

# A Hellenistic Inscription from Bargylia

*Kent J. Rigsby*

IN 1739 Richard Pococke copied on Samos an inscription which, he was told, had been brought to the island from Mylasa in Caria.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of Pococke's majuscule copy, Boeckh in 1835 was able to present the text in a scholarly fashion, recognizing in it the remains of two civic decrees concerning the acceptance of the panhellenic games and the inviolability (*ἀσυλία*) of some city or temple.<sup>2</sup> In 1903 Paul Graindor offered a number of new restorations, an interpretation of the diplomatic relationship of the two decrees, and a theory about the identity of the city honored.<sup>3</sup> I shall reserve a reëdition of this document for a corpus of grants of inviolability which I am preparing; but the identity of the city that received these honors, on which Graindor's suggestions must be rejected, merits a separate investigation.

The upper text is a letter in Doric from the recipient of the honors to Bargylia; the lower is the Bargylian decree recognizing the Dorian city's panhellenic games and inviolability. The stone itself therefore probably stood originally at Bargylia (as Pococke already suspected), coming to Samos by way of Mylasa if his informant was correct, and is the grantor's copy: for the recipient of the status, in its inscribed archive of such grants, is less likely to have included its own letter. Graindor understood the upper text as a vote of thanks to Bargylia for its favorable response to the Dorian city's request for the recognition; such a gesture would not be completely unparalleled (*cf.* IG IV 679). The order of the two texts on the stone, however, suggests strongly that the Dorian letter is the ordinary initial invitation to Bargylia to recognize the festival (*cf.* Syll.<sup>3</sup> 590). Otherwise we must imagine, with Graindor, that the Dorian city learned Bargylia's

<sup>1</sup> R. Pococke, *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Graecarum et Latinarum Liber* (London 1752) 44; on the poor quality of his copies see L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 23 and 135.

<sup>2</sup> A. Boeckh, CIG II 2670, with reproduction of Pococke's majuscules. The basic studies of *ἀσυλία* remain B. Barth, *De Graecorum Asylis* (Strasbourg 1888) and E. Schlesinger, *Die griechische Asylie* (Giessen 1933); for panhellenic games see P. Boesch, *Θεωπόσις, Untersuchung zur Epangelie griechischer Feste* (Zürich 1908), and the references in Hug, RE 3A (1929) 2351 s.v. STEPHANITES AGON.

<sup>3</sup> *MusB* 7 (1903) 296–300.

response and conveyed a vote of thanks before Bargylia had inscribed its own decree.<sup>4</sup>

The date of the inscription can be estimated, for virtually all extant civic grants of ἀσυλία fall between approximately 250 and 150 B.C. From the surviving text we know that the city in question was Dorian and that its chief divinity, honored with ἀσυλία, was a goddess (τᾶς θε[οῦ], line 11). Two of Graindor's restorations, which would identify the city and the cult, must be rejected. In the Bargylian decree (line 25), he understood [δεδοχθαι τῶι δήμωι· ἐπαινέσαι] τὸν δῆμον τοῦς Τε[- -], and suggested Τ(η)[λίους] as the ethnic to be restored. But a subject is otiose and confusing with this infinitive; the sentiment is usually phrased ἐπαινέσαι τὸν δῆμον τῶν δεινῶν. Boeckh's restoration, [δεδοχθαι μετέχειν] τὸν δῆμον τοῦ στε[φανίτου ἀγῶνος], is at least economical. Telos, moreover, was probably too insignificant ever to have obtained inviolability and panhellenic games.<sup>5</sup>

Again, as Graindor restored, the Dorian city had sent its ambassadors "concerning the Persian goddess and inviolability," [περὶ τε τᾶς θεοῦ τᾶς Περσ]ικᾶς καὶ περὶ τᾶς ἀσυλία[ς] (line 6, left unrestored by Boeckh). This is most unlikely. This divinity is known expressly as 'the Persian goddess' only in Lydia, in the Hyrcanian plain and around Mt Tmolus; under other names she is attested rather more widely in Anatolia.<sup>6</sup> But we may not imagine that a Dorian city of the Hellenistic age had 'the Persian goddess' as its chief divinity.

From what is known today about the proliferation of panhellenic games and of inviolability among Hellenistic cities, it may be possible to suggest another identity for the city and cult. Inviolability was the most prized civic status of the Hellenistic world, attained by fewer than twenty cities or temples in the first century of its existence. Of those known to us few were Dorian, and most of these are removed

<sup>4</sup> Boesch, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 99 n.1, commented on this oddity but accepted Graindor's interpretation; but see L. Robert, *BCH* 49 (1925) 236 n.5 (*Opera Minora Selecta* I [Paris 1969] 30), who also rejects Graindor's identification of the city and cult.

<sup>5</sup> The evidence for Telos as an independent city is collected by L. Robert, *RevPhil* 1934, 43–48 (*Opera Minora* I 569–74).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. H. Oppermann, *RE* 19 (1937) 1026–29 s.v. PERSIKE: this epithet only at Hierocaesarea, Hypaepa, Mermere and the ancient site southwest of Sarı Çam (cf. L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure*<sup>2</sup> [Paris 1962] 88–90, especially 89 n.2 on the provenance of C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* [New Haven 1934] no.68). See further L. Robert, *Hellenica* 4 (Paris 1948) 19 n.1, *CRAI* 1953, 410f (*Opera Minora Selecta* III [Paris 1969] 1532f), *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie-Mineure* I (Paris 1963) 217 and 349, on these cults as evidence of Iranian population groups.

from consideration by the gender of the honored divinity: Asclepius at Cos, Apollo at Chalcedon, Delphi, Anaphe. After such eliminations, the one possible candidate, a Dorian city with a goddess honored with inviolability and panhellenic games, would seem to be Megara with the cult of Artemis Soteira: L. Robert has identified an inscription said to be from Megara as a fragment of an archive of ἀκυλία grants.<sup>7</sup> Some doubt, however, attaches to this case, for, as Robert observed, the name of one of the allegedly Megarian ambassadors is not Doric (–νθοδημον). One is obliged to choose between the possibilities of a mason’s error (H for A), a ‘pierre errante’, or an error on the part of Viscount Strangford (who acquired the stone in the 1820’s).<sup>8</sup>

There is some reason, then, to pass over Megara and search among cities not currently known as recipients of inviolability. In seeking a Dorian goddess honored in our period by the creation of panhellenic games, one finds, if I am not mistaken, only Artemis Hyacinthotrophos of Cnidus.<sup>9</sup> The enlargement of her contest is known from two fragmentary inscriptions dated to the late third or early second century B.C., one a Delphian decree of recognition inscribed on the Cnidian treasury at Delphi (FD III.1 308), the other an unpublished text from Cos containing the Cnidian decree of request and the Coan recognition.<sup>10</sup> Several victors in the panhellenic Hyacinthotropheia are subsequently attested in late Hellenistic inscriptions.<sup>11</sup> In the second century B.C. the goddess bore the added title Ἐπιφανής, and indeed the unpublished Cnidian decree cites a manifestation of Artemis as the occasion for the requested increase in her honors.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 70–76, on IG VII 16.

<sup>8</sup> On Percy Clinton Sydney Smythe, sixth Viscount of Strangford and British ambassador in Istanbul from 1821 to 1824, see E. Barrington de Fonblanque, *Lives of the Lords Strangford* (London 1877) 107–203; DNB 18.603–05. Mr B. F. Cook of the British Museum, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, kindly writes that “research on other objects from his Collection suggests that the stated provenances are not always reliable and may be disregarded,” and refers to an instance in the forthcoming *Journal* of the J. Paul Getty Museum. Foucart and Holleaux’s attribution to Cyzicus would then be possible (M. Holleaux, *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques* I [Paris 1938] 211–17).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Boesch, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 98–99, with Robert, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.4). The cult of Demeter Chthonia at Hermione should be noted, although participation in this festival does not seem to have extended beyond the Peloponnesus (IG IV 679 and 727; Boesch 117).

<sup>10</sup> R. Herzog, *ArchAnz* 1905, 11, cf. *Hermes* 65 (1930) 462; M. Segre in L. Robert, *Hellenica* 5 (Paris 1948) 108 n.1.

<sup>11</sup> L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (Paris 1949) 114–16.

<sup>12</sup> SGDI 3502.13f, a temple and priest for Ἀρτάμιτι Ἰακυνθοτρόφωι [καὶ] Ἐπιφανεῖ; 3512, a dedication to Ἀρτάμιτι Ἰακυνθοτρόφωι Ἐπιφανεῖ; for the manifestation see Herzog, *ArchAnz* 1905, 11.

In antiquity public miracles tended to happen when they were needed, and they were most often needed in time of military crisis, the god intervening to save his city.<sup>13</sup> Homolle, commenting on the Delphian decree, was surely right to suspect that the background of the event was a military attack on Cnidus. I suggest that the Bargylian inscription reveals a similar background, for the Dorian city has restored its contest, evidently after a lapse: [τοῦ] ἀγῶνος δ(ν) ἀποκατέστα[σεν ἅ πόλις ἀμέων] (line 8: OT Pococke). While many reasons might be imagined for such a lapse, war is the cause of the disruption of festivals that is most commonly mentioned in Hellenistic texts,<sup>14</sup> and it is a reasonable deduction that the Dorian city has been under attack.

Moreover, miracles tended in Hellenistic diplomacy to merit more than the creation of panhellenic games; they were, in fact, commonly the occasion to ask for the recognition of inviolability. This tendency may shed further light on the Delphian decree (the only published acceptance of the Hyacinthotropheia). Fragmentary throughout and of undetermined line-length, the text states that Cnidus has sent ambassadors to Delphi and has undertaken to increase the honors of the goddess, asking Delphi to join in this effort: Delphi decrees to praise the Cnidians for the piety they show Artemis Hyacinthotrophos, καὶ ἀποδεδέχθαι [ι τ]ὰν πόλιν τὰν [θυσίαν – – καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας μουσικὸν καὶ] | γυμνικὸν ἰσοπυθίου κτλ. (lines 9–10; Homolle suggested in his note on the passage [θυσίαν ἂν μέλλουσιν ἄγειν καὶ τὰν πανάγυριν]). The restoration is not altogether satisfactory. The verb serves first without and then with a double accusative, and is endowed with a subject where none is needed (the subject τὰν πόλιν is stated later, in line 12, when future enactments are promised with a present infinitive). Homolle considered the restoration τὰν πόλιν τὰν [Κνιδίων ἄκυλον εἶμεν] only to reject it: “the Cnidians are called ὁ δᾶμος l. 14, and the words ἀποστειλάς l. 3, αὐτῶι l. 4, αὐτοῦ l. 8, prove that throughout the text ὁ δᾶμος τῶν Κνιδίων is to be restored” (FD III p.171 n.1). The restoration would indeed be mistaken, but not for the reason stated. The formula ‘city and country’ is virtually obligatory in grants of ἀκυλία to a city, and the use of this formula is not dependent on the

<sup>13</sup> See in general F. Pfister, *RE Suppl.* 4 (1924) 277ff, s.v. EPIPHANIE; P. Roussel, *BCH* 55 (1931) 95ff.

<sup>14</sup> As examples see *OGIS* 55.33ff; H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* III (Munich 1969) no.523.8ff and 46ff; *AthMitt* 33 (1908) 406 no.35, cf. Chr. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon* VIII.3 (Berlin 1969) 26ff; *IG IX.1* 694.18ff and 25ff; cf. Robert, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 426.

juridical person that authors the city's decrees.<sup>15</sup> The proper formula would also make of this line a Greek sentence: ἀποδεδέχθα[ι τ]ὰν πόλιν τὰν [Κνιδίων καὶ τὰν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας κτλ.]

If these suggestions are correct, the Bargylian and Delphian inscriptions both stem from an effort by Cnidus, around 200 B.C., to obtain Greek recognition of panhellenic games and inviolability. But it must be emphasized that there is no specific point of contact between the two texts (such as the ambassadors' names or a mention in the Delphian decree of the unusual 'restoration' of the contest) which would guarantee that the two texts concerned the same city. If the Dorian city of the Bargylian inscription is Cnidus, then the opening of the letter is vague and therefore unrevealing: [Κνιδίων (ὁ δᾶμος καὶ) οἱ ἄρχοντες Βαργυλιητῶν τᾶι πόλι [χαίρειν]. Cnidus did not to our knowledge have 'archons', but civic letters were authored by 'the magistrates' (οἱ ἄρχοντες) collectively<sup>16</sup> as often as by the chief executive magistrates, who at Cnidus would have been the *προστάται*.<sup>17</sup> If the name of the goddess is to be restored in line 6, perhaps the Cnidians on this occasion used one of the most common epithets of Artemis: [περὶ τᾶς Ἀρτάμιτος τᾶς Σωτερί(ρ)ας καὶ περὶ τᾶς ἄκυλίας[ε].<sup>18</sup> The necessary implication of these suggestions is that there was at Cnidus an inscribed archive of decrees of inviolability, none of which has been found on the site. The archive would probably have been inscribed on the temple of Artemis, which has not yet been identified. A cult of the importance of Artemis Hyacinthotrophos might fittingly have occupied the Corinthian temple of Roman imperial date in the northwest part of the city. This building had been at last report only superficially excavated,<sup>19</sup> but presumably it replaced an earlier

<sup>15</sup> Random examples of a δῆμος whose city and country are declared inviolable are *ICr* I. xxvii 1 and II.iii 1 for Teos.

<sup>16</sup> E.g., ἡ πόλις καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες at Cydonia rather than the κόσμοι (*ICr* II x 2); cf. ἡ πόλις at Thessalonica (*IG* X.2 1028).

<sup>17</sup> Thus the *strategoí* at Athens (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 664) and Lampsacus (*BCH* 77 [1953] 426), the polemarchs and *synedroi* at Thebes (*ICr* II xxiii 1); a letter from Thera to Cnidus was addressed to *προστά[τ]αίς καὶ [τῶ]ι δά[μω]ι* (*IG* XII.3 322; the usage of the Roman chancellery in *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 780 is uninformative here).

<sup>18</sup> Pococke mistook *K* for *P* in line 14. This epithet, however, was apparently not used in the Delphian decree, and not in the two texts cited *supra* n.12.

<sup>19</sup> See the general description in E. Akurgal, *Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey*<sup>3</sup> (Istanbul 1973) 252f; I. Love in M. Mellink, *AJA* 73 (1969) 216, for the date; *AJA* 76 (1972) 61, for the state of the excavations.

temple and its inscriptions. Future excavation may resolve these matters.

Homolle recognized from the Delphian decree the event that must lie behind the Cnidian request.<sup>20</sup> If the Bargylian text concerns Cnidus, it further clarifies one of the central events in the city's history. During his Carian expedition,<sup>21</sup> Philip V, probably late in the summer of 201, besieged Cnidus, making several unsuccessful attacks and finally withdrawing, defeated by the strength of the place.<sup>22</sup> By autumn he had moved on to the north, ravaging Mylasa and Alabanda and holding Bargyilia under siege through the winter, until he evacuated Caria in the early months of 200. The expedition was not without some success, for several cities, including Bargyilia, owed him some sort of allegiance still in 196.<sup>23</sup> The two inscriptions suggest what these events meant to Cnidus: that the time for the Hyacinthotropheia, which will have been annual, came while Cnidus was under siege, and the festival could not be held; that Artemis, manifesting herself in some way, was credited with the withdrawal of the Macedonian forces from the city; and that the Cnidians, following what had become a custom in the third century, commemorated this event by seeking Greek recognition of the sanctity of their city and the pan-hellenic status of the restored games of Artemis, who, for a time at least,<sup>24</sup> became the patron divinity of Cnidus.

The granting of inviolability was a matter that transcended political allegiance. In this instance, Aetolian Delphi and Antigonid Bargyilia recognize the sanctity of a free city. The two neighbors Bargyilia and Cnidus had both suffered at the hands of a powerful invader, and Bargyilia evidently much the worse. Indeed, the Cnidians, commemorating the event which had preserved their independence, must have realized that their own good fortune could not have been viewed with indifference at Bargyilia. Edouard Will, in a provocative note on

<sup>20</sup> *FD III 1* (1929) p.171 n.2 "if we reject a private apparition of the goddess to a believer and consider rather an official manifestation, occurring in a moment of crisis, to save the city, for example from danger in war, we may recall the siege of Cnidus by Philip in 201."

<sup>21</sup> For the chronology, see M. Holleaux, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) IV (1952) 211ff.

<sup>22</sup> Polyb. 16.11.1; the city is identified only by a gloss, as H. H. Schmitt properly cautions (*Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochus' der Grossen und seiner Zeit* [Wiesbaden 1964] 258), but its accuracy has not been questioned.

<sup>23</sup> Livy 33.30.3, with H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit*<sup>2</sup> II (Munich 1964) 367ff.

<sup>24</sup> On the possible later eclipse of the contest of Artemis see L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (Paris 1949) 116.

these years, detected the growth of a feeling of community among the old Greek cities of the eastern Aegean in the face of the increasing feebleness and violence of the Hellenistic monarchs.<sup>25</sup> Perhaps the rapid spread of ἀσυλία in these years was facilitated by this same spirit.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

*July, 1975*

<sup>25</sup> *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* II (Nancy 1967) 109: "no one will doubt that the crisis of the great kingdoms . . . had meant a degree of relaxation for the Greek cities of the old tradition, on the islands and the coast of Asia Minor, and had fostered regional alliances among cities and with a Pergamum as yet not formidable. The evidence is nevertheless insufficient to reveal whether this was a factor fostering a trend toward federalism . . . but it is certain that the brutal irruption of Philip V into a little world no longer accustomed to feel too heavily the weight of royal tutelage would have favored its cohesion."