarding *asylia* is the necessity for it. Why would sanctuaries and temples need a title of inviolability when culturally they were already considered inviolable by Greeks? Many blame increased violence in the Hellenistic period or a loss of religious adherence. Rigsby suggests the title was desired merely for honor.²⁰³ True, *poleis* desired the title so fervently in part because of honor. Yet Rigsby's overlooks other

²⁰³ Rigsby, 22.

important factors, as the networks in which the Greek *poleis* were involved drove them to seek the title. Each *polis* needed to prove it was as important as the next, and it did so by emulating its peer polities. They were mainly *poleis* from the Greek East asserting their “Greekness” and trying to maintain their identity under the Hellenistic kings. There is no evidence that the Greek *poleis* from the mainland (aside from those in Boeotia and Delphi) wanted to acquire *asylia*, probably because they had nothing to prove when it came to Greekness and they were already incorporated within the peer polity networks. The *poleis* in mainland Greece were clearly familiar with the title because epigraphic sources show them granting *asylia*. Cities within the Hellenistic world that were not Greek in ethnicity adopted the *polis* model for their cities and were able to interact within these peer polity networks too. To imply a *polis* wanted *asylia* for honor is insufficient.

This chronological study of the epigraphic and numismatic sources reveals the progression the title made from starting out as a declaration only granted by the Delphic Amphictyony, growing into a formal diplomatic interaction in which ambassadors canvassed the Greek world seeking recognition. The primary source material was predominantly inscribed on steles and blocks and displayed in places of great importance, such as temples and sanctuaries, or places with high foot traffic, such as *agora* walls. This conspicuous action of displaying the title of inviolability indicates that it was indeed an honorable title to own, and the *polis* wanted everyone else to know it had it. This action is also seen in the numismatic evidence from the areas of Syria, Palestine, and Cilicia. It was a trend in this area to have the title “sacred and inviolable” stamped on

coins, which demonstrates that the *poleis* holding this title wanted everyone else to know they had it.

The idea of utilizing the theory of Peer Polity Interaction within the Hellenistic period comes from Ma. It helps explain how the Greek *poleis* continued acting like *poleis* under hegemonic powers by use of networks in a shared civic culture. The discussion in Chapter Two of *asylia* in the Hellenistic period is examined under the framework put forth by Renfrew and Cherry regarding the Peer Polity Interaction Theory. It is seen that *asylia*, in itself, was not the true innovation in the Hellenistic period; instead, it was the way in which it was spread throughout the Greek world at the time. Ma coined the term “traveling decree” as the type of interaction that *asylia* and the exchange of decrees between one another entailed. This includes the way in which festivals gained recognition and the way in which they were proclaimed. The *poleis* that wanted *asylia* chose to use available networks and also create new ones to distribute these traveling decrees and consciously gain further recognition amongst its peers.

The case studies in Chapter Four help to understand the competitive emulation between the *poleis* and how the networks were formed and used. The study mentioned by Thoneman brings to light the competitive emulation between Magnesia and Miletus. Magnesia wanted to make it clear that it was granted crowned games and *asylia* by an oracle first, even though they were not able to follow through with the undertaking of obtaining them right away. Sosin’s study on Magnesia’s differing asking decrees examined the diplomatic ways in which it knew it could and should ask different *poleis*

for granting it *asylia*. In each decree Magnesia had to include information that would connect the two *poleis* together, be it *eunoia* (goodwill), or *syngenia* (kinship), *oikeiotes* (close relationship), myth, or any other connection they might have. This kinship diplomacy was very common in the Hellenistic period and used for many diplomatic interactions, not just *asylia*. When two *poleis* were connected by one of these associations, they were able to do cordial business together along the network lines. The specific case of Magnesia and Same-on-Cephalenia shows that sometimes a *polis* had to put forth a myth or eponymous hero to connect itself to another *polis*. The example of Antioch-in-Persis having acquired colonists from Magnesia helps to explain kinship diplomacy ties and also how a city so far away was able to adopt the *polis* model and participate in these diplomatic networks and *asylia*.

The study on the *asylia* decrees from Teos illustrates a few compelling issues with the title. It has been suggested that Teos appealed to “pirates” to secure *asylia* for itself in the hopes that it would make it safer. The extant decrees differ from most as they asked for more security measures than other *poleis*. If this is the case, why would a *polis* need to ask for security on top of inviolability? The only explanation is that *asylia* did not provide the protection that its definition indicates. This is evidence that perhaps the title really was not about security, but more for prestige and communication. Teos used the *asylia* networks to gain access to *poleis* who were not necessarily its allies, because it knew they probably would not decline an embassy seeking *asylia*.

In Chapter Five, we see Rome being included in the many networks the Greek *poleis* created for themselves. It seemed to be, at first, a friendly gesture, because Rome was becoming stronger in the region. By the first century B.C.E., Rome was very active in the region, and *poleis* had essentially stopped canvassing for Panhellenic recognition. They relied solely on Rome to keep and recognize the titles they had already acquired. The main ancient literary source we do have that speaks of *asylia* is from the Roman, Tacitus. His excerpt about the Senate hearing on Greek *asylia* in 22/3 C.E., that has been mentioned several times, makes it clear that the Greeks still coveted this title at the time, as the *poleis* all had to bring forth evidence that they deserved the honor. The Romans' view of *asylia* was vastly different than that of the Greeks', but they understood how important it was to the *poleis*, and let them continue using it (with restrictions) until the end of paganism. With the advent of the Romans assuming power over the region, we see a shift in Peer Polity Interaction. As the Peer Polity Interaction Theory model suggests, transformations in the polities will follow hierarchical structures for the exercise of power, therefore the Greek *poleis* desired to please the Romans. This is seen by the rise in popularity of the Roman civic title, *neocoria*, and the decline of the Greek title, *asylia*.

Peer Polity Interaction of the Hellenistic age closely mirrors that of the Archaic age. Both periods experienced the creation of colonies and cities, many of which adopted the *polis* model. In the Archaic period, adopting the *polis* model allowed the cities to thrive as civilizations while in the Hellenistic period, adopting the *polis* model allowed a

city to utilize the networks the Greek *poleis* had already put into place. In both periods the Sanctuary at Delphi played an important role as well. The Delphic oracle was consulted about colonizing endeavors as well as initiating colonizing ventures. It was also a place where Greeks would go to exchange information. In the Hellenistic Period, the oracle was still an important authority and consultant. Almost all of the *asylia* grants from the Hellenistic period included an acceptance and/or an instigation from the oracle at Delphi.

Snodgrass also suggests that the Peer Polity Interaction of the Archaic period was a conscious process. This could not ring more true for the Hellenistic period. The Greek *poleis* in the Hellenistic period needed an avenue to keep their identity and some independence from their hegemon, so they created the many networks that enabled them to communicate culturally and diplomatically with each other. To quote John Ma, who sums it up beautifully, “this meshing of institutions was possible because set forms of interaction and the shared language of honors helped to constitute a repertoire of gestures along acceptable lines of collaboration and recognition between peer entities, within a unified community of discourse.”²⁰⁴ *Asylia* was clearly one of these institutions that was made possible by Peer Polity Interaction, these “set forms of interaction.” It started out as a small honor and flourished into an institution that honored *poleis* and promoted collaboration and recognition throughout the Hellenistic Greek World.

²⁰⁴ Ma, 18.

APPENDIX

Chronological Overview of New or Renewed Crowned or Panhellenic Festivals in the Hellenistic Period.

Chronological Overview of New or Renewed Crowned or Panhellenic Festivals				
	Before 300 B.C.E.	Before 250 B.C.E.	Before 220 B.C.E.	Circa 200 B.C.E. 2nd Cent. C.E. - c. 120
Mainland Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The Asclepeia of Epidaurus (360-359 and 356-355) *Heraia of Argos (c.330-324) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Delphic Soteria (245 or 247) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Hemerasia, Lousoi (200-185)
Boeotia		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Eleuthera at Plataea (c. 280) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Mousia, Thespiai (230-225) *Basileia, Lebdeia (c. 220's) 	
Greek East		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Ptolemaea in Alexandria (279-8 or 282-1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Festival of Dionysus, Cadmeus, Thebes (220's) *Ptoia, Acraephia (220's) *Great Asclepeia, Cos (230-225) *Lindos (c. 225) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Soteria, Cyzicus (c.200) *Klaria, Colophon (c.200) *Nikephoria, Pergamum (181) *Artemis Hyakinthotrophos Epiphaneas, Cnidus (c.200) *Athaneia and Eumeneia, Sardis (c. 167) *Leukophryeneia, Magnesia (208) *Halicia, Rhodes (171)

© Kathleen Kirsch 2015

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES:

- Bauslaugh, Robert A. *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Broneer, Oscar. "The Isthmian Victory Crown." *American Journal of Archaeology* 66, no. 3 (July 1962): 259-263.
- Carlsson, Susanne. *Hellenistic Democracies*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010.
- Cherry, John F. and Colin Renfrew, eds. *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Dignas, Beate. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Eckstein, Arthur. *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Gardiner, E. Norman. *Athletics in the Ancient World*. Devon, UK: David and Charles, 2012.
- Jones, Christopher P. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Kvist, Kirsten. "Cretan Grants of *Asyilia* - Violence and Protection as Interstate Relations." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 54 (2003): 185-222.
- Kyle, Donald G. "Winning at Olympia." *Archaeology* 49, no. 4 (July/August 1996): 26-37.
- . *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Levine, Lee I. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.
- Ma, John. "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age." *Past & Present* 180

(August 2003): 9-39.

- Martzavou, Paraskevi and Nikolas Papazarkadas. Introduction to *Eppigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2013.
- Michels, Christoph. "The Spread of *Polis* Institutions in Hellenistic Cappadocia and the Peer Polity Interaction Theory," in *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period: Narrations, Practices, and Images*. Edited by Etfychia Stavrianopoulou. Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Miller, Stephan G. *Arete: Greek Sports from Ancient Sources*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Nelson, Eric D. "Coan *Asyilia*: Small-State Diplomacy and the Hippocratic Legend." In *Regionalism and Globalism in Antiquity: Exploring Their Limits*. Edited by Franco De Angelis, 247-266. Paris: Peeters, 2013.
- Nilsson, M.P. *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece*. New York: Cooper Square publishers, 1972.
- Parker, Robert. "New 'Panhellenic Festivals in Hellenic Greece.'" In *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Edited by Renata Schlepper and Ulrik Zellman. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004.
- Patterson, Lee E. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2010.
- Perlman, Paula Jean. *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Pritchett, W. Kendrick. *The Greek State at War: Part V*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Renfrew, Colin, and Paul Bahn, eds. *Archaeology: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Rigsby, Kent J. *Asyilia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Seyrig, Henri. *Notes on Syrian Coins*. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1950.

Slater, William J. and Daniela Summa. "Crowns at Magnesia." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 46 (2006): 275-299.

Snodgrass, Anthony. "Interaction by Design: The Greek City-State." In *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*. Edited by Colin Renfrew and John F. Cherry. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Sosin, Joshua D. "Magnesian Inviolability." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139, no. 2 (Autumn 2009): 369-410.

Thoneman, Peter. "Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia: (I.Magnesia 16.16)." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007): 151-160.

Vlassopoulos, Kostas. *Greeks and Barbarians*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Wallace, Shane. "The Significance of Plataia for Greek Eleutheria in the Early Hellenistic Period." In *Creating a Hellenistic World*. Edited by Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones. Oxford: The Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

LITERARY PASSAGES:

Arrian:

Anabasis 1.17.18, 1.18.2

Herodotus:

The Histories 5.22

Pausanias

Description of Greece 5.24.9-10

Plutarch:

Aristides 21.1

Pompey 24.5

Polybius:

Histories 4.73, 9.34

Strabo:

Geography 8.3.33, 14.1.23

Tacitus:

Annales 3.60-64

Thucydides:

The Peloponnesian War 2.71, 8.9.1