te ἀσύλιαν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.20 Apparently the status was revoked or at least threatened at some moment after 44 B.C.; perhaps Caesar's expansion of the limits had provoked hostility and challenge on the part of some affected party such as publicans. On a later occasion the Milesians honored a citizen with a statue in the temple precinct; among his past services was an embassy to an emperor concerning the inviolability of the temple and the rights of the city, [πρεσβέ]έσαντα πρὸς τὸν Σέβαστόν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγυλοῦ τοῦ ᾽Απόλλωνος καὶ τῶν τῆς πάλεως δικαίων.21 This may refer to the inquest of A.D. 22; the text is consistent with Tacitus, who says that the embassies were sent to the emperor, who deferred them to the Senate. Finally, we have a small fragment of a stele found near the temple; its script indicates a much later date, perhaps the third century A.D.22

The subject appears to be some repair to the temple or repopulation of the sacred village, a change that apparently required the permission or generosity of the emperor. The mention of "two miles" might allude to Caesar's enlargement of the inviolable territory, but that is speculative.

1. Anac. frag. 1; cf. Nic. frag. 74.15-16 (Ἄνωκοραὶ Φιλικῆς ἄγγελοι τῆς νήσου). The testimonia on Magnesia are set out by Kern, I.Magn. pp. v–xxviii. For description of the site and the remains see G. Humann, Magnesia am Maeander (Berlin 1904); A. Yaylı, Der Freis der Artemision von Magnesia, IBLitt-BH 15 (Tübingen 1976); on the cult, R. Fleischer, Artemis von Ephesos, EPRO 35 (Leiden 1973) 140–146. Pausanias was shown on the Athenian Acropolis a statue of the goddess dedicated by the sons of Themistocles, who had been made tyrant of Magnesia (1.26.4: Μάγγυστας γὰρ ... Ἀρτέμις ἀγαθοὶ αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν Μάγγυστος. On the coins of Roman date see G. Humann, "Die Münzprägung von Magnesia" (1975).

2. Anac. frag. 1; cf. Nic. frag. 74.15-16 (Ἄνωκοραὶ Φιλικῆς ἄγγελοι τῆς νήσου). The testimonia on Magnesia are set out by Kern, I.Magn. pp. v–xxviii. For description of the site and the remains see G. Humann, Magnesia am Maeander (Berlin 1904); A. Yaylı, Der Freis der Artemision von Magnesia, IBLitt-BH 15 (Tübingen 1976); on the cult, R. Fleischer, Artemis von Ephesos, EPRO 35 (Leiden 1973) 140–146. Pausanias was shown on the Athenian Acropolis a statue of the goddess dedicated by the sons of Themistocles, who had been made tyrant of Magnesia (1.26.4: Μάγγυστας γὰρ ... Ἀρτέμις ἀγαθοὶ αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν Μάγγυστος. On the coins of Roman date see G. Humann, "Die Münzprägung von Magnesia" (1975).

The temple of Artemis was in the heart of the city, facing the agora. In 1891–92 the excavators found what remains today the largest archive of texts deriving from a quest for asylia, inscribed on the perimeter walls of the agora. More than sixty decrees and letters survive; to judge from the distribution of the stones, this may represent little more than two-thirds of what was once inscribed. Subscriptions appended to fifteen of the decrees ("the following voted the same way") name more than 100 other cities whose decrees were not inscribed at all, their authors instead listed thus in short form. Geographically, the attested grantors range from Sicily to Iran. The organization of the texts is not unlike that of a modern epigraphical corpus: some covering documents came first, then royal letters, then civic decrees in roughly geographical groups, beginning in central Greece and proceeding to the rest of the mainland, then the northwest, the Aegean, Anatolia, and the far west and the far east.

The most important item is the Magnesians’ own account of events (66), which gives us their reasons and a chronology. As a result of some sign, it seems, the Magnesians consulted old oracles of Apollo, in which the god spoke to them about “preserving their holy city.” Later a manifestation of Artemis occurred, and the city sent to consult Delphi; Apollo ordered that he and Artemis be honored and the city and country of Magnesia be declared sacred and inviolable. In response the Magnesians in 221/0 sought recognition of inviolability and of a competition with cash prizes to which they invited the Greeks of Asia. But this quest failed: the Magnesians were “fobbed off” (66.24).

So in 208 they decided to establish a “crowned” competition for all the Greeks, quadrennial and with prizes equal to the Pythia (“just thanks” to Artemis, as the grantors often say), and to renew their quest for asylia now in connection with the enlarged contest: this invitation was universally approved, with the city and country recognized as sacred and inviolable and the Leucophrineia as Panhellenic.

One text stands apart, a decree of the Aetolian League inscribed at Thermus and Delphi (67). The Aetolians recognize the asylia of Magnesia but do not mention the games or indeed Artemis. This act must derive from the Magnesians’ first effort, in 221, before they added Panhellenic games to their request.

4. I hope to comment elsewhere on various aspects of these lists.


6. The proper distinction is explicit at 159.22–23, 160.7–16, 210.28–33, and 212.17–19, to cite a few instances: the oracle urged asylia for Magnesia; the Magnesians added their own request for enlarged games. More often the grantors simply merge matters, implying that Apollo’s oracles asked for both games and asylia (e.g., 112.28). The Epirotes (82.6–14) seem to distinguish two divine orders, the oracles (μαντεῖας) that called for Panhellenic games (cf. 83.12 and 131.10) and the oracle (χαρίσματος) that called for inviolability. Various oracles were recited in the context of narrating Magnesia’s history and services (85.9, 86.9, 96.13–14, etc.).

7. The Epidamnians alone specify these particulars (96.8–12); more vague allusions to Magnesian services to the Greeks and to the temple at Delphi are found in 85.8, 86.8, 94.13, etc. Several Cretan inscriptions attest honors voted to Magnesians there in Hellenistic times: see J. Out. III 91 C, with Guarducci’s notes.

8. In addition to their own poetic and historical texts, they were able to cite earlier decrees of other cities honoring them for Magnesia’s services (85.9–10, 88.22–23, and most specifically 96.17–18: “honors and crowns”). The thekoi do not seem to invoke the other asylia decrees that they have themselves gathered (but see 94.17).


10. Cf. Robert, Op. min. s. I 777 n. 3. In arriving at spring 207 for the quest, he was assuming that the Magnesian year started in autumn; but see below, and on 87.

11. See Kern, Hermes 495–504.

12. The month is suggested by the name itself and by the fact that a lesser and annual festival instituted at the temple in the second century B.C. was held on 5 Artemision: Syll. 655,5–7, 56 (= LSAM 32); this decree also reveals that the annual elections took place on 2 Artemision (lines 77–79), as would suit the last month of the year. At neighboring Miletus the year began in spring 180, and its last month was Artemision. For all this see Ebert, Philologus 120 (1969) 212. Foreign theatres attending the new games were to be sent in the month Poseidonia on Paros (100.46), on 16 Therpeios on Lesbos (101.38), and in Hysceinthions on Rhodes (104.23).

The bulk of the responses traditionally have been assigned to the period from 208/7 to 203. But the year of the quest was most likely 208, for the Magnesians’ phrase “the fourteenth stephanephorus” from Zenodotus in Aetolian decree of 221 (66.25) implies inclusive reckoning rather than exclusive. I assume as a working principle that all the extant responses date to 208 except those we have good individual reasons to place later (or, in the one case, earlier). These are the Aetolian decree of 221 (67), the Seleucid letters (69, 70), and the appended decrees of some Attalid cities (128–131); and from Tacitus we know the Roman recognition of 186 B.C.

The Magnesians report that in 208 all who were asked accepted the games and the inviolability (66.30ff.). Among the extant decrees, however, several states accept the Panhellenic games but do not mention ayia: these are Attalus (68), the Seleucid kings (69, 70), Argos (90), Sicyon (91), Chalcis (97, yet mentioning the epiphany), Delos (99), Rhodes (104), Antioch in Persis (111, yet mentioning the oracle), probably the Aetolian League and Delphi (78, 79), and later than 208 an Attalid city (131). Some doubt is possible. Thus we do not have the end of the letter of Attalus, which might have gone on to introduce ayia, although this seems unlikely. Rhodes, in its brief decree, “accepts the festival that the Magnesians are holding for Artemis, and the other things, and joins them in taking care to increase the things voted by them”; so too the Seleucid kings. These last vague phrases might be taken to encompass ayia, but that seems excluded by ἐπέφεραμενα: these are the honors voted by Magnesia for Artemis (cf. 95–95).

These omissions of ayia have been interpreted as deliberate refusals. In their own account of the initial quest (in 221) the Magnesians make clear that one might well refuse to recognize ayia (66.24)—a decision that in the nature of things normally leaves us no evidence. If the omissions are intentional, do these states have in common? Of kings, Welles noted, only Ptolemy accepts ayia as well as the games: “Just the kings with territorial interests in the Maeander Valley ... held aloof.” This, however, does not explain the silence of these cities (not all, for example, were allies of the aloof kings); nor was Ptolemy without territorial interests in the Maeander Valley.

A Giovannini has offered the astute alternative that subject cities and league members did not have the freedom of foreign policy to recognize ayia; the league or the king spoke for them. This is not, however, borne out consistently; thus Corinth and Megalopolis, members of the Achaean League, accepted ayia as well as the games, as does Antigonid Eretria (but not Chalcis). Giovannini’s assumption was that ayia was a serious foreign policy decision with military implications, which would not have been permitted to a subordinate state.

Careless writing is a possible explanation: thus Corinth (92), Corcyra (94), and Tralles (129) in the preliminaries of their decrees cite the request for the crowned games, even referring (Corcyra at some length) to the Magnesian benefactions and the oracles, but do not mention ayia—yet each then grants ayia in the decree proper. Conceivably a complete omission in other texts might reflect no more than such an error. Cnidus (105) cites the request for ayia but in the grant proper abridges this to accepting “what they request, in keeping with the oracle.”

Another explanation, equally unsinister, seems to me more likely. We have a decree of the Aetolian League (67, surviving only at Thermus and Delphi) that derives from the quest of 221; the Aetolians recognize ayia but of course not the games for the Greeks of Asia, to which they would not have been invited. The omissions of ayia in 208 may represent those states that had recognized the inviolability of Magnesia in 221, so that a recognition from them would be superfluous in 208. And in fact the decree of Gonian (83) describes the inviolability of Magnesia as a fact and proceeds to recognize only the games. The “omitting” states can hardly have been 10 percent of the extant archive; if that fraction had recognized Magnesian inviolability in 221, then we have a gauge on what the Magnesians regarded as being “fobbed off,” as constituting failure—the Greeks’ refusal was not total. If this is so (whatever the percentages), it would seem that the most active grantors of ayia in the Hellenistic period, the kings and Delphi and its patrons, hastened to recognize Magnesia in 221, but few others did. It may be objected that those putative early recognitions of ayia have not been found inscribed in the agora with the decrees of 208; but this applies as well to 67, whose date in 221 is secure.

To the Senate in A.D. 22 the Magnesians stated that Scipio and Sulla had recognized the inviolability of the temple of Artemis. The first must be L. Cornelius Scipio at the beginning of 189 B.C., when after the defeat of Antiochus III he and his brother were approached by a number of Asian cities in their first diplomatic contact with Rome. Magnesia surrendered to the Scipios and became one of the cities where the Roman army wintered (Livy 37.45). Sulla granted Magnesia freedom because the city had opposed Mithridates, and also confirmed the inviolability, unless Tacitus here has merged the two in summarizing the Magnesians’ survey of their Roman honors.

The Magnesians make no mention of a political or military background or motive in their quest for inviolability. By their own account, their motives were...
were religious: ordered to add inviolability to the honors of Artemis, they at first misjudged the character of the games that would be the fitting accompaniment for the status. Gods, however, tend to manifest themselves when they are needed. Possibly the sojourn and expulsion of Antiochus Hierax early in the 220s put the city in difficulty and moved the Magnesians toward the undertaking of 221 B.C. 21

Why was it in 208 that they tried again? 22 The most pertinent fact seems to me to be the success of Magnesia's neighbor and enemy Miletus in obtaining first Panhellenic games and then inviolability. Until Michael Wörle backdated a crucial set of Milesian stephanephoroi, it was thought that the asylia of Magnesia preceded that of Miletus by several years and inspired it. 23 It is altogether sensible that the great city came first and the lesser neighbor followed. 24 The envy will have been all the sharper if Miletus succeeded after Magnesia had first been rebuffed. There is reason to think that the Leucophryeneia were simply ignorant and relying on formula in asking the Magnesians to place the decree in the temple of Artemis. 25 It is possible that the status was revoked at a later time and then restored altogether in obtaining it. 23

The city began issuing large denomination silver with local types at about this time, which may well have been prompted by the new honor; 22 similar gestures are likely at Alabanda, Teos, and perhaps Miletus.

Nothing suggests that the recognition protected Magnesia from war. In 201 the army of Philip V imposed requisitions (Polyb. 16.24.6). In the 180s Magnesia and Miletus fought a war against each other; the elaborate peace treaty that survives makes no mention of the inviolability of either city, as though this was irrelevant to matters of war and peace. 26 The Magnesians told the Senate in A.D. 22 that they had opposed Antiochus III in 190 and Mithridates a century later. 27 It is possible that the status was revoked at a later time and then restored by Caesar in 44 through the agency of Servilius Isauricus: for the Magnesians...

21. The outbreak of war in the Greek mainland in 220 may be relevant. Compare Wilamowitz, K. Schr. VI 361, noting the special arrangements for security attested in 221/0 (I. Magn. 15.8.24-26); and Haussoullier, Etudes 143-144. But there was war in the Peloponnesus in 208, the Achaean League attempting to seize the Olympic games (Livy 28.7.15). And, in any Panhellenic undertakings, when will there not have been war somewhere?
22. Because of the threat of war, Wilamowitz, GGA 162 (1900) 575; the building of Hellenogena's temple: Kern, Hermes 495-499, and others.
25. Cf. P. Kinnas in Koyro-Methone Essays (Louvain 1986) 137-148; but note that the iconography (horseman but bull, conventional since the fourth century) shows nothing of Artemis.
After the manifestation of Artemis had occurred and they received the oracle, when Zenođotus was stephanephorus, Thrasyphon archon in Athens, first year of the Prytaneia in which [— —] Boeotian won as cithara-singer, one year before Olympiad 140 when Hegesidamos Messenian won in pancration [for the third time], they first voted to hold a moneyed contest for those who live in Asia, making this interpretation of the oracle, that these (the Asians) would honor Artemis in this way, being in general piously disposed toward the divine, if accompanying the Magnesians to the [old] altar they should render gifts pleasing to the Fountaer—inasmuch as other contests had been established originally with moneyed prizes, but later as a result of oracles became crowned. But when having undertaken this they were fobbed off, when Moeragoras was stephanephorus, the fourteenth from Zenođotus under whom the oracle was given them, remembering their ancestral [friends] they revealed to others all that had been prophesied; and, in Moeragoras’ year, they established the crowned contest, equal to the Pythia, giving a crown worth fifty gold staters, with the approval of the kings and all the other Greeks to whom they sent ambassadors, voting by nations and cities to honor Artemis and to make inviolable the city and country of Magnesia, because of the god’s urging (etc.)

14: Hiller restored an allusion to earlier festivals and prizes. I suggest a different possibility, although the word order is clumsy: καὶ τοιαῦτας ὑπὸ τῆς ἔργωσες ἐξέλεξεν (or ἐξήρεσεν) αὐτοῦ τελέσαντι εὐήθειαν πάνω τῇ ἐκδροῇ.

21: The only other Magnesian Agaristus on record is the father of one of the oracles that had already been given, according to which they would preserve the holy city. This last was merely the familiar poetic phrase, which then in 221 B.C. (lines 6ff) was given a contemporary and literal reading when Apollo was consulted again and ordered that the city be declared sacred and inviolable. The repeated issuance of oracles, with growing clarity and insistence, is a familiar pattern; a graphic case is the famous Sarapis decrees. Z.Magn. 187

Text of Ebert. 1-2: [ὅτει αὐτός καὶ χρισαντέμια καὶ ἄν όνων] τιοι ἐν τοιοί θύματες θεῷ ζώνων νομίζεις ἀπὸ τῶν 

5-6: The only other Magnesian Agaristus on record is the father of one of the oracles that had already been given, according to which they would preserve the holy city. This last was merely the familiar poetic phrase, which then in 221 B.C. (lines 6ff) was given a contemporary and literal reading when Apollo was consulted again and ordered that the city be declared sacred and inviolable. The repeated issuance of oracles, with growing clarity and insistence, is a familiar pattern; a graphic case is the famous Sarapis papyri, PSI 435.

6: The only other Magnesian Agaristus on record is the father of one of the oracles that had already been given, according to which they would preserve the holy city. This last was merely the familiar poetic phrase, which then in 221 B.C. (lines 6ff) was given a contemporary and literal reading when Apollo was consulted again and ordered that the city be declared sacred and inviolable. The repeated issuance of oracles, with growing clarity and insistence, is a familiar pattern; a graphic case is the famous Sarapis papyri, PSI 435.

12ff: The more precise date of this first quest was probably spring/summer 221; see on 67. This text gives us one of the two externally dated archons of third-century Athens (listed by C. Habicht, Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens, Vestigia 30 [Göttingen 1979] 113) and helps to anchor the list IG II² 1706

30. For τελεύην in Delphian oracles compare Parke/Wormell II nos. 292 (τ. θεσποτ) and 339 (τ. καθαρῆς).

31. Compare the verse oracle quoted in L.Magn. 215.13, Μακεδόνων ἀνάμνης ἐτέρω 3θαιναι ἐνδαποτοῦν δόλου, where “holy town” is merely poetic. This text, an “ancient oracle,” is older than the mid-third century, as the date by a papyrus shows (see Hiller on L.Pins 2.4 and Kern on L.Magn. 5.11; cf. A. D. Nock, Conversion [Oxford 1933] 277), and thus earlier than the asylla declarations.
Artemis was composed after with the number of his victories (rather than by (cf. B. Meritt, Hesperia 23 [1954] 244). Zenodotus is named on civic coins, as is Moeragoras (line 253; H. Engelmann, ZPE 10 [1973] 278).

15. Kern’s ἄριστης, about which he was doubtful, implied that the narrative was composed after 200 B.C., when the boys’ category was added in Pausanias 5.8.11; Kern, Hermes 494). The Olympia are identified by the pantocrastian with the number of his victories (rather than by stadion) also at Thuc. 3.8 (facility) and 5.49.1.

16. Ebert’s δυναμικὴν eliminates the self-contradiction that Kern’s στηριγμὸν had involved. The oracle did not specify what the proper honor for Artemis was, and the Magnesians had to interpret. They intended a gradual promotion of the contest, from local to Asian to Panhellenic, and from moneved to “crowned.” For the term (which Ebert, 202 n. 17, preferred because of the echo in 22) note the contrast at Ath. BAA' 5.120 (ὁ γὰρ στεφανάτος ὁ ἄγιος ἐστιν ἀλλ’ φραγκίστης); but χρησματίζειν or δημιουργεῖν are also possible.

The notion of the “Greeks of Asia” was of course old, and it does not seem to have expanded in the Hellenistic period despite the many civic foundations in Asia by Alexander and later kings. That is, I suspect that the Magnesians in 221 did not invite to the games all the Greek cities from Ionia to Afghanistan, but rather, as we see in the Delphian theerodochar list, the old Greek cities of Aeolis, Ionia, and the Dorian south.

18. For the expression cf. Polyb. 22.7.6: λαμβάνειν ἐκδοχήν δυτι. 20. If Ebert’s restoration is right, this is the original altar rather than the Hellenistic great altar (Hummant 91–99), a distinction envisioned by Kern, Hermes 494. This implies that the extant great altar was in place by 208 B.C.; it is normally taken to be the work of Hermocrates and contemporary with his temple.

22. The Magnesians are defensive and their first interpretation of new honors for Artemis, which proved to be inadequate.

24. For ἐπιβάλλοντας an oracular “undertaking,” Robert adduced an example from Antioch of Cragus: μαντεῖαν... στρέφων. (Laodice du Lycos 306 n. 7). Ebert took παράκλησις to mean that the Magnesians “were slow in their undertaking” (to establish crowned games, which he believed to be their intention from the start), and that annual games for the Greeks of Asia were a reality down to 208. He guessed that they were waiting on the new constructions of altar and temple for the final elevation of the games. This seems to me mistaken, and Kern’s understanding of an initial failure correct. The passive παράκλησις ought not to mean “were delayed,” with no moral tone, but “were turned aside,” “fobbed off.” That is regularly its meaning and tone in Ptolemaic papyri, where the word figures in complaints and petitions when one is being “stalled” or “fobbed off” (especially by debtors or by bureaucrats).

And the defensive tone of the passage does not suit the success story that Ebert deduces, a growth from local to Asian to Panhellenic games, with an apology only for its slowness. Rather, ἐπιβαλλομένων is the undertaking of both the Asian games and (as specified in the oracle) ἀσυλία, and the Magnesians met with refusal of both in 221. Refusals will not normally have left any record. We evidently have one result from the quest of 221, the decree of the Aetolians (67).

25. The phrase “fourteenth stephanephoros from” 221/0 includes inclusive reckoning, as would be natural in counting eponyms in sequence, thus 208/7 rather than 207/6. We have seen that the quest began early in the civil year, so spring 208.

27: So other cities “remember” their kinship and friendship with Magnesia (84.16, 88.29, 102.62; Ebert cites also L.Ont. III 3.6.2–4); cf. 12.33, 48.19, 49.19, and the Xanthians being asked to remember (νομισματίζεσθαι) their kinship with Cytemon (SEG 3.1475.14).

28. The force of repeating the citation of Moeragoras is that he not only dates the year of invitations (ἐπέδειξαν) but was still stephanephorus when the enlarged games actually came to be celebrated (spanning spring to spring, in my view). The text thus speaks against the theory of Ferguson (see on 87) that the Magnesian theoroi went out in 209 and Magnesoras merely dates their return to Magnesia.

35. He argued (909) from the detail of the Asians’ sacrifice envisaged at the old altar, and from the annual contest attested in a decree of 200/1 (LMag. 136.4–5), which he took as the Asian games. As to the latter text, surely there had long been a local and annual contest for the patron divinity, so that this passage (ἔστω ἐκείνην ἐνακτήν ἐν τοῖς μοιροσὶς) ἄργας τῶν συντεχνοῦντων παρ’ ἐκείνην [Δεσποτηρίων - - -] is not proof of the existence of the contest for Asians between the local and the Panhellenic games. Ebert speculated that the vacat in 24 represents an erasure and that the mason intended οὔτως... εἰς τὸν νόμον, having omitted ἐκείνην by mistake, altered the conjunction.

36. So all three instances in PÉlanos (52.9, 55.14, 75.10); all seven in the Zenon papyri, listed at P. Pestman, Guide (Plag. But. 21) p. 698 n. 1. Note especially PChZan 65955s.108: παρὰ τῆς γῆς τῶν χρυσοφιγησθῆναι διὰ τὴν Φ[ι][ν]όνας ἄγγονισσον [γραφίς; cf. (all passive) UPZ 20.49, 57: 39.8 = 40.7.

32: Note that a single word (whether δοῦλον or θερόν) is sufficient to evoke the status; compare the elliptical allusions in 88.37 and 140.7.

34: D. Musti, AnnPha 32 (1963) 225–239, has argued for the increasing banality of the claim of kinship by the late third century B.C.; for “kinship with all,” however, he cites (227–228) 27.7–8 of 242 B.C.

67. Aetolian League

Copies at Thermus in Aetolia and at Delphi, not at Magnesia.

Thermus: inv. 57 + 86, found in 1897, inscribed with several other Aetolian acts; limestone stele broken at top; h. 0.63, w. 0.75, th. 0.39; letters 0.010–0.015, intersp. 0.007.

I. Magn. pp. xiv–xv (copy of Soteriades) [Dittenberger, Syll. 2 923; Schwyzer 383; Soteriades, Ephdruk 1905, 83; Pontom, Syll. 3 554]; Klaffenbach, IG IX.1 4–c.

Photograph: Kern, Inscriptiones Graecae (Bonn 1913) 34.

Delphi: inv. 60, a small fragment found ca. 1892, preserved only at bottom right; h. 0.13, w. 0.11, th. 0.038; letters 0.008, intersp. 0.003–4.

Bousquet, BCH 82 (1958) 90–91 [SEG 18.246].

Photograph: Bousquet fig. 18.

I give the Thermus copy, underlining the little that survives at Delphi.

stratagōnestos Ἀγελάου Ναυπακτίου τὸ δεῦτερον, ἰππαρχὸς τοῦ Πολεμάρχου Θυμοσακίου, γραμματεύς τοῦ Σάκα Τριχονέος,

4 ἢδος τοῦ Αἰτωλίου ἠπαθὴ Μάγνιτης οὗ ἦν Μακάλαρον ἀποσταλόντες προσευτάκις,

Μακαρέωντο καὶ ἵππον καθαρόν τὸν ὕψη ἄνωτα τὰ τὸν αὐτός ἄφθονς καὶ τὸν πόλιν ἄφθον καὶ τὸν κόραρα ἱματία καὶ ὄνων ἐμέν, καθότι οὐ

προσευταί ἐπαγγέλλονταν καὶ μηθενὶ ἐξουσιών εἰμέν Ἀιτωλίας μήτε τὸν ἐν Αἰτωλία κατοικεώντων ἐνέδραν ἡμᾶν ἐκ τῶν χώρας τὰς Μαγνήτιον μηθενὶ ἐμέν κατὰ τὰς ἐκτάσεις εἶναι τὶ ἐν

16 καὶ ἔξω, τὰ μὲν ἐμεσευκτὰ ἀναπράσον ἔτει τὸν στραταγόν τοῦ ἑκάρχον, τὸν δὲ ἐφαίνετο τὸν αὐτὸς συνέδρον τὸν Θερονίμον Σιπτολέμους ἐν παρακομᾶντι ὡς τὰ κοφα

μακάριας θυγατέρας τὰς καθαρὰς καὶ ἀποθέτω

20 δότας τοὺς ἀλκοφάνους κυρίος ἐμέν ἐμέν ἐδοξοῦσι δὲ αὐτῶς καὶ ἱματίαν ἐφαίνετο καὶ ἀναπράσον ἐν Θερονίμον καὶ ἐν Δέλφοισι.

5 BETTAN, 17 ΤΟΣΕ lapis. 20 Dittenberger: ΚΤΡΙΟΙΣ lapis. 21 TIONAS Delphi.

(48) Inasmuch as the Magnesians on the Maeander, sending as envoys Maesipolos and Hippionic, have renewed their friendship with our people and made clear the loyalty they have toward the League, it is decreed to preserve our friendship with them, and their city and country are to be sacred and inviolable, as the ambassadors proclaim. No one of Aetolians or those living in Aetolia is permitted to seize anyone from Magnesian territory, operating from anywhere, by land or sea. If anyone does, the current strategos is to impound the visible property, while for that not visible the synedroi are empowered to fix such fines as they deem fit, as upon those harming League affairs, and to collect the fines and pay them over to the victims. They are to be given as well a hieromnemonic vote in the Amphilicyoty.

At Thermus a subsequent Aetolian decree (IG IX.1 4.4) was inscribed below this one; it mentions King Philip, hence a terminus ante quem of 179 B.C. The text, mostly lost, was restored by Klaffenbach as a grant of a crown and citizenship to the Magnesians in thanks for their prior grant of these to the Aetolians, with a provision to include in the laws the decree under Agelaus. Most of this is speculative, and the act can provide no reliable guide for defining the occasion or date of 67.

When was Agelaus strategos for the second time? Polybius names other men as the Aetolian strategoi of 221/0 and 220/219 (4.5.1, 4.27.1), and Agelaus in 217/6 (5.107.6) — but which time this was for him Polybius does not say. Agelaus was strategos again in 206/5 (SEG 38.1476.79, also unnumbered). Klaffenbach, treating the chronology of the strategoi, dated our decree to 224/3 — thus before the first effort of the Magnesians in 221, which is impossible; Bousquet preferred to call 217/6 the first and 206/5 the third, with our text somewhere in between.

The Aetolians here grant the Magnesians a seat on the Amphilicyoty. This seat is first seen with certainty in 133, probably 202/1 B.C. (the Delphian archon Megartas). Flacelitre assigned to the years ca. 220 to Megartas as many as five Amphilicyotic decrees that seemed to lack the Magnesian seat. Accordingly he placed this decree with the second quest, in 206. This too should be judged impossible, giving the silences of the decree. The Delphian evidence seems in fact to be inconclusive on whether Magnesia had a seat during the period 220–202. Moreover, we now have in 78 an Aetolian decree given to the Magnesian theoroi

38. That is, already disposed of.

39. Klaffenbach, IG IX.1 p.1. (he put the first tenure in 231/0; he could not know about that of 206/5); J. Bousquet, REG 100 (1980) 66–77.

40. So also P. Fraser, BCH 78 (1954) 65. See Flacelitre, Aitolia 324–325, 409–412. Flacelitre admitted (325 n. 1) that his I 42 and 43 were of quite uncertain date; I 40 and 41 are too fragmentary to show whether the Magnesians are absent; I 39, almost complete and certainly lacking the Magnesian seat, he assigned to 216/5 (archon Polycleitus): but 225–214 or 206–205 according to G. Daux, Chronologie déphique (Paris 1943) 48.
of 208, accepting the Leucophryenea: that occasion could not have produced two Aetolian decrees. We must judge by the nature of the act itself and put it into the historical context defined by the Magnesians' account (66.4).

The Magnesians send two ambassadors, not called theoroi, both otherwise unattested, who speak on friendship; the Aetolians approve the friendship and declare the city and country sacred and inviolable, dwelling at length on penalty clauses of the sort regularly found in Aetolian grants of collective personal inviolability. This decree differs from those Aetolian grants only in making inviolable not the people but the city and country, which (the Aetolians add) is what the Magnesians are "proclaiming" (11–12). This territoriality, by contrast, is the only point that the present act shares with the recognitions of the Magnesians' account defined by the Magnesians' account (208).

This decree, therefore, is a response to the first Magnesian effort, in which they asked boldly for inviolability without "revealing" all the oracular testimonia (66.27), and without requesting crowned games for Artemis; nor of course would they invite Aetolians to the games for the Greeks of Asia. The Aetolians responded by reading this request into their own conventional formulary for collective personal asylia, as they would for Teos later (132) and as the Cretan League would for Anaphe (175). Indeed in 221 B.C. the Aetolians may never before have been faced with a request for the asylia of an entire city and country.

The Magnesians say that they failed in their effort in 221: we can conclude that the Aetolians' recognition was exceptional. In 208 a number of Aetolian cities responded to the Magnesians by accepting at least the Panhellenic games (77): but not enough of that decree survives to indicate whether they granted asylia at the same time; likewise it is not certain that the Delphians (79) granted asylia in 208. All these may well have followed the League's lead in 221 and granted asylia then.

1: The date is Olympiad 139.4 = 221/0 (66.14). Aetolian strategoi served from autumn to autumn (Polyb. 4.37.2); another man is certain in 221/0 (Polyb. 4.5.1), so Ageleus' year, his second tenure, must be 222/1.44 Our decree must date from the last months of his term, in the summer of 221.

41. Beloch (Gr. Gesch. IV.2 417), Pomtow (ad loc.), and Daux (J.Schr. 1933, 192) have all seen that this act must precede those of 208; cf. Gauthier, Symbola 273–274. Summary by Frazer, (above, n. 40).
42. The name Hippionicus is found again at the end of the Hellenistic period, I.Magn. 88.1 and 346.
43. His term in 217/6, unnumbered at Polyb. 5.107.6, will be his third.
44. To this year Klaffenbach (p. 74) assigned Pantaleon's fourth tenure, but with much hesitation. He invoked Pomtow, who, however, said no more than "c.a. 220" (Syll. 3 522 n. 5) and "c.a. 222" (546.1 n. 1).

16–17: On these terms for disputed property see J.-H. Michel in Le monde grec (Brussels 1975) 508–512.
18–19: For parallels for "harming" see Wilhelm, VS 29 (1907) 3.

68. Attalus I

To the left is inscribed the list of Cretan cities I.Magnesia 21, apparently the subscription to the forgery I.Magnesia 20.

Kern, I.Magnesia 22 [Dittenberger, OGIS 282]; Schroeter 23; Welles, Royal Corres. 34.

Cf. Wilhelm, Jahresh. 4 (1901) Beibl. 27 n. 6 (Kl. Schr. II.1 154); Holleaux, Études I 315; P. Roussel, REA 38 (1937) 229; R. E. Allen, The Attalid Kingdom (Oxford 1983) 189.

...
I place Attalus' letter first, for although he makes no allusion to the fact, Magnesia certainly was on some terms an Attalid city in 208. Presumably they had been allies since the 220s and his defeat of Antiochus Hierax, who had held Magnesia. Attalid rule over much of Caria would be ended for a time in 204 by the western campaign of Antiochus III.

In what survives of the letter, Attalus does not mention the request for asyía. He alone among the kings specifies the categories of competition (θ-γ) and promises to provide a sacrifice for Artemis (αιτάσαι ήμιστε τα χρήματα και προσφέρεις). The verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<.

Roussel's emendation asks" is revealing concerning the verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<. Hence Roussel's emendation is not well supported by the parallels adduced by Welles.

Your envoys Pythion and Lycomedes brought me a decree in which you ask me to accept as crowned and isopythian the musical, athletic, and equestrian contest you are holding for Artemis Leucophryene; and they themselves spoke in keeping with the text, and asked that also the cities under me accept it likewise. Seeing that your people are mindful of my past benefactions to them and are always friendly in their dealings with me (?), I accept the contest as you ask and have given orders to give a firstfruits sacrifice; and the cities that obey me will do likewise, for I have written them asking. And in all else, insofar as your people ask, I shall join in increasing the contest ...

of an Amphictyonic recognition for Magnesia, see 11; (Rome Magnesia was Ptolemaic; Eraser, The verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<. hence Roussel's emendation asking" is revealing concerning the verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<. Hence Roussel's emendation is not well supported by the parallels adduced by Welles.

The verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<. Hence Roussel's emendation asking" is revealing concerning the verb is common in the aoi 6ptAoGvm<. Hence Roussel's emendation is not well supported by the parallels adduced by Welles.
Kern (pp. 13, 15) this letter has been dated to 205.49 Other reasons are doubtful, but the geographical argument for 205 and 208 is strong. Antiochus wintered in Carmania in 206/5 (Polyb. 11.34.13) and was on the Persian Gulf by late 205 (13.9.4–5): he therefore passed through Persis in 205. His whereabouts during all of 208 are not certain,50 but probably he defeated the Parthians in 209 and began his invasion of Bactria in 208 (Polyb. 10.48–49). It is very unlikely that he came as far south as Persis in between. If the Magnesians were willing to take the trouble to find him in Iran in 205 but not in the northeast in 208, that must reflect his engagement in his campaign, ended by 205. But this need have no bearing on the date of the non-Seleucid letters.

Of the Magnesian request he mentions the crowned games but not apylla, unless the latter is encompassed in “the other things” they have asked (6); what he goes on to approve is in fact rather vague, the “honors voted by you.” If this mission was delayed until 205 (these theoroi do not recur in the archive), then the Magnesians apparently had no difficulty about addressing themselves to Seleucid cities in 208 (e.g., Laodicea on the Lycus, which does recognize apylla), before they had approached the king.

23–25: “It is our intention to join in increasing these things in whatever ways you might ask or we ourselves might conceive” (for ἐκτιμῶν see Gauthier, Now. inscr. Sardes II p. 77).

25–28: The reference to royal officials is generic, and no particular level of government is meant; their task, well illustrated in other Seleucid inscriptions, will be to convey down the chain of command a letter of the king signaling the will be to convey down the chain of command a letter of the king signaling his decision about Magnesia. Attalus, by contrast, implies that he will write to his cities directly. None of the answers from Seleucid cities (notably that of Antioch in Persis, 111) cites the king’s opinion in this matter, except perhaps 110.19—contrast such allusions to the Antigonid kings in decrees for Cos (25–27) and once for Magnesia (97). The reason, rather than constitutional, may be chronological: most had been approached in 208; or instead geographical: even if the Seleucid letters date to 208, the Magnesian theoroi had long scattered on their missions before this set found Antiochus in Iran and could report his answer to others. As to Antioch in Persis, it is possible that the theoroi received a hearing from the city before they could obtain one from the king; the same may have happened to the Coan envoys at Pella (cf. on 29).

70. Antiochus son of Antiochus III

Kern, I.Magnesia 19 [Dittenberger, OGIS 232]; Schroeter 26; Welles, Royal Correspondence 32.

49. Cf. Holleaux, CAH VIII 142; Etudes III 178 n. 4; Schmitt, Untersuchungen 28 n. 3; Welles and Will (Histoire II 65) for all the royal letters to Magnesia.

50. “We lose sight of him,” Holleaux, CAH 141.

Cf. Wilhelm, Jahrest. 4 (1901) Beihl. 25 (M. Schr. II 1 135); Holleaux, Études I 315.

βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μαγνητῶν ἡμίβουλὴ καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν χαϊτεῖν Ἁρτουρίῳ, καὶ Φιλίστῳ καὶ Θέργοις ταύτη τοῦ πατρός τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ἀντικείμενων τοῦ δώσεως καὶ τάλλα δέ ἔγησαν τοῦ δήμου συντελεῖν διὰ πεντακατη.

8 ρήμα τῆς ἀρχηγετίδος τῆς πόλεως Ἀρτουρίῳ, διεκφρασάμενη ἐπισκεψιν καὶ τὸ τρέχον ἐμὴ ψήφισμα καὶ διελέγχθηναι μετὰ σπουδῆς ἀκολουθίας τοῖς ἐν τούτων κατακεχωρισμένοις παρακαλούντες ἀποδέξασθαι στεφανί
tὴν ἰσόποθον τὸν ἀνόην ἐν τίθετε τῇ θείῃ. ἔχοντος σὸν τοῦ πατρός περί τοῦ δήμου τῆς φιλοπαθετότης διο
[shall]να ταύτα ἀποδεξηθημένου, γέρον [ὑπὲ]ρ σαῦν ἀκολουθηθῆναι τῇ προαίρετῃ αὐτῷ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τὰς ἐθνῖ


The eldest son of Antiochus the Great, born in 220, was co-regent by 209 and died in 193; he never ruled alone.31 Evidently he accompanied his father on the eastern campaign, and it is visible that he has his father’s answer before him; but it need not follow that he too was at Antioch in Persis (in whose decree the response of neither king is mentioned). That the Magnesians obtained a separate letter from him (contrast the letters of the joint rulers Theodore and Aminander to Teos and Claros) might suggest that the two were in fact not in the same place. And the Magnesians presented the decree and made their speeches “to me” (10), not to the two together.

4–5: For this simple citation of the parent see Aymard 86 n. 2, 93 n. 5. The son makes explicit that the ambassadors were sent “to my father” and not to himself.

71. Ptolemy IV

The only inscription of the archive that was found exposed to the elements, its text was badly worn and had a furrow down the middle; the stone was left at the site. Kern derived more from the squeezes. The letters become increasingly crowded, so that the loss in the middle of each line is hard to estimate.

Kern, I Magnesia 23 [Strack, ArchPPF 2 (1903) 543; Schroeter 24; Welles, Royal Caves 33].

Cf. J. De Decker, RPhil n.s. 29 (1903) 160 (squeeze).

72. Unknown king (Philip V?)

Small fragment, with large lettering as in the openings of the other royal letters; left at Magnesia.

Kern, I Magnesia 24 [Schroeter p. 107 frag. 13].

βασιλεὺς — — — — — — — — — —

Kern suggested Philip on the basis of elimination and of the mention of his favorable response at 97.1–2; followed by Boesch 41, among others.

73. Boeotian League

Kern, I Magnesia 25; Fyecl, Contribution 5–14 (squeeze).


Two fragments, the upper (lines 1–2) in Berlin, the lower left at Magnesia and deciphered by Kern mostly from the squeezes.

πάρα τοῦ κυνωνίου τοῦ
Boileus[vn]

[Ἀρχοντος Βοιοῦτος Θείονος? — — — — — — — — — —]

4 [τοὺς ἀγαθούς παρ Μαγνησίαν ἀπολλονίαν Ἡσροῦλων, Εὔβοιαν—
[λόγος Ἀνασί]αγόρα, Α[λ]κουμοῆς Χαράιου τῷ τῷ φάσματι
[Θεοκρόε]αν [κά] τούτου διελέγατον ἀπολογοίδος τοῦ τοῦ φασιν—
[τῶν τῶν] ἐπὶ Μεσσαπίου πότι τοῦ κυνωνιοῦ [Βοιοῦ]τον καὶ ἀπολογίας[—
[Δαμιανον ἄν] τε ταῦς τῆς Ἀρετίμοις Λευκαρροπομάς ἐπιστάμενον]-
[αν θεῖος ἡ θείοι]να ἔν διποτὸν πρῶτον θείον εἰς τῶν Ἁλλαί[ας]

72. Unknown king (Philip V?)

Small fragment, with large lettering as in the openings of the other royal letters; left at Magnesia.

Kern, I Magnesia 24 [Schroeter p. 107 frag. 13].

βασιλεὺς — — — — — — — — — —

Kern suggested Philip on the basis of elimination and of the mention of his favorable response at 97.1–2; followed by Boesch 41, among others.

73. Boeotian League

Kern, I Magnesia 25; Fyecl, Contribution 5–14 (squeeze).


Two fragments, the upper (lines 1–2) in Berlin, the lower left at Magnesia and deciphered by Kern mostly from the squeezes.
This decree of the Boeotian League, one of the few extant, was evidently long; Feyel saw essential points of its structure. At 17ff. the Boeotians acknowledge the piety and kinship they shared with Magnesia; at 22ff. they recognize the games and the inviolability; at 27ff. the theoroi are honored; so also Giovannini (above, p. 182), on the grounds that members of leagues were not free to decide the foreign policy matters of war and peace implicit in declaring inviolability. This assumes that the Boeotian League took a general constitutional posture about allowing these recognitions, and the general principle is contradicted by several civic decrees for Magnesia by members of leagues.

74. Unknown city
A heading, inscribed below 73.
Kern, L Magnesia 25c.

75. Larisa (?)
The stone is badly damaged and difficult to read.

The dialect is Thessalian. Kern's suggestion of Larisa seems best. Our city had more than one treasurer (29), which is unusual in Thessalian cities but richly attested at Larisa. The city seems to have supplied the Magnesian theoroi with a boat for some part of their voyage (22); Larisa had a harbor on the Peneius River, which was navigable, and we can envisage a boat downriver to Homolion. Whichever was the city, its king (28) was Philip V.

The sequence of thought is difficult to make out. At 17–18 we seem to have a provision for making known the documents (γεγραμμένα) brought by the theoroi (so Fick), then for honoring the men (19) and sending them on their way (21–22).
Perhaps in 23–24 the reference is to a request that the decree be inscribed in a conspicuous place in Magnesia; at 27–28 is the provision for inscribing the act locally, next to the statue of the king.

18: Probably the inquirer’s error for Thessalian *ἔσοδετα, = ἔσοδον *set out, published” (so Fick; cf. error τίς for Thessalian relative τις in 30).


24–26: As I restore, “not only for their kinship ... but also for their whole policy.” For ἀναγγέλσας = αἴρεσις cf. IG IX.2 461.28, 504.4; BCH 59 (1935) 56 line 40; Bechtel 204. ὑμογένεια is nearly a hapax.39 Rarity may intensify the implication of *ὅτι: this seems a stronger word than the familiar συγγένεια. That is perhaps especially apt for a Thessalian city addressing the Magnesians, whose ambassadors will have described their origins in the region (I. Magn. 17).

76. Unknown city

Kern, *I. Magnesia* 27.

[---] ἄγονα
[---] ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τέσσαρις
[---] ὑμογένεια
[---] θεαρον
[---] οἶκος [---] Ω

77. Calydon

Inscribed to the right of 76.


[---] ΑI-

tοιοὶ ἄγονα 
προέδρους καὶ ὑπηρετῶν 
τόθε γὰρ ἄλλοις 
ἀρχαῖοι
καὶ ἀρχαῖοι

8 οἴκῳ τὰ ἄλλα ἐν ἡγήσιμον

Περιονίς
Περιονίς
ἱκανοί
ἱκανοί

54. Posidonius Förster 87 f. 109b (Strabo 16.4.27) uses it of three Arab tribes. See also Dion. 4, where the poem is prompted by long use of the adjective ὑμογένεια in biology; whence a scientific tone in Epicur. frag. 36 Usserio (of two perceptions); cf. Iamb. *In Nic.* 38.23 Patelli.
It happens that in the Magnesian archive decrees of the Aetolian League and Delphi have not survived. But the theoroi (79.6) are those attested in the Magnesian archive for northwestern Greece, so the occasion is certain. The Aetolians here manifestly recognized the crowned games, which their decree of 221 (67) had not done; nothing of what survives here suggests that the Aetolians granted inviolability again, which no doubt would have been felt superfluous. We have two decrees, both addressing the games. Enough survives of the first (6–12) to reveal it as the League’s initial acceptance of the games (3–4), however we reconstruct the first two lines. The second (6–12) is a summary text, stating a decision without the preliminaries that would have revealed the occasion; the provision is to incorporate their earlier vote on the Leucophryeneia into the laws—at the prompting of the Magnesians, if g is rightly restored. This fixes the Delphian archon Athanion to 209/8 or 208/7, depending upon how quickly the theoroi reached Delphi (where the year began in early summer). The presence of both the Aetolian and Delphian recognitions on this stone at Delphi would suggest that the Aetolians’ was obtained first; if it is rightly assigned to their autumn meeting, then the Delphians’ is also autumn and Athanion’s year was 208. This fixes the Delphian archon Athenion to 209/8 or 208/7, depending upon how quickly the theoroi reached Delphi (where the year began in early summer). The presence of both the Aetolian and Delphian recognitions on this stone at Delphi would suggest that the Aetolians’ was obtained first; if it is rightly assigned to their autumn meeting, then the Delphians’ is also autumn and Athanion’s year was 208. The alternative, with the Magnesians traveling from east to west, is that the Aetolians’ decree was sent on to Delphi before the Delphians had gotten around to inscribing their own decree. There is not room to restore mention of a request for asylia in lines 7–8, which would in any case be too early in the text. If van Effenterre was right to restore the recognition at 23–24 (where nothing survives but an allusion to the oracle), then this decree is like those of Corinth and Corcyra in neglecting to mention the request in the preliminaries. It may be, however, that Delphi does not mention asylia at all but following the lead of the Aetolians had granted it in 221.

80. Unknown city
Kern, I.Magnesia 30.

From the Doric and the location in the archive, Kern surmised a city in the northwest, perhaps Oeniadae (which is absent from the list in 81).

81. Acarnanian League

Inscribed below 80.
Kern,LMagnesia 31; Klaffenbach, IG IX.1 2 382.
Cf. Habicht, Hermes 85 (1957) 110 n. 2.

36-37: perhaps Thespiae, Magnesia 207

The Acarnanian League was at this time allied with Philip V against the Aetolians. For the constitutional details seen here we have a close parallel in Staatsvertr. III 523, a League treaty of about a decade earlier. The earlier text adds a nauarch to the roster of magistrates (in third position) and calls the two secretaries those of the council (βουλή) and magistrates. The Aetolian League likewise had two secretaries (cf. Klaffenbach ad IG 69.3-4).

8-10: Aristodamus, with varying companions but always named first, went upon the Illyrian coast; he had one set of companions on the southern mainland, another companion (who went on to Sicily) on the western islands (where he was second to his brother) and then Illyria. The brother later served as Magnesia’s representative to the Amphictyony, and both were then honored by Delphi and the Aetolian League (LMagn. 91 [Syl. 598; IG IX.1 187], 1905 b.c.).

26-27: “The council and the Thousands” recur in the decree at P. Funke et al., Klio 75 (1993) 131-144; “the Thousands” are reported to have been mentioned in a now lost inscription of the early third century, IG IX.1 207. Staatsvertr. III 523 lacks the authorizing phrase; in later League decrees (listed at Habicht 90) we find τοί βουλεῖαι καὶ τῶν κοινῶν τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων.

31-34: The League can order its member cities to elect theoedochoi, so too the Aetolian League (178.25). Presumably this is the same as ordering them to recognize the crowned games, as Attalus did with his subjects.

40-41: Staatsvertr. III 523 reveals that the temple of Apollo at Actium became a federal temple of the League only about a decade before the present decree.

82. Epirote League

Cf. Wilhelm, Jahrest. 4 (1901) Beibl. 26 (K1 Schr. II.1 153).

[ἐπειδή Μάγνητες οἱ ἐπὶ Μαυλάνδρον φίλοι] δύνες καὶ
On the institutions and the extant decrees of the League see P. Cabanes, *L'Épìre* (Paris 1976) 353–383; Gauthier, *RPhII* III.53 (1979) 120–128; Moretti, *I. stor. ellen.* II p. 129 n. 10. As Pouilloux remarks (p. 87), the Magnesian inscriber has omitted the constitutional mechanics that would have headed the decree. In 208 the League was already dominated by Rome; cf. S. I. Oost, *Roman Policy in Epirus and Acanania* (Dallas 1954) 30–39.


33–36: The oracular shrine of Zeus at Dodona became the federal temple of the Epirotes toward 230 B.C. As Kern saw, the *boma* of the Athenians must be the dedication mentioned by the fourth-century orators, called a *bronze trapēza* (Dem. 21.53) and an ornament of the throne of Dionysus (Hyper. Euk. 24).

37: Cabanes, 369, 392; cf. 362 on συνάρτοντας suggests that Crison may be the same as a man attested some years earlier whom he takes also to be a strategist (SEG 24.445, 451), hence here for the second time or more.

45: ενέτειλα is often granted in Epirote proxeny decrees, always as one in a list of rights and therefore not easily interpreted; LSJ translate “full rights.” Here the word seems to be more specific, and to balance ἄτελεα. Perhaps the pair means “with tax immunity and liability” the same as of Epirotes.

83. Gonni


48 [άυτός Χαριπώταν τὸν τὸν γυμναστήνι ἔδωκεν] τὸν γυμναστήν [ι] τῶν συνεδρίων]

βοσαν καὶ τοιού ἐπὶ Πύθεια ἐπηγγέλλουσαν ἐν τοῖς γύμνασις.

[κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ ἀπεδέχατο]

[Ko]σμο[ποιοῖ].

11: τιμὴν Σ. Schulze ap. Kern. 19: the mason wrote THI, then corrected to AHI (i.e., he misplaced the new letter). 24: NAIOTIDEXETAI lapis. 37 Wilhelm: ΨΗΙ lapis.
violability already and do not describe this as part of the request, nor do they cophryene and intending to increase their piety toward the gods," they are had granted inviolability already in 221

and what is at issue is the new games. I would conclude that they

them toward the gods [cf. Helly I 34].

Phocian League
From line 13 on a lower block, from 30 on a third.
Kern, IGn Magnesia 34.

23: For sýnodoς of a festival cf. IG XII 7.36.22, OGIS 326.25.

58. E.g., Coin Hoards 5 (1979) no. 42 (buried ca. 190 B.C.).

30-31: The city itself rather than a private citizen is made responsible for hosting future theoriai. Boesch (111-112) compares the city of Delphi serving as prokes for Sardes in Syll. 5.548 (on which see Gauthier, Nouv. inscr. Sardes II pp. 143-144).

34: Phalanna, about fifteen kilometers southwest of Gonnos up the Eruphos River, presumably shared a border, as no city is known in between (cf. Helly I 34).

84. Phocian League
From line 13 on a lower block, from 30 on a third.
Kern, IGn Magnesia 34.

pará toû koinon tòn Phokôn
êkei[θ]e Mâgnîntves ei eiôî Mêiandôôri oîkeiô oînêe kai fil-
ôk Phokôn fôrâas kai òthepók [ê]epêstallâsei 'Apôlôrfâ-
nv Aîgôkôlou, 'Eôîolou 'Anâsaôtra, 'Aukômîbîn[θ]-
Har-

Gonin in Thessaly was a dependency of the Antigonids.

2: Micythus is attested as

23: For sýnodoς of a festival cf. IG XII 7.36.22, OGIS 326.25.

28: For nomophylakes in cities closely controlled by kings, see on 25.2.

15-16: Having their city and country sacred and inviolable for Artemis Leucophrone and intending to increase their piety toward the gods, they are establishing the games: the Gonnis clearly state that Magnesia possesses inviolability already and do not describe this as part of the request, nor do they grant it. It is evident that this is not a refusal, but a presumption that that status already exists and what is at issue is the new games. I would conclude that they had granted inviolability already in 221 B.C.

11: For prokephrâsetai of a contest see Syll. 5.457.15 (the Mousae of Thespiae).

20: "Demetrian drachmas" are silver of Demetrius Poliorcetes (289), which the hoard evidence shows to have circulated throughout the third century B.C. and later. No coinage has been attributed to Demetrius II (299-292 B.C.). Only bronze issues are known on the part of Gonni (Helly I 153-159).

23: For sýnodoς of a festival cf. IG XII 7.36.22, OGIS 326.25.

28: For nomophylakes in cities closely controlled by kings, see on 25.2.
The only other Phocian decree extant is 53 for Tenos. In 208 the League was allied with Philip V and the Achaenae; Elateia was under Macedonian control.

Robert realized that he had skipped the article again by mistake; that is, the true text was

The temple of Athena Cranaea, the federal temple of the Phocians, was atop a hill two miles southeast of Elateia; 53 was discovered in the ruins. For the excavations see P. Paris, Elateia (Paris 1892) 75–206.

33: Robert saw that the Phocians ought not to call themselves a city. On the squeeze I can see nothing; the stone yields faint traces, which I report with much uncertainty. Perhaps the mason meant to write τοῦ χοινοῦ.

85. Same

Kerr, l.Magnesia 35.

8. He word order seems garbled. Given his one error, I suspect that the mason realized that he had skipped έπώρεες, and in inscribing it late included the article again by mistake; that is, the true text was τὰν τε έπώρεες τὰς θέσεις Άρτεμίτος τὰς Διευκορυφής κη.

32: The temple of Athena Cranaea, the federal temple of the Phocians, was atop a hill two miles southeast of Elateia; 53 was discovered in the ruins. For the excavations see P. Paris, Elateia (Paris 1892) 75–206.

33: Robert saw that the Phocians ought not to call themselves a city. On the squeeze I can see nothing; the stone yields faint traces, which I report with much uncertainty. Perhaps the mason meant to write τοῦ χοινοῦ.

85. Same

Kerr, l.Magnesia 35.
The same *theta* at Ithaca apparently mentioned no kinship there, although Odysseus was great-great-great-grandson to Deion.

19: Collective *prodrus* at the local games was also voted by neighboring Ithaca, 86.16.

36–37: The provision of an escort was a common civility of Hellenistic diplomacy and does not (as Kern thought, *Hermes* 506) prove the political dependence of Ithaca upon Cephalenia; cf. Dittenberger, *Syll.* 2.257 note 2. This gesture would seem to imply that Same was the last of the Cephalenic cities visited; at any rate, it was the closest to Ithaca.

86. Ithaca


...thought the phrase indicated a standard (Aeginetan).

...an apparently rural "local drachmas" the theoroi, not money for the site of Odysseus' palace outside of the assembly met in the Odysseum; but perhaps rather the latter was the putative site of Odysseus' palace outside of the city.

It is of course one of the engaging features of this decree that these partners from literature figure prominently in the cults of Hellenistic Ithaca (including games of Odysseus, 16); so too on the city's coins, which show only Athena and Odysseus (*BMC Pelop.* 105–106).

4–5: "ambassadors, and the same men as proclaimers"; ἐπαγγελτὴρ seems to be a harap, a recherché way of saying θεωρός. The formula is at 96.5: προσφέυτας τούς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ θαυμάζως.

20: Hellenistic Ithaca is known to have struck only bronze, and that sporadically. Yet these "local drachmas" appear to be the gift to the present Magnesian theoroi, not money for the Ithacans who will attend the future festival and might be expected to use the "local" money there, that is, Magnesian silver. Unless we have failed to recognize Ithacan money, the requirement would seem to indicate weight: every city of course had a definition of the drachma.

87. Athens


...explained...
In 208 Athens was free and neutral.\textsuperscript{68} The other extant Athenian decree of 
\textit{aσβία} is 162 for Alabanda several years later.

The date of this text has spawned a substantial literature, conceived in the 
main as a conflict between the implications of 66 (with the missions commonly 
dated 207–205) and the Athenian tribal cycle (line 2: fourth position, implying 
209/8).\textsuperscript{65} In fact the Athenian year 209/8 is what we should expect from the 
Magnesians’ account in 66 (with inclusive reckoning): the \textit{theoria}, leaving in 
spring or early summer 208, will likely have reached Athens before midsummer 
and the end of the Athenian year 209/8. The problem is not in the year but 
in the season.\textsuperscript{66}

Pyanopis in the fifth prytany requires us to assume an intercalary month 
closer in the year,\textsuperscript{2} making the season late autumn, well into November. This, 
however, is not the time we expect the Magnesians to be in Athens—certainly 
too early if we go by the tribal cycle and posit November 209, probably too late if 
we disregard the cycle and posit November 208. Chronologically, therefore, this 
text seems to me a non liquet, and I continue to rely on 66.\textsuperscript{68}

2–6: These Athenians are not otherwise on record. In 2, we expect \textit{ταύτα} before 
the secretary’s name; in 4, \textit{οὕτως}.

35: Holleaux (\textit{Études I} 316) thought that this unidentified temple must be 
that of the Demos and the Charites, where a number of Athenian decrees 
were inscribed in these years; cf. Habicht, \textit{Studien} \textit{85} n. 33. But the noun is at best 
ambiguous, for the usual expression is \textit{ἐν τοῖς τεμένεσι} τοῦ Δήμου καὶ τῶν Ἀριστων.

88. Megalopolis

A second column begins at line 41.


Photograph: Maier pl. 21 (lines 60–67 col. b).


\textsuperscript{65} Relying on the tribal cycle: Kirchner, \textit{IG} \textit{II2} p. 14 (but 222/1 A.C.); Ferguson, \textit{Athenian Tribal Cycles} 36, 129–139 (209/8 A.C., with the return of the theoria in 208/7 under Mecropou); Meritt, \textit{Historia} 26 (1977) 178; Habicht, \textit{Studien} 171. Relying on the unity of the thoric missions: Robert, \textit{Op. min.} \textit{II.} 775–778; Nachtergaele, \textit{Lex Graec.} 234; Ebert (\textit{Phainoba} 1982, 208–210) follows a different numeration of the cycle to arrive at 205/4.

66. The 6th of Pyanopis (line 3) was a sacred day for some purposes, but apparently 
no state festival obstructed the council from meeting; see J. D. Mikalon, \textit{The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year} (Princeton 1975) 67–78, who cites this decree and \textit{IG} \textit{I2} 1014 for 
meetings on this day.

claiming other instances from the last quarter of the third century; Kern and Dinsmoor (\textit{Athenian Archon List} 256) considered emendation necessary (\textit{fifth} prytany to fourth, Dinsmoor).

The usual intercalation was Poseideon II, hence later than our decree; but a Hecatombaion 
II is attested (\textit{IG} \textit{I2} 78).

68. Fritchett, \textit{Greek State at War III} (Berkeley 1979) 173 n. 66, on a different problem, evokes erroneous month names in the prescriptions of Attic decrees. In ours, however, name and number, 
even while incompatible, are each improbable for the travels of the \textit{theoria}, both being well 
in autumn.
theoroi obviously had consulted the old Magnesian decree voting funds. The literary evidence on the foundation Panhellenic donations aided the rebuilding of Thebes late in the fourth century an important member of the Achaean League and in 208 was allied with Philip V of Macedon. Weourselves to be unstinting friends to the building of the city walls; in Arcadia this can only be considering Magnesia's earlier contribution toward the building of the city walls; in Arcadia this can only be considering Magnesia's earlier contribution. The errors in transcribing Arcadian. The use of lapis. 47 Wilhelm: ΣΑΝΤΑΙ, ΧΗΡΑΣΑΝΤΙΝΑ lapis. See Kern and Fick for the mason's errors in transcribing Arcadian.

The theoroi visited a number of Arcadian cities, but the Magnesian authorities chose to inscribe the decree of Megalopolis and merely list the others. Authorship is established by lines 22–29, citing Magnesia's earlier contribution of 500 darics toward the building of the city walls; in Arcadia this can only be the famous walls of Megalopolis. The birthplace of Polybius was the most important member of the Achaean League and in 208 was allied with Philip V and Macedonia. 20–22: "to return favors to kinsmen and friends with a view to showing ourselves to be unstinting friends to all who have preferred us", the participle seems an error for ἐμπρόσθεν or ἐφαρμόσαν (Kern). 25–29: Able to name the Megalopolitan envoys who came to Magnesia in 309 B.C. and the Magnesian who returned, the theoroi obviously had consulted the old Magnesian decree voting funds. The literary evidence on the foundation of Megalopolis does not preserve a report of such a far-ranging quest for funds. Panhellenic donations aided the rebuilding of Thebes late in the fourth century (Holleaux, Etudes I 1–40). The use of darics, Persian gold staters, is to be
This excludes the suggestion of T. Reinach, BCH 88 (1904) 13 n. 1, that the contribution may have been recent, after the destruction that followed the battle of Sellasia in 222 (Polby. 5-93). 70. See Samuel, Chronology 97: Acharan usage, which was followed in some Arcadian cities in the second century B.C., had the seventh month equal to the tenth at Delphi (Sicyon 1774 of 170/169), whose year started ca. June.
a decree of the federal council, which met with some frequency, whereas the full assembly met only when called.71

Lines 23–24 seem poorly formulated, as we expect a noun parallel to μαντέας (cf. Εὐχαρίστει, 93.15; ἔβδομα, 96.9). Arguing for the Magnesians’ interpretation of the oracle, the ambassador told the Achaeans that “by acceding to the request and joining in increasing the honors of Artemis, they would be acting in accord with the oracle of the god and the benefactions already rendered to them.” They respond with an observation of their own [δ[δ] ... ἄτι κτλ.], apparently not part of the genuine absolute that begins in line 1 and summarizes the ambassador’s speech (cf. 93.22, 96.25, 98.13, etc.): “It is ancestral to Achaeans to join in increasing honors among those who do so for the Achaeans.” Compare 18.7–8 about the Achaeans, which I take as a general sentiment.

27: At Syll.3 519.13 we find ἔδωκε τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ἀχαίων. Our wording in its ambiguity may reflect that this is a decree of the Achaean council rather than the full assembly.

28: For the damiourgoi as executives of the League (e.g., Staatsvertr. III 452.3–4; Syll.3 519) see Larsen 221–223.

29: The temple of Zeus Amarios was a federal temple; the cult is also attested in Achaean colonies. This is the first god by whom the Achaeans swear in Achaean colonies. This is the first god by whom the Achaeans swear. The somewhat fuller decree of Sicyon (91) also is silent about asylia—yet both cities, in addressing the games, claim to be acting on the example of the Achaean League, which granted both games and asylia. Neither city, moreover, makes any provision for a sacrifice to Artemis or for sending their own theoroi to the games. We cannot deduce that the League arrogated these powers to itself (so Giovannini) and left to member cities only the right to receive Magnesian theoroi as they passed through, for the response of Achaean Megalopolis is lengthy and detailed and granted the full Magnesian request.

On the formula of Argive decrees see P. Charneux, BCH 114 (1990) 395–415 (396 n. 7 on the several omissions here).

90. Argos
Kern, L Magnesia 40.

71. On the problems raised by Achaean political bodies see A. Aymard, Les assemblées de la confédération achaïenne (Bordeaux 1938), esp. 86 n. 1 (rightly observing that the use of Ἀχαῖοι does not establish which body passed this decree); G. A. Lehmann, ZPE 51 (1980) 237–261; in general, J. A. O. Larsen, Greek Federal States (Oxford 1968) 227–233.
The only decree of Sicyon extant. It was a member of the Achaean League. In summer 208 its territory was raided by Roman forces and defended by Philip V (Livy 27.31.1–2, 27.32.2; Broughton, MRR I 287). Like the Argives, the Sicyonians evoke the League decree but do not mention ayyia; but they are more detailed in dealing with the games.

17: Instead of ἀν τοῦ νῦν, which reveals Sicyon published its laws on tablets (so Wilhelm, Beinäg. 244, 287).

20: Another city may have been subscribed to the left, and the list may have continued on a block below. The coins of Callistata indicate that Ἀλλιστατίς [cf. von Gaisau, RE 10 (1919) 1673]; but the Magnesians, in composing these subscriptions, several times got the ethnic wrong.

92. Corinth
Kern, L.Magnesia 42.

The only decree of Sicyon extant. It was a member of the Achaean League. In summer 208 its territory was raided by Roman forces and defended by Philip V (Livy 27.31.1–2, 27.32.2; Broughton, MRR I 287). Like the Argives, the Sicyonians evoke the League decree but do not mention ayyia; but they are more detailed in dealing with the games.

17: Instead of ἀν τοῦ νῦν, which reveals Sicyon published its laws on tablets (so Wilhelm, Beinäg. 244, 287).

20: Another city may have been subscribed to the left, and the list may have continued on a block below. The coins of Callistata indicate that Ἀλλιστατίς [cf. von Gaisau, RE 10 (1919) 1673]; but the Magnesians, in composing these subscriptions, several times got the ethnic wrong.
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The only decree of Sicyon extant. It was a member of the Achaean League. In summer 208 its territory was raided by Roman forces and defended by Philip V (Livy 27.31.1–2, 27.32.2; Broughton, MRR I 287). Like the Argives, the Sicyonians evoke the League decree but do not mention ayyia; but they are more detailed in dealing with the games.

17: Instead of ἀν τοῦ νῦν, which reveals Sicyon published its laws on tablets (so Wilhelm, Beinäg. 244, 287).

20: Another city may have been subscribed to the left, and the list may have continued on a block below. The coins of Callistata indicate that Ἀλλιστατίς [cf. von Gaisau, RE 10 (1919) 1673]; but the Magnesians, in composing these subscriptions, several times got the ethnic wrong.
20 are found helping to defend Delphi (FD v1at rhv xal vouc, cptapa txet64 Ar6rtpov txl Cf. [x~rpiav] [rois [lxxtxbv 10: Lxtcphv~tav riis npurhvtos rtplov &xl&wxav is mentioned twice in the preliminaries (by virtue of quoting both the oracle and the speech); unless the decree had an omission the reverse of that of Corinth and Corcyra, the grant must have come in the damaged lines 23–25. For khoảnν as "government" see Robert, Monnais antiques en Troade (Geneva 1966) 89–90.

94. Corcyra
Kern, I,Magnesia 44.
Cf. Wilhelm, Jahresber. 4 (1901) Beibl. 26 (K.I Schr. II.1 153); Holleaux, Études I 917.
From line 43, on a lower block.

parά Κορυκαιων ἐπὶ πρωτάνος Ἀνθρωπίσιος, μηνὸς Φωκαίωτος ἄμερον πέμπτα(ς) ἐπὶ ἐκάθι, προστατεύει προφθάλμων Μάγοις Στράτους, ἀγάθου τύχαι, 4 ἐπειδὴ ἂ πόλις ἦ τῶν Μαγνητῶν πρὸς τὸν Μακεδόνον ὑπάρχουσας οἰκειότατον αὐτὰς ποὺ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Κορυκαιῶν θυσίαν νεεῖ τινᾶν ἐφάρσιος κατὰ τὰ τῶν Ἀπόκλωνος μανεῖται τῆς Ἀρτέμις τῆς Ἐλευσινῆς καὶ πανάγιλοι διὰ πενταεπετήριος καὶ ἀγάθου μισθίου καὶ ἐπικών 8 καὶ γυμνικῶν στεφάνων ἰσοπάθους τὰς τιμάς καὶ ἀπέσταλε προσφεύλαξαν θαυμάξας καὶ ἔραμες Σωσικλῆς Διόκλεως, Ἀριστόδαμον Διόκλεως, Δίοκλην Μηνιαίον, ο ἐκείνων ποὺ τὰς ἐπισκόποις τὸν τὰ φάρσιος ἀπέθανον τὰ παρὰ Κορυκαίων καὶ ἐπελογίζατο τὰν τὰς θεοὺς ἐπεροίνει καὶ τὰν ὑπάρχοντας ὀἰκειότατα ποὺς πόλιν καὶ τὰς γεγονόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων αὐτῶν ἐπερεῖπε εἰς τὸ Ιερὼν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ εἰς τοὺς Ἐλλήνας διὰ τὰ τῶν θεοῦ χρήσιμοι καὶ διὰ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ διὰ τῶν φαντασμάτων τῶν ὑπαρχοντας αὐτῶς ποὺς πόλιν λειτο οὗν καὶ ἄνθρωποι, παρακάλεσαν τὰς καὶ ζύγιντα δεὴν παραδείσαμοι, καθὼς καὶ αἱ πόλεις αἱ Ἐλληνικῆς, μετὰ τὴν τὰς πόλις ταῦτα καὶ τὸν ἄγνως καὶ ἀποστέλλει χαρώς οἶκε καὶ ἐκατοστάς χρόνος περιοθῆς τὰς περιπετείς τοὺς καὶ τῶν καὶ ὅπων τιμὰς παρ’ αὐτοῖς, δεῦδερας τοῦ Κορυκαιῶν παραδέξασθαι — 12 τὸν τὴν θυσίαν καὶ τὸν ἄγνως τὰς Ἀρτέμις τῆς Ἐλευσινῆς στεφάνων ἰσοπάθους τὰς τιμάς δὲν τίθητι ἂ πόλις ἦ τῶν Μαγνητῶν, καὶ τοῖς νικητὰς τῶν πολεμῶν τὰς αὐτὰς ἐμὲν τιμὰς παρὰ τὰς πόλις δεὶ καὶ τοῖς τὰς Πύθεα νυκτὸν ἀποκρίνονται δεὶ τοὺς προσφεύλαξαν καὶ χαρώς διότι ἂ πόλις καὶ τῶν Κορυκαιῶν αὐτὰ τὰ τιμῶσα διαπέτευκα τὰς Ἀρτέμιν θυσίας,
we know how the Corcyraeans named a specially convened meeting; also bronze coins (BMC Thessaly 149 nos. 525–526), of uncertain date.

10: LS] take ἐπέσκλητος as an adjective, "(sc. ἐςκλήσθα, specially convened meeting," as in Athens an ἐςκλήσθα σύγκλητος. To the contrary, in this context it is clearly a noun and must be western usage for "assembly." In fact we know how the Corcyraeans named a specially convened meeting: καρυκτᾶ ἀλία (IG 694.53). Compare the noun σύγκλητος in Italy, also ἐπίσκλητος (= consilium, IG XIV 657, 660), ἐπισκλῆτος (= the ptytanis? 612; Hesych. s.v. of a privy council at Syracuse).

17: While many grantors invoke the honorific decrees that cities have voted for Magnesia, this passage alone suggests that these might include the recognitions for Magnesia.

19: Epidamnus (96.41); cf. IG 480.39, one "Corinthian stater" per day for a cavalryman in Aetolia and Acarnania in the 260s.

26: The provision to give the present ambassadors their gifts when they make the stages of the visit.

27: So G. Busolt, Griechische Staatskunde (Munch 1920) 444 n. 2, 447 n. 1; F. Ghinatti, PP 15 (1960) 371, argued that the Corcyraean ἐπέσκλητος was an oligarchic assembly, between a council and a full assembly.

32: A Stratton is the ptytanis of IG 682, which has been assigned to the end of the fourth century. We have Corcyraean amphoras stamped ἐπὶ Στράτωνος, also bronze coins (BMC Thessaly 149 nos. 525–526), of uncertain date.

33: The provision to give the present ambassadors their gifts when they make the proclamation of the contest reveals a two-stage process: the Magnesians made one speech to request the new status, and a second, only after that was approved, in order to invite Corcyraeans to the upcoming contest of 207. This legal nicety is clear otherwise only at Paros (100.42–45), another unusually detailed decree. Possibly it was true in all cases, and other texts merely condense the stages of the visit.

74: E.g., BMC Thes. 135-139 and Hymettian Coll. II 18; S. Fried, "The Autonomous Silver Coinage of Korkyra" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan 1998), stops with 289 B.C. and the end of the drachmas that give the ἐκοποιαλω in full (the exact date 289 is conventional).

46: In the late third century, Oricum, the harbor city on the Epirote mainland near the mouth of the Aous, was in a symphōleia with Corcyra, as we know from a question put to Zeus of Dodona by the two cities jointly.26

95. Apollonia

From line 44, on a lower block.

Kern, Ι.Μagnesia 45.

Cf. Boesch, Θεοφόρος 72 n. 1; De Decker, RPhil n.s. 29 (1905) 161 (collation).
48. it must be recognized as isopythian by defining the reward for victors in games, but not in so many words the games, which are in effect the Apollonian.

230  ASYLIA: TERRITORIAL INVIOLABILITY

From line 44, on a lower block.

Kern, I. Magnesia 46 [Dittenberger, SylI. 2 259; Hiller, SylI. 3 560].
Our only decree of Epidamus, this text provides unique details about the Magnesians' speech; lines 8–12 identify the services of Magnesia to the Greek people, so often cited in the abstract, as aid to Delphi against the Gauls in 279 and arbitrating civil war on Crete.

2–3: For Heliotropios see on 95.1–2. In Apollonia on the third of the month, the envoys had passed through Epidamnus before its end, as we should expect.

5: For this description of the ambassadors see on 86.4–5.

16: This sentence suggests, if only by its silence about the games and inviolability, that these decrees, cited elsewhere in more general terms, concerned past honors and are not the new recognitions. A unique verb (so LSJ ávβκω) is then followed by an emendation and a lacuna. I suggest therefore that further emendation is warranted here; for the common expression with ávβκω see the index, and on 102.65.

24–25: For expressions of one’s own piety see on 94.25.

37–39: Apparently the pryianis, who was eponymous (cf. Robert, Hellenica X 289), is to pray to the Magnesian goddess and to the goddess of the Epidamnians’ public hearth “that the things voted with the goodwill of the gods be fulfilled now and forever for the good of the Magnesians and Epidamnians.” Such public prayer is a common enough stipulation in honorific decrees (in the aitia texts: 111.53, 125.6.13), but elsewhere it is done by priests rather than magistrates.

In what follows the sentiments are clear but not the structure or details: the envoys had passed through Epidamnus before its end, as we should expect.

4: For this description of the ambassadors see on 86.4–5.

5: For this description of the ambassadors see on 86.4–5.

8: For expressions of one’s own piety see on 94.25.
234 ASYLIA: TERRITORIAL INVOLIABILITY

3: Macedon and Magnesia were brothers (Hes. frag. 7 M.-W.), whence this kinship. By contrast, neither the Chalcidians nor the Eretrians claim kinship with Magnesia.

98. Eretria
To the right of 97.
Kern, I. Magnesia 48 [Ziebarth, IG XII.9 p. 162].

1 Picard [nepl. δν ἐ β. ] Kern. 6 Wilhelm: [τ]ο[τ]ο δι Κερν; the stone and the squeeze are too faint to decide.

Chalcis was the largest city on Euboea, and subject to the Antigonids, as is explicit here. The decree is brief and without verbal flourishes. It does not even provide for the inscribing of the act—and it makes no mention of asylia.

Lines 1–8 summarize the letter of Philip V to Chalcis (hence Makedóonou, reflecting the Magnesians’ argument to Philip, not to the Chalcidians); in direct speech, “I have myself acceded, and you too would do well to accept the men sent concerning this”—that is, accept them favorably, as εὐνόμως προσέπεσαντο at 88.26. For the expression cf. Royal Corn. 13.13: χαλκὸς δ’ ὑπὸ ποιήσατε ὕψησαμενοι. The reference to the king implied by this opening is striking and contrasts with the decrees of Macedonian cities for Cos, which mention the wishes of the king in brief and in the body of the decree. It contrasts too with the decree of Eretria (98), which does not mention Philip at all.

The Chalcidians speak of two prompting events, the royal letter and the Magnesians’ visit. It would seem that the king’s letter arrived before the theoum, who are not said to have brought it. These are the men who conversed central Greece, and unless they were traveling from north to south, they did not approach Philip; already others had done that, and early enough for his letter (of the sort promised in some extant royal letters) to reach Euboea before the theoum.

1: The dating by hegemōn that commonly precedes Chalcidian decrees has been omitted at Magnesia. A board of strategoi we see otherwise at IG XII.9 900.c.8. Strategoi commonly propose decrees at Eretria (whose Hellenistic epigraphy is more abundant than that of Chalcis).
At any rate, Eretria grants some more privileged condition than that of Chalcis; but perhaps an easier phraseology in the granting of personal inviolability: “They are to have in-

This decree of Antigonid Eretria, to which that of Histiaea is subscribed (96), makes no mention of the wishes of Philip V. Possibly we should deduce some more privileged condition than that of Chalcis; but perhaps an easier explanation is that the king’s letter had not yet reached Eretria when the the- ory arrived. The tone seems a good deal friendlier to the Magnesians than that of the Chalcidians (cf. 12–13, and the elaborate honors for the theoreis). At any rate, Eretria grants asylia as well as the crowned games. For the theoreis they add a distinction (27–28) which enlarges upon the more familiar phraseology in the granting of personal inviolability: “They are to have inviolability and security in war and peace whenever coming into the city and country.”

1: In the fourth century a board of strategoi commonly authored proposals (IG XII.9 205, 206, 208, 212), but here alone we see one as eponymous.


33: The temple of Apollo Daphnehoros was in the middle of the city; see IG p. 162 and P. Auberson, *Eretria* I (Bern 1968). A number of public acts were inscribed there, and the oath of IG 191 was sworn there.

99. Delos

Kern, *I Magnesia* 49.


The attribution to Delos was established by Wilhelm (confirming Kern’s suggestion), who recognized Aristeides as the proposer of other Delian decrees (*IG* X1.4 704ff.). Delos is not in the list of Cycladic cities subscribed to the decree of Paros (100).

100. Paros

Beginning below 99, a second column from line 18, a third from 60.

Kern, *I Magnesia* 50 [Dittenberger, *SylL* 261; *IG XII.5* 1341 (excerpts); Hiller, *SylL* 562].

36
44
32
56
60
52
64
238
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3 Wilhelm, from line 48: xαβε- Kern; the stone and squeeze are indeterminate.
8 Wilhelm: ΤΙΝ lapis. 9: (δε) add. Dittenberger. 14 Holleaux: διώτι Κερν. 27 Holleaux: 3'5' είν προ- Dittenberger (the stone confirms N). 33 Holleaux: Μφιο Κερν. 67-68 Dittenberger. 75 Fraser Matthews: Νεο(ε)δου Κερν. 84 Μφιο: Hil.

For this long decree of Paros parallels are supplied by the decree found on Pharos: see Robert, Hellenica XI-XII (1960) 520-526. The names of a number of the Cyclades are subscribed, excluding, however, the Delians, whose decree was inscribed separately—and who did not vote aσυλιά (99).

3-5: This procedure is seen at the start of other Parian decrees (Robert 520-524: L. Migeotte, L'empirant public (Paris 1984) no. 62): “Concerning the matters which the archons proposed about the decree from Magnesia, it is decided that the archons are to introduce the theoroi to the assembly . . . .” In 8 the phrase resembles that by which a rider is added to a decree; Dittenberger deduced that the council had refused the Magnesian request but was overridden by the assembly (Wilhelm was skeptical of this). But this phrase occurs also in the Pharos decree; and there as here probouleuma and decree were proposed by the same man. The council, without dealing with the substance of the request, simply put this item on the agenda of the assembly and named the sponsors of the Magnesians’ appearance there. Compare (in the realm of religious policy) IG II2 337, in which the council’s role is confined to urging the assembly to discuss a request to establish a cult of Astarte.

14-17: The preliminaries as we have them do not mention aσυλιά, so probably the oracle was quoted in these damaged lines and that was felt sufficient, as in 95. Oguse suggested δι' τοῦ Αλλώλους | τοῦ ἐν Δέλφῃ, τούτοις ἡρώτατος λόγον εἶναι καὶ | ἄρει τοῦ σεβόμενος Ἀρτέμιος Λευκοφρυηνήν καὶ | τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ δούλου νομίζοντο | διήφρωται.

33-34 and 39: For the order “inviolable and sacred” see p. 33. For the provision in 39-42 to proclaim the inviolability to the public we have perhaps 109.9.29; it is to be proclaimed only once (πρῶτον, the “next” Dionysia, 41). By contrast, the present theoroi are themselves to proclaim the upcoming Leucophryenia immediately (43, cf. 94.33); where we are not told. For a festival there was a schedule to be met, and real consequences, the participation
of foreigners; Magnesia was employing one theoric visit both to seek Panhellenic recognition and to invite visitors to the first Panhellenic celebration. The Parian Great Dionysia (42) are known otherwise only at IG XII.1 129-34 (II n.c.).

49: The calendar of Paros (Wörle, Chiron 1993, 352-357) is too imperfectly known to determine when in the year the archons were to make arrangements for the theoric mission to Magnesia. If their Poseidon matched the Athenian month, then midwinter, which would be reasonable for a spring festival.

50: πρόεδρος might be used here because the theorodochos will introduce future Magnesian theoroi to the Parian assembly; the term does not recur in the governmental usages of Paros.

58ff.: Here probably was quoted the praise of the Magnesian ambassadors that was to be read out at the Dionysia (61).


69-71: The Parians make provision to keep the Magnesians' decree of request in the record office, and to ask that their own decree be inscribed at Magnesia (two gestures that cost them nothing), but make no provision to inscribe either text at Paros. Their specification that the inscription be in the temple of Artemis at Magnesia (73) is simply formulaic and uninformed as to the Magnesians' intentions.

77ff.: Arisinoe is Corea on Ceos, on which see Robert, Hellenica XI-XII (1960) 132-176. Robert, REG 46 (1939) 423-444 (Op. min. sel. I 549-568), argued cautiously that the Asclepieis are Thermae on Icaros, given both its warm springs and the next entry Oene on Icaros; but these lists are not arranged geographically.

101. Mytilene (?)

Kern, I.Magnesia 52.

Cf. A. Fick, Beitr.KundIndogernSpr. 26 (1901) 281-283; Wilhelm, Jahrbsh. 4 (1901) Beibl. 28 (Kl. Schr. II.1 154); Robert, REG 38 (1925) 41 n. 2 (Op. min. sel. II 733 n. 2); Hiller, IG XII Suppl. 138.

See Fick on the dialectical forms and the mason's errors (28, for θυσίας; 36, for παράστασις; 59, for πάντων; 69, for παράστασις; 100, for παράστασις). Rigsby in the squeeze: epibēs Kern. 3: e.g., γειτονίαν αν μέγαν τό τέλειον τόν τόν πολίταν, δόμενα δέ καί (ΕΕ) vai tois προσεπετέμνεται ει τό νόμος δικαιείας? [κατά τα αύτα δέ έφησανον] [Μηθηματικόν Αντιστάσιον [7-9 ] vacat

The author is either Mytilene or Eresus, as the other two cities of Lesbos are named in the subscription. The stone has been beveled off immediately to the right of Αντιστάσιος (42); if a third ethnic was inscribed here, there is room for Εφέσιον, but not for Μύτηλανον.

3: Some verb for sending the theoroi is to be assumed.

17: As to kinship, Magnes had a brother Macar, who was founder of Mytilene (Hom. Hymna. Ap. 37; Paus. 6.21.11).
33: év for ἐπάρχῃ seems to be attested only here; perhaps a scribe's error, as at 102.12.
38: The season of Terpheios is unknown; there might be a parallel for specifying the day on which future theoroi are to be elected at 111.69.
39-40: I cannot confirm on stone or squeeze Kern's δίδων, a hapax for ἐρποδαν and incompatible with the plural τά that follows; Klaftenbach (in sched. IG) glosses this as an error. I have assumed the familiar ξενια.

102. Clazomenae

A second column begins at 44.
Kern, I Magnesia 53 [Engelmann/Merkelbach, I Erythrai/Clazomenae II 507].

... θοουκι ἀποτρέπωσαν τοὺς ποτισµαίς καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν· τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐναποκαταστάσεως τοῦ καταστραµένου ναοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων στήλων. Εὐχές ἀρχῆς ἐπετείµαθεν θρήνος τῆς ἀνεχθέντος βασιλείας καὶ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀπαγωγής...
60. 'Εφέσιοι
Πριν νεῖται
Σμύρνας


11 Γ.ΑΙ, 12 ΕΝΑΙΓ (οτέρ (δ) 

47–60) our people, acting in keeping with the example of our ancestors, who for the sake of good reputation and honor devoted themselves to everything that was advantageous to cities in need and who undertook many great struggles because of their understanding that their good deeds stored up among many were a fine and honorable thing, have always imitated them worthily on every occasion, and now, seeing that the Magnesians for their part are acting in keeping with the policy of their ancestors and are piously and honorably disposed toward the divine, on this occasion approve the honors and praise the Magnesians, seeing that they are making a fine and distinguished display of their zeal for the most serious things; and for the future our people, mindful of our traditional friendly and beneficial attitude toward the Magnesians, will devote ourselves without being asked and will stilt in nothing of what behits the city of the Magnesians as regards honor and the rendering of thanks.

That the author is Clazomenae was suggested by Kern and supported by Wilhelm and Haussoullier. Of Ionian cities, only Miletus and Clazomenae are missing in the subscription. The name Hermesioschus (79) occurs on coins of Clazomenae, and exestasia (72) are known there but not at Miletus. Of decrees of Clazomenae we have also I.Erythrai/Klazomenai 503, of the early third century b.C.

These theoroi are not again attested, perhaps because they visited only Ionian cities, all of whose decrees have been reduced to the subscription. Different men, however, were sent to the Dionysiac Artists at Teos (103). Probably the Ionians, near neighbors of Magnesia but in opposite directions, were visited by several sets of theoroi.

The text is especially detailed and ornate and might fairly be reckoned an example of what would later be called the Asiatic style. The unusual passage at 47ff., a long account of the Clazomenians’ motives, in effect explices philotimia as a civic policy.

2: Kern’s restoration is dubious, as Engelmann and Merkelbach note; this is not yet the moment to mention the approach of the theoroi to the assembly, which first occurs at 16.

14–16: The reasoning of the Magnesian decree is summarized: “for by acting in accord with these requests they will be acting in accord with the oracles of the god and will gratify our people.” On the future χαριστεῖσθαι see on 10.3.

19: On συναντάντασσε see Holleux, Etudes III 142–143.

29: The crowning of the city, and with a golden crown, is a substantial honor, and in the Magnesian archive a rare one—otherwise done by the Artists (103), and in gold at 107.23 and perhaps 109.b.27.

33–35: The decree carefully distinguishes that the games were requested by the Magnesians, the inviolability by the god.

65: For ἁνόησιν see Robert, Villes 32 n. 2.

73: The name recurs of a mint magistrate on a Hellenistic bronze issue, BMC Ionia 27 no. 87, Copenhagen Ionia no. 101.

103. The Artists of Dionysus

From line 45, on a lower block.

Kern, L.Magnesia 54.

[------------------------]

For the rendering of thanks.

[---------------------------]

29: The crowning of the city, and with a golden crown, is a substantial honor, and in the Magnesian archive a rare one—otherwise done by the Artists (103), and in gold at 107.23 and perhaps 109.b.27.

33–35: The decree carefully distinguishes that the games were requested by the Magnesians, the inviolability by the god.

65: For ἁνόησιν see Robert, Villes 32 n. 2.

73: The name recurs of a mint magistrate on a Hellenistic bronze issue, BMC Ionia 27 no. 87, Copenhagen Ionia no. 101.

74E: With the author Clazomenae, these are the original thirteen Ionian cities, if we restore Miletus at the end. On Old and New Colophon (the latter is Notium) see Wilhelm, Beitrag 173; Robert, Villes 62.

103. The Artists of Dionysus

From line 45, on a lower block.

Kern, L.Magnesia 54.

[------------------------]
The Ionian-Hellespontine branch of the guild of the Artists of Dionysus was headquartered at Teos. The decree shows that the guild was treated in international law as a Greek government, of like standing with the "kings, nations, cities" of the formula. The theoroi are not those who visited Clazomenae (102), to whose decree the vote of Teos was subscribed. The present men are attested again (whence the restoration) in a second inscription pertinent to the Artists, when subsequently the three were sent by Magnesia to attend a sacrifice conducted by the Artists. Epicurus is also named on silver didrachms and drachms: Kinns, *Kraay–Margholm Essays* 141.

13: Or perhaps [ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἵππων καὶ δεσπότης], to be closer to the text of the oracle; but for a single adjective see 88.37.

15: Otherwise only the Epirotes (82.11) mention that the oracle included honor to Pythian Apollo (67.7).

21: The procession that Kern restored is explicit elsewhere only in line 39; certainly there was one—each year, according to *I.Magn*. 100a.33. In the Coan archive only a single allusion survives to the procession for Asclepius (49.31).

34: I do not understand how the Artists can dictate the proclamation of their action in a contest at Magnesia, or why it is athletic rather than musical; the latter would seem more appropriate, at which too the Artists were subsequently granted prostraria (*I.Magn*. 89.15).

79. *I.Magn*. 89, a stele, not part of the wall, and cut by a different hand, but apparently erected in the southwest corner of the agora near the apye inscriptions (even though the stipulation was to erect it in the temple of Artemis, lines 82–84).

36: μεριστής = "treasurer" also at Istria; but μεριστᾶς is the usual verb for what treasurers do.

42ff.: Here will have been the provision to crown the envoys, mentioned in *I.Magn*. 89.

104. Rhodes

Kern, *I.Magnesia* 55.


[δέσει ταῖς βουλαὶς καὶ τοῖς δήμοις περὶ ὅν] Μάγνητος ἐπιτυχείς διὰ τῆς δόμου [τὸ ψάρισμα] καὶ τοὺς διὰ τέσσερας διὰ τεσσαρεῖς,

4 [ο]δὲ παραγενόμενοι παρῄ[θ]ήναν Λάμπωνον,

Διαγόρας, Πιθοδόμος τῶν ἄγγελο[ρ]άθαν ἐποιήσατο


8 [μι]αρι,[ἀ]ποκρίναμαι αὐτοῖς δὴ ὅδε δαμός πρότερον τε [διετέλει κάσαν εἰς ἐμπεθέκεις κοινεύμενος]


16 δαμοῦ τὰς ἀξιόμενα ὑπὸ Μάγνητος· τοῖς


[καὶ οἴο] δὲν ἔναρξας εὐνύτες καὶ οὔτος καὶ

20 χρόνους συνετείλατε Μάγνητος τὰν θυσίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγάλματα τοῦ Ἀρταμίττος τὰς Λεο[]-


24 καθότι ἡ θυσία ἀποπετάλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ δαμοῦ κατὰ τὰ νομοθετεῖ ἐνιαotypεῖ καὶ εὑρέσχει μορφοτεράν κολλὸν·

28 καλεῖσαι ἐὰν ξένοις ἐλεφθερουσθοῦν.

11 Robert: τ’ ἐσὶ τὰν Κερν.
festival “and the other things as they ask” but does not explicitly mention asyía. The decree serves to date to 208/7 or 207/6 the eponymous priest of Helios Aristonidas (line 18), who is also attested by amphora stamps.80

The few details are bureaucratic in tone. Where the theôi would normally be said to have presented the Magnesian decree, here they “made their deposition” (5). The Rhodians, rather than electing a theôrodes and providing for the future honors for Artemis, establish the lines of authority for doing so and leave all specifics to the future (17ff): “The pyrtanies who hold office in the first semester of the year of Aristonidas, and those who do so in future at such times as the Magnesians celebrate the sacrifice and games for Artemis, are to draft (a proposal) and bring it before the council and people in the month Hyacinthios so that the sacrifice may be sent” (a similar procedure at Cnidus, 105.31ff). It seems a conservative response, committing Rhodes to as few specifics as possible. I take it from 18 that we are near the end of a year and the next eponymous priest of Helios, Aristonidas, is already known. The Rhodian year began in spring or summer (its two semesters were first summer and then winter). In Roman times Hyacinthios (line 23) was the ninth month, so perhaps spring; but there are grounds for thinking that the calendar was reformed in the second century B.C. See Samuel, Chronology 108–110; C. Börker, ZPE 31 (1978) 193–218.

105. Cnidus
Kern, J. Magnesia 56 [Blümel, I. Kniados I 219].
Cf. Wilhelm, Jahresh. 4 (1901) Beibl. 28–29 (Kl. Schr. II.1 154–155); Holleaux, Études 1 318; De Decker, RPhil n.s. 29 (1905) 162–163 (collation).

80. But the Aristonidas of these is dated to 222 B.C. by V. R. Grace, AM 89 (1974) 199.
As Kern saw, a Dorian city visited by these *thoroi* may well be Cos, and Wilhelm aduced some parallel phrasing in Coan decrees. This decree, while not mentioning *asylia* in the preliminaries (except perhaps in "the things asked," 19; cf. 105.26, 107.30), in fact grants it, though in the briefest possible terms (25: "the inviolability and the contest and sacrifice").

28: Wilhelm saw that a new clause, concerned with funds for the sacrifice, begins here and that its subject (*toumali* if this is Cos; cf. S. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* [Gottingen 1978] 210-211; or, for example, *obonovου*) has been omitted by the mason.

32: Kern considered *πόρον* but lacked a parallel; for *πόσειον* = "travel money" cf. *Delphin* 152.65, 104; *I.Cret.* II 3.18. A trip of thirty days is envisaged; contrast the period of five days before and after a festival in 3 and 4.

36: A verb has been omitted by the mason.

107. Unknown city

*I.Magn.* 58 was in situ on the wall, while 73 was found detached; Oguse showed 73 to be the right side of 58.

Kern, *I.Magnasia* 58 and 73a; joined by Oguse, *RPhil* n.s. 54 (1928) 313-319 (Robert, *SEG* 4.509).

The city was in the direction of southwestern Asia Minor; Lampon (3) was alone at Cnidus, and the full team was at Rhodes and Cos. The city spoke Koine and had proochoi (39); Oguse restored an archon as the eponym (39).

It is odd that the decision to crown Magnesia (a rarity in the archive in any case) is put before the response to the request. 108.14 similarly declares a holiday before answering the Magnesians' request.


39: Here as occasionally elsewhere, specifying the eponym under whom money is to be provided for the sacrifice implies that the city was near the end of its current year.

108. Unknown city

Inscribed to the right of 107.

Kern, *IMagnesia* 79b.

---

**Magnesia**
Magnesia 255

Kern saw from the subscription that this Laodicea must be in the vicinity of Caria, thus the city on the Lycus. Useful parallels are supplied by the decrees I.Priene 59 and MAMA VI 5. This Seleucid foundation makes no reference to the king, so far as we have the decree (contrast 110 and 111). This was, however, a long text, and much is lost: we have the provisions for the sacrifice sent to Artemis and for honors for the Magnesians, which followed the recognition of the games (by a.5–6) and ayia (the latter is included in the announcement prescribed at a.29). All of the second column is taken up with provisions and requests for inscribing the text.

a.16: Annual crowning of individuals also in I.Priene 59 (foreign judges); the festival, not named here but implied by the month, was the Antiocheia (cf. Robert, Laodicea of Lycus pp. 25ff).

a.27: Kern’s restoration is uncertain; only the theorai (a.15), not the Magnesian people, are voted a crown in what survives (the provision may have come in a.22–24). What follows concerns the Laodiceans’ proclamation, whether at their own Antiocheia or by an ambassador elected (a.24) to travel to Magnesia for the purpose.
b.9: For the eponymous priest of the City see Robert, *Laodicé* p. 325. Here as occasionally elsewhere, we seem to be near the end of the civic year—the next eponymous magistrate is known.
b.20-21: Perhaps what were "assigned" were rewards for future *theoriai*, the verb used as at 84.20 and Robert, *Op. min. sel.* 535 (cf. 357 n. 2); a new sentence may begin with this finite verb.

110. Unknown city

Kern, *Magna Magnesia* 60.

(four lines lost)

111. Antioch in Persia

Inscribed to the right of 110. A second column begins with line 577 on a second stone from lines 44 and 100.


The author was a subject of the Seleucids, making deferential references to Antiochus III (9, 19). If Ἐρεσίσιος is right in 23 and the king or a subordinate is the subject (as in 97.2), then the city has received instruction from him and this decree must date later than 69—perhaps then later than 205 B.C. But too much is lost to be confident of this. What little we have preserves mention of the games but not of άσυλο.
This is the fullest decree we have from a Seleucid subject city or royal city, a city both founded and governed by the Seleucid crown. See generally the Roberts’ remarks at La Chiron 15 (1985) 9 n. 18.
king to the city concerning their request. Although the Antiochenes mention the oracle (29), they apparently relate it only to the crowned games and (like the Seleucid kings) do not mention inviolability. The king’s presence there seems to guarantee that the year is 205 B.C., his return from his long and successful campaign in the northeast; but it is striking that he is not here given the appointment Antiochus the Great, which that campaign had occasioned (Holleaux, *Études* III 169).

1–6: On dating by the priest of the royal cult see J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon* p. 168. The calendar, with division into semesters and the months Pantheos and Harkleios (69–70), is not Macedonian, nor does the city use the Seleucid era (see *La Carie* II 301 n. 6; Bickerman, *Institutions* 206). It is interesting that the son (cf. 70) has not only the royal title but also a cult.


14–20: As at Megalopolis, the Magnesians were able to cite a historical connection that gave them a special claim on this city’s favor: “When previously Antiochus Soter [281–261 B.C.] did us the benefaction of increasing our city, which was named for him, and sent to them about a colony, they passed a fine and honored decree, made prayers and sacrifices, and sent men sufficient in number and distinguished in virtue, as they were eager to join in increasing the people of Antioch.” Apparently Antioch already was in existence, whether founded by Nicator or Antiochus. We know also that Magnesia at some date sent colonists to Antioch in Pisidia (Strab. 12.8.14 [577]: ταύτην δ’ ξύσσον Μάγνητις όπερ Μαζανδραῖο)—the only colonists there mentioned by Strabo.83 Dittenberger in fact considered the possibility that the latter is our city, with *Πανθεόν* in line 1; that is excluded if 125 is from Antioch in Pisidia (cf. Boesch, *Theta* 66 n. 1).

40–41: In general the sentiment here is like that expressed by so many Cretan cities to Teos, “we too worship Dionysus.” But certainly the Magnesian colonists will have brought some of their own cults with them to Antioch.

51–53: “and because they have used well their private prosperity and the well being of their city and have preserved their ancestral constitution”—the solicitude of a colony for its mother city; cf. Robert, *Laodicé* 331 n. 4.

75: The Roberts8 restoration is on the assumption that Ephesians had also joined in the colony (cf. *Laodicé* 330), not that Ephesus had crowned games (although that is possible at this date).


82. Literary evidence of Roman date attributes the same two months to the original Seleucid capital, Seleucia in Pieria (Samuel, *Chronology* 174); but two inscriptions from there use Seleucid dates (IG2 δ 1183–1184; II b.c.).


112. Unknown city

From line 36, on a lower block.

Kern, *M. Magnesia* 62.

40 part of the state; cf. 1320; 4

of the Parihellenic games, although both are cited in the preliminaries
and there appears to be provision for electing a

ment, this was with

theoroi

(2) is unknown, and the city unidentified. If the acceptance


and there appears to be provision for electing a

ment, this was with

theoroi

(2) is unknown, and the city unidentified. If the acceptance


and there appears to be provision for electing a
20 were found 654/75 [IV 176], Gortyn similarly, and 67 [I viii 10], Cnossus honoring two Magnesians (cf. II vii 7c) for unspecified favors. These decrees probably were carried by the theoroi in illustration of Magnesian services to the Greeks.

116. Unknown city
Inscribed to the right of the Cnossian honorific decree I.Magn. 67.

117. Unknown city
Inscribed to the right of 116.

118. Unknown Cretan city
Inscribed to the right of a decree of Tralles, and those who traveled through central Greece for Magnesia, those sent to Tralles, and those who traveled through central Greece for Alabanda.

Part of a covering letter to a decree; cf. 90.
7: A Theodotus and Aristomachus obtained from Hierapytta in Crete a decree to inscribe various ancestral privileges enjoyed there by Magnesians (L.Cret. III n 3.6). Although the Hierapytta decree is probably later than 208 B.C., the privileges listed do not include territorial inviolability, which apparently was not a concern. Guarducci, who assigned the script of the Hierapytta decree to the early second century B.C., rightly remarked that nothing guarantees the name of Aristomachus at 188.7. Note, however, the second visit to the Artists at Teos by the three theoremi of 208 (cf. on 103).

23-24: Here seems to have been a provision for the military defense of Magnesia, parallel to those in Cretan recognitions of other cities but not in the other decrees.

119. Unknown city

Kern, 1 Magnesia 71.

17 Rightly: [pata tην τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μ. Κερν.

Line 15 shows that this was a letter in form.

20 Europs {a[p]e[toμενή] in the older form, 

Magnesia 267
The only extant decree of Syracuse, and passed three years after the city was sacked by M. Claudius Marcellus. Of the the two sons of Diocles (and was not the chief of that mission); he is nicknamed Taktēs, the eponym of Syracuse is reported to have been the priest of Zeus Olympus (Diod. 16.70.6).

5: Lines 4-7 seem to be a docket rather than part of the decree proper, for they summarize the act so far as to omit where the theoreis came from. The preliminaries reveal an elaborate attention to the proboulemata (as do the Sicilian decrees for Cos 49, 49). A committee of ten drafted the bill and put it before the assembly.

1: The eponym of Syracuse is reported to have been the priest of Zeus Olympus (Diod. 16.70.6).

25-26: See Dubois ad loc. for bibliography on the problem of constitutional forms. I have assumed a simple pair, council and assembly.

39: The Panhellenic games most in honor at Syracuse are those of its mother city, Corinth (cf. 92.14).

122. Unknown city
Inscribed to the right of the Gortynian decree I.Magn. 65a+75, the stone was found near 113.

Kern, I.Magnesia 76.

123. Unknown city

Kern, I.Magnesia 77.

124. Unknown city

Found near 130.

Kern, I.Magnesia 78.

Cf. Boeschi, Theoroi 27 n. 2.
The city was Dorian. Philiscus toured the Peloponnesus—sometimes alone as here (23), sometimes with others. Boesch saw that the pair at 27 were not his subordinates but the foreign city’s demeordoi. The city’s executive or fiscal magistrates were hieromnomoi (23), a rarity in the Peloponnesus; we know the office at Roman Sparta, and they were eponymous at Hellenistic Lusi (IG V2 393–394).

125. Antioch in Pisidia (?)

Kern, J., Magnesia 79+80.


a. τόσον τῆς σεβασμοῦ τῆς [Σπάρτης] ταύτης εἷσθαι 

b. "ἀνάχωσταν ἀπό τοὺς προσευτόντος τοὺς ἱερομνημονεῖς καὶ τὰ συνυπηρετοῦντα Μάγνητιον ἁγιαθὶ ὁ πρὸς θεὸν ἡστήκατο τῇ θεῷ προφ[...]

270 ASYLIA: TERRITORIAL INVOLIABILITY
126. Antioch in ?
Inscribed below the second column of 125.
Kern, I.Magnesia 81.

\[\text{\textit{Theoroi}}\]
\[\text{\textit{Thesmo\deltaoroi}}\]
\[\text{\textit{Savior}}\]

Inscribed immediately after 125, this decree was obtained by the same \textit{theoroi}.
The decree was evidently short, and in what survives there is evidence of games but not \textit{asylia}. The city dated its acts by a \textit{stragoros}. The month Simisios (\(\gamma\)) is attested otherwise only at Magnesia itself, so this passage may state a synchronism (for the sending of future Magnesian \textit{theoroi}) rather than a month of the author.

127. Unknown city

Found near 110-111; inscribed by a different hand from that of the rest of the archive.
Kern, I.Magnesia 82.
Photograph: Kern pl. v (lines 7-16).

\[\text{\textit{Antiochoi}}\]
\[\text{\textit{Antiochetes}}\]

\[\text{\textit{Savior}}\]
Prytanis was one of the theoria to the Artists at Teos (103), a relatively short trip, so that he was perhaps available at once for another mission. As the fragment begins the city is accepting the games; mention of inviolability does not survive. The invitation to “dinner” (δόρφος) is the most individual item (14); as occasionally elsewhere, an escort is provided for the departing theoroi (16).

128. Attalid city

Inscribed to the right of 127, but in the script of the majority of the archive.

Kern, I. Magnesia 83.

Photograph: Kern pl. v (lines 5–14).


8 Holleaux (or εἰςηγγελμένης θειαν). 9 Holleaux: ΘΕΣ lapis. 9–10 Holleaux from the photograph: γυναικικος αυτου βασιλισσης Στρατινίκης Kern. 16 Righty, from 127.16.

Although this decree appears to have been inscribed by the same mason who did the rest of the archive, Kern assigned it to the reign of Eumenes (107–159 B.C.), noting its placement to the right of 127; and if Holleaux was right in seeing the queen mother rather than Stratonice, the date is before Eumenes married Stratonice.

In 208 Attalus had promised that his subjects would respond favorably (68); this decree, like those that certainly are under Eumenes, may derive from a city acquired by the Attalid dynasty only in 188 B.C. But in general I do not see why the Magnesians would have failed to canvass these cities in 208 (especially their neighbor Tralles), no matter who the cities’ ruler had been at that time. Two ambassadors made up this team (14). Line 6 shows that the games were accepted; no trace survives about ayaia.

5: “by the moon”, the season of the Leucophryenia is here defined in terms of the local calendar, as “in the second month” at the Attalid city of 130.9.

9–10: It seems the formula was like that found in the decrees of Attalid cities that certainly are later than 208 B.C. (130.16, 131.15), hence Holleaux’s emendation of ΤΗΣ.
These ambassadors do not recur in Magnesian inscriptions; but Diogoras son of Isagoras, evidently the ambassador’s son, moved the decree for a new statue of Artemis in the second half of the second century B.C. (L.Magn. 100).

The games but inviolability are mentioned in the preliminaries (although the oracle is); but both are granted in the decree proper. The letter of Attalus I (168) does not include *ayiia*.

1: The proposal is by the college of executive magistrates; *stratejoi* were frequent in Attalid cities, often numbering five, as at Pergamum (cf. 131; see Allen, *Attalid Kingdom* 104–109).

3: Magnesia and Tralles shared a border, Tralles being the next city up the Maeander Valley.

18: For the order “inviolable and sacred” see p. 33.

20: In 208 B.C. there would have been few “isophtian” games that could have been invoked; the comfortable analogy used here reflects the later date, for Panhellenic festivals proliferated in the late third and early second centuries.

23ff.: Such a specification of a dedicatory object to be presented to Artemis by the first Attalid *theos* is unique in the *ayiia* inscriptions.

130. Attalid city

Same mason as 129 and 131.

Kern, *L.Magnesia* 86.


These are the references for the Magnesia inscription.

In 208 B.C. Tralles would still have been called “Seleucia”; it reverted to its original name after the defeat of Antiochus III in 190 and the end of Seleucid power in western Anatolia. This confirms the implication of the common hand that wrote 131 in the time of Attalus II, that the Trallian decree was obtained later than the rest of the archive.
Inscribed by the same mason as the other two late decrees of Attalid cities, this dates explicitly under Eumenes II Soter (197–193). Inviolability is not mentioned—but the epiphany is (6), and in fact little of the text survives; 129 omitted aya in the preliminaries but recognized it in the decree proper, which here is mostly lost.

The roster of the royal house is quite full, like that of 131 under Attalus II (cf. 128), more than in 129. In line 9, the phrase for "for security and inviolability" seems to apply to "those who come" to the games (cf. 9.10) rather than to territorial inviolability. In 9, the date of the Magnesians' festival appears to be reckoned by the moon.

131. Attalid city

Same mason as 129 and 130.

Kern, I. Magnesia 87 [Dittenberger, OGIS 319].