

I THE PROBLEM

DURING THE TWO GENERATIONS which fall before and after 480 B.C. Miletus underwent shifts of fortune more extreme than those of almost any other Greek state. After being “the glory of Ionia” in the late sixth century the city was laid in ruins and left desolate in 494 (Hdt. 5.28, 6.18–21); when the Persians withdrew from Ionia in 479 Miletus again grew into at least a middling city in which the oligarchs courted and then defied imperial Athens, to be replaced by a democracy on the Athenian model ([Xen.] *Const. Ath.* 3.11; *IG I³* 21, Athenian regulations for Miletus; *IG I³* 259–290, the Athenian tribute-quota lists; Herrmann 165–166 = *BullEp* 1971 no. 584, a Milesian decree of the later fifth century, of either 437/6 or 413/2 or 404/3, displaying Cleisthenic institutions in the prescript). So much can be said at once from a straightforward reading of the evidence, without resorting to any controversial interpretation.

Yet at many points the evidence is not so tidy. Both the tribute-quota lists and the regulations for Miletus are elliptic in themselves and survive only in mutilated fragments; and other sources add other complications. There are literary anecdotes, at once silly and significant, about fierce continuing social conflicts both in the city and in the country districts of Miletus (Hdt. 5.28–29; Ath. 12.26, 523f–524b = Heracleides Ponticus fr. 50 Wehrli; Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 32, 298c–d; etc.). There is a Milesian decree inscribed on a base from the North Market, ruthlessly proscribing some prominent citizens (*SIG³* 58 = *Milet* 1.6 no. 187 = *GHI²* 43 = Piérart “Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . .” 366–367). There are the statutes of the Molpi recovered from the Delphinium, which show that during most of our period the chief public ritual and festivity, including the annual procession to Didyma, were in the hands of an elite group who took special measures in the years 525/4, 479/8, and 450/49 (Wilamowitz, *SBBerl* 1904.619–623 = *Milet* 1.3 no. 133 = *SIG³* 57 = *LSAM* 50). Given this range of tantalizing evidence, which includes some new accessions, and given also the outstanding importance of Miletus, it is understandable that scholars have written so much and agreed in so little.¹

¹The following deal with the relations of Athens and Miletus at the mid century: R. Meiggs, “The Growth of Athenian Imperialism,” *JHS* 63 (1943) 21–34, at 25–27; A. J. Earp, “Athens and Miletus ca 450 B.C.,” *Phoenix* 8 (1954) 142–147; J. P. Barron, “Milesian Politics and Athenian Propaganda,” *JHS* 82 (1962) 1–6; M. Piérart, “Les ἐπιμήνιοι de Milet,” *AntCl* 38 (1969) 365–388; P. Herrmann, “Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Athen und Milet im 5. Jahrhundert,” *Klio* 52 (1970) 163–173; C. W. Fornara, “The Date of the ‘Regulations for Miletus,’”

Over the years certain hypotheses have had their run and now are laid to rest. No piece of evidence points to a family or clan of Neleids active in government in the late sixth and early fifth century. The story of the end of the Neleid kingship which we read in Nicolaus of Damascus (*FGrHist* 90 FF 52–53) is an *aition* deduced from customs and conditions prevailing in later times, from the cults of Apollo and the Cabeiri and from the ceremonial duties of the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi, and not from any memory or relic of actual Neleid predominance. That mythical Neleids sometimes bear the same names as well-to-do persons in sixth- and fifth-century Miletus is only to be expected.

Equally illusory are the *aisymnetes* and five *proshetairoi* as the chief magistrates of oligarchic government. Both the statutes of the Molpi and several later inscriptions, Hellenistic and Roman, show that the *aisymnetes* and his *proshetairoi* had extensive, not only token, ritual duties; nothing suggests that they were also entrusted with effective political power, or ever had been. It was therefore misguided to introduce the titles *aisymnetes* and

AJP 92 (1971) 473–475; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972); B. D. Meritt, "The Tribute Quota List of 454–453 B.C.," *Hesperia* 41 (1972) 403–417, pls. 99–100; D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor, *Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy* (Norman, Okla. 1973) 24–70; M. Piérart, "Milet dans la première liste de tributs," *ZPE* 15 (1974) 163–167; H.-J. Gehrke, "Zur Geschichte Milets in der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.," *Historia* 29 (1980) 17–31; H. B. Mattingly, "The Athenian Decree for Miletos (*IG* I² 22+ = ATL II, D 11): a Postscript," *Historia* 30 (1981) 113–117; S. Cataldi, "La secessione dei βέλτιστοι milesi e le συγγραφαί ateniesi per Mileto," in G. Nenci, ed., *Studi sui rapporti interstatali nel mondo antico* (Pisa 1981) 161–233; J. M. Balcer, "Miletos (*IG* I².22 [1³.21]) and the Structures of Alliances," in W. Schuller, ed., *Studien zum attischen Seebund* (Konstanz 1984) 11–30.

We should also take account of recent work on Miletus' constitution: M. Piérart, "La 'sixième' tribu de Milet," *BCH* 102 (1978) 563–564; "La constitution de Milet à la lumière des institutions de ses colonies," in D. M. Pippidi, ed., *Actes du VII^e congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine* (Bucharest 1979) 439–440; "Athènes et Milet I. Tribus et dèmes milésiens," *MusHelv* 40 (1983) 1–18; N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen* (Frankfurt 1983); M. Piérart, "Athènes et Milet II. L'organisation du territoire," *MusHelv* 42 (1985) 276–299.

The decree of the Molpi has mostly been the subject of separate studies: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Satzungen einer milesischen Sängergilde," *SBBerl* 1904.619–640; reviewing *Milet* 1.3 at *GGA* 176 (1914) 65–109, at 76–80, 82 = *Kleine Schriften* 5.1 (Berlin 1936) 417–466, at 429–434, 436; O. A. Danielsson, "Bemerkungen zu dem auf einer milesischen Inschrift erhaltenen Kultgesetz der 'Molpoi'," *Eranos* 14 (1914) 1–20; W. Vollgraff, "De lege collegii cantorum Milesii," *Mnemosyne* ns 46 (1918) 415–427; S. Luria, "Ein milesischer Männerbund im Lichte ethnologischer Parallelen," *Philologus* 83 (1928) 113–136; G. De Sanctis, "I Molpi di Mileto," *Studi in onore di P. Bonfante* (Milan 1930) 2.671–679 = *Scritti minori* 4 (Rome 1976) 461–469; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, "Miletos 1," *RE* 15.2 (1932) 1595–1596; F. Poland, "Μολποί," *RE Supp.* 6 (1935); S. Luria, "Kureten, Molpen, Aisymneten," *AAntHung* 11 (1963) 31–36. Cf. F. Graf, "Das Kollegium der Molpoi von Olbia," *MusHelv* 31 (1974) 209–215; "Apollon Delphinios," *MusHelv* 36 (1979) 2–22.

These contributions will be cited hereafter in abbreviated form, as will B. Hemberg, *Die Kabiren* (Uppsala 1950).

proshetairoi into the Athenian regulations for Miletus—even before a closer inspection of the traces excluded the proposed reading (*IG* I³ 21.7 n.).

These negative conclusions were firmly stated in 1980 by H.-J. Gehrke, whose critique of earlier reconstructions is largely valid. But his own cannot stand in their place. The net result of Gehrke's study is to minimize the evidence and to simplify the course of events which it discloses. He thinks that [Xenophon] and the tribute-quota lists together show the oligarchs of Miletus in revolt from Athens between ca 457 and 452; before this the oligarchs held power with Athenian support, and after this a democracy was installed by Athens and lasted for many years; the banishment decree, *Milet* 1.6 no. 187, was among the first enactments of this democracy, while the presiding committee of the council were still called *epimenioi* rather than *prytaneis*; the regulations for Miletus, *IG* I³ 21, tightened Athenian control in 450/49, and a few years later the tribute assessment was reduced by half.

The objections to Gehrke are as follows. First, and most importantly, the case for a revolt of Miletus in the mid 450s, which was always fragile, is now quite destroyed by the third group of Milesians appearing in a new fragment of the first tribute-quota list (*IG* I³ 259 III 19); the conjectural suppletion of the new fragment that is meant to shore up this case is in fact unbelievable. Second, experts have judged that the lettering and the archaeological provenance of the banishment decree are earlier than the mid century; and now that the term *prytanis* in the Athenian sense is attested for Miletus in the later fifth century, perhaps as early as 437/6,² it seems very wilful to suppose that the same institution was called by a different name just a few years earlier. Third, the Athenian regulations for Miletus show an oligarchy still in power as late as 450/49, perhaps even later. Fourth, the statutes of the Molpi cannot be simply swept aside as they are by Gehrke; like the regulations they indicate an adjustment in the oligarchic regime in 450/49, whence it follows that the undoubted secession of Miletus from Athens at the instance of this regime must be later. All these points will be argued at length in due course.

If it is granted that every previous reconstruction including Gehrke's is flawed, what prospect is there of success? It seems to me that both the epigraphic and the literary evidence can tell us more than has been grasped about the make-up of Milesian government and society, especially about the tension between town and country, and about the successive efforts of conciliation or constraint on the part of the civic authorities. In the light of our literary sources a recurring pattern is discernible in the statutes of the Molpi, in the banishment decree, even in the Athenian regulations for Miletus and the tribute-quota lists. The result is a fairly clear and definite

²The new decree begins, after the loss of a line and a half, Εὐδήμο· Λεωντ[ὶς ἐπρυτά]νευεν (Herrmann 165). "Eudemus" must be a *stephanephoros* or the father of one; the *stephanephoroi* of 437/6 and of 404/3 were so called, and the father of the *stephanephoros* of 413/2. Gehrke admits 437/6 as a possible date, and even as the likeliest (18, n. 4).

picture of Miletus' internal history over a long period. It will be convenient to take these four main items in turn.

II THE STATUTES OF THE MOLPI

The statutes of the Molpi, *Milet* 1.3 no. 133, take the form of a decree issued by this body in 450/49 B.C. in which they undertake "to write up the observances, τὰ ὄργια, and to place them in the shrine [the Delphinium], and to abide by these observances," χρῆσθαι τούτοιςιν (lines 4–5). Although the copy we have was inscribed in late Hellenistic times, it is clear that all the main observances are earlier than 450/49 B.C.—earlier in fact than 479/8 B.C., when a material amendment was inserted at the end (lines 40–42).³ The dating of the decree and of the earlier amendment is given by the names of the annual *aisymnetes* of the Molpi, later called the *stephanephoros*, who is known from civic documents as the eponymous magistrate of Miletus. The list of eponyms, also posted in the Delphinium, begins in 525/4 B.C. (*Milet* 1.3 nos. 122–129); so this year too saw an important development.

The political significance of these statutes has not been properly appreciated; scholars say either too much or too little. It is obvious that the *aisymnetes* and his associates are ceremonial figures; they have no real power.⁴ But the prescript of the decree shows that in 450/49 Miletus was still governed by an oligarchy. For the five associates of the *aisymnetes*, his *proshetairoi*, are labelled as belonging to one or another of the old Ionic tribes: Οἰνώπων Ἀγαμήδης Ἀριστοκράτεος, Ὀπλήθων Λύκος Κλέαντος κτλ. (lines 1–4). Later in the fifth century Miletus has Cleisthenic tribes and prytanies, and the inescapable conclusion is that these were introduced when Athens imposed democracy in place of oligarchy.⁵ It has indeed been held that, as at Athens,

³A few very minor points of ritual are commonly recognized as subsequent insertions (lines 8–10, 23–25, 33–34, 36–37, 43–45); they do no more than amplify the original text, and need not even be later than the decree of 450/49. It is arguable too that lines 20–23 are a somewhat larger insertion, for they disturb the general arrangement by mentioning festivals other than the parade to Didyma—the Thargelia, Metageitnia, Hebdomaea; they may or may not be later than 450/49. In the regulations for the cult of Rome which were inscribed in ca 130 B.C. we find offerings by the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi on 7th Thargelion and 12th Metageitnion (*Milet* 1.7, no. 203 a 26–33 = *LSAM* 49 B 26–33). It is wrong to infer, as Poland does (512–513, 519), that the re-publication of our decree must be earlier; for as we shall see, the decree does not aim to describe all the ritual duties of the Molpi at any given time. The re-publication was no doubt inspired by antiquarian interest, though some of the provisions may have been revived.

⁴So De Sanctis. Graf ("Apollon Delphinios" 7) regards the Molpi as an early *Männerbund*, and Ehrhardt (143, 202), accepting this, takes it as a consequence that they once possessed effective power. But Ehrhardt himself (192–203) has shown reason to suppose that the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi did not become an eponymous magistrate until the mid seventh century, superseding the *prytanis*; this is much too late for the advancement of a *Männerbund*.

⁵Cf., e.g., Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 381–382, "La constitution de Milet . . ." 440, "Athènes et Milet I . . ." 1, 5; Gehrke 30; Ehrhardt 98.

so at Miletus the old tribes continued to figure in ritual.⁶ But in the prescript of our decree the tribal affiliation of the *proshetairoi* has no ritual significance. Only three of the six Ionic tribes happen to be represented, one tribe furnishing one *proshetairos*, two others furnishing two each; the five-member board is incommensurate with the tribes, and the *proshetairoi* have been selected on some other principle (we shall come back to this).⁷ So far as we can tell, Miletus had no reason to perpetuate the old names in ritual, inasmuch as the tribal bodies, as distinct from their names, seem to have been left unchanged: the division both before and after was twelvefold.⁸ Instead the *proshetairoi* are labelled as any citizen might be. From the fourth century onwards the public documents of Miletus commonly give a man's tribe in the genitive; our decree is an early example, from the days of the Ionic tribes. Thus the Molpi were active under an oligarchic government; we shall see that part of their festivity is typical of oligarchs.

The substance of the decree falls into three sections and may be summarized as follows. The first section, with the heading "Hebdomaea," Ἑβδομαίους, gives rules for the festival so named, at which a new board of *aisymnetes* and *proshetairoi* come forward, and both the new board and the old engage in tippling and contests (lines 6–18). In the second section, beginning with the clause ὅταν στεφανηφόροι ἴωσιν ἐς Διδύμα, the subject is the annual procession to Didyma, and the stages are described in some detail (lines 18–31); the city supplies certain victims, and in a brief digression we hear of the victims that the city will supply to the Molpi at still other festivals, and of the portion that the Basileus will receive on all these occasions (lines 19–23). The third section deals with the obligations and perquisites of a group called Onitadae (lines 31–42); perquisites for a herald and a musician were added later (lines 43–45).

The statutes then are concerned with two festivals, the Hebdomaea and the procession to Didyma, and more precisely with the participation at these festivals of the board of *aisymnetes* and *proshetairoi* and of the group of Onitadae. A member of this group has a large role at the Hebdomaea (lines 17–18), and all or most of the business of the third section will take place at the two festivals. The festival Hebdomaea occupies four days, the

⁶So Gehrke 22–23. An inscription Ὅπληθων δεοτέρης is assigned to the end of the fifth century by G. Dunst, "Zu den altmilesischen Phylen," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 35 (1961) 272–273; but Piérart shows reason for dating the letter-forms "40 or 50 years earlier" ("Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 382, n. 72). It has also been suggested that the Ionic names were revived during the oligarchic interlude after 405: Herrmann 171; Ehrhardt 104–105.

⁷Some are content to say that the five *proshetairoi* represented three tribes at a time: Wilamowitz, *GGA* 176 (1914) 77; Hiller von Gaertringen, *SIG*³ 57, n. 3; Poland 515. But it is impossible to believe either that unequal representation was tolerated, or that it was redressed by a set of rules operating over a six-year cycle. D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité* (Paris 1976) 217, n. 7, remarks that "the inequality in the representation of the three *phylai* remains unexplained."

⁸Piérart, "Athènes et Milet I . . ." 2–8; Ehrhardt 98–109.

7th through the 10th, of an unnamed month—which is undoubtedly Boedromion, the first month of the year at Miletus; for the *aisymnetes* who first comes forward at the Hebdomaea gives his name to the civic year.⁹ The inference is confirmed by the sequence of festivals further on: procession to Didyma, Thargelia, Metageitnia, Hebdomaea (lines 18–22). When the calendar of Miletus was revised in the early Hellenistic period and the first month became Taureon, a note was added prescribing sacrifice at this season (lines 23–25).¹⁰ The procession to Didyma presumably took place in the spring.

It is important to observe that the statutes of the Molpi are far from being a comprehensive description of their activity. This band of “Singers,” wealthy citizens who serve Apollo as only the wealthy can, by expert singing and dancing, go far back in time, so far that similar bands were established in Milesian colonies (probably Sinope, certainly Olbia and Aegiale).¹¹ Their god presides at all large-scale formal reunions of the citizen body; at Miletus as elsewhere in Ionia, indeed as almost everywhere in Greece, nearly half the months in the calendar are named for festivals of Apollo. The Molpi of Miletus had much to do at many times other than those we hear of in the statutes. Even in the context of the Hebdomaea and the procession to Didyma much is left unspoken. The Molpi furnish wine and victims in plenty, and at every stage the *aisymnetes* and the *proshetairoi* are entitled to certain customary portions; yet these things are mentioned only in passing, and are specified only in relation to the Onitadae. Attention is focused instead on certain festive actions of the Hebdomaea, on tippling and singing and contests, and on those who take part; on the rural shrines which are visited during the parade to Didyma; above all, on the role of the Onitadae. These are not the essential elements of either festival, but they were somehow topical at the time the decree was issued, in 450/49 B.C. Let us look more closely at the Hebdomaea, the procession to Didyma, and the Onitadae.

First the Hebdomaea (lines 6–18).¹² Nothing is said of the 7th of the month, though this is Apollo’s holy day and gives its name to the festival; whatever rites took place were not of interest. On the 8th we are told first that “the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi” does something which a faulty text leaves obscure—a ritual act as it seems, since organs and libation come into it. Yet

⁹A. Rehm, *Milet* 1.3 p. 235, suggests Boedromion or Pyanopsion for the Hebdomaea. Others leave the month undecided: M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (Leipzig 1906) 170–171; Graf, “Apollon Delphinios” 6.

¹⁰For details of the calendar see Rehm, *Milet* 1.3.230–340; Ehrhardt 113–126, 397–418.

¹¹Poland 510–511; Graf, “Das Kollegium . . .” 209–215; Ehrhardt 134, 136, 139, 142–143.

¹²For the sake of brevity, I must forbear to quote the Greek, except a few words, or to cite opinion, except in general terms. For editions see 356 above, for commentaries see n. 1. Much has been repeated over and over from Wilamowitz’s *editio princeps* of 1904.

some suppose that a good many letters and even words have dropped out, and that the sentence actually refers to the appointment of the *aisymnetes*. This is most unlikely; there is no evident lacuna elsewhere in our text. The next sentence shows both *aisymnetes* and *proshetairos* in a festive setting: ὁ δὲ αἰσυμνήτης καὶ ὁ προσεταῖρος προσαιρέται, ὅταν οἱ κρητῆρες πάντες κτλ., “whenever all the mixing bowls have been consecrated by libation and paeans have been sung.” For the main clause the only natural rendering is, “the *aisymnetes* and the *proshetairos*,” i.e., each *proshetairos*, “chooses for companionship”—whomever it may be, for the object is not expressed. Mixing bowls and paeans tell us that a drinking party is about to begin; it is time to decide the arrangement of the drinkers. Each member of the board is entitled to choose his companion on the next couch, and we shall see in a moment who might be chosen. Yet most editors and commentators prefer to emend the text, either expunging the second ὁ or changing it to <τ>ὸς, so that the noun becomes acc. pl., προσεταῖρος, and the meaning is, “the *aisymnetes* co-opts the *proshetairoi*.” But why should he do this at the start of a drinking party?

For the rest of the Hebdomaea, for the ceremonies of the 9th and 10th, text and meaning are not so much in doubt, and it will suffice to state the main points. On both the 9th and the 10th the mixing bowls are topped up again, with libation and paeans, and on the 10th contests are held among the new board, here called *stephanephoroi*, and among another group, seemingly “the priests,” οἱ <ι>έρεω<ι> (line 16). The Molpi set the tone for this festivity, but others take part. “And mixing bowls are mixed as among the Molpi” (lines 11–12); “and there are given by the Molpi two victims, adult, to the *stephanephoroi*” (lines 14–15); “and they [the new *stephanephoroi* and the priests (as restored)] drink the wine of the Molpi, and mixing bowls are consecrated with libation as among the Molpi” (lines 16–17). Thus the five *proshetairoi* who with the *aisymnetes* make up the board of *stephanephoroi* are not themselves Molpi; neither are the other group, “the priests.” Only the *aisymnetes* belongs to the Molpi; “the retiring *aisymnetes*,” ὁ ἐξιὼν αἰσυμνήτης, is singled out as performing ritual actions (lines 11–12).

At the very end of the three days’ carouse it is said that “the retiring *aisymnetes* provides the same as the Onitades,” ὁ Ὀνιτάδης sing., “and receives the same as the Onitades” (lines 17–18). This is the first mention by name of the group Onitadae; one of their number, evidently chosen for the occasion, is to have the same obligations and perquisites as the retiring *aisymnetes*. Is he not the man whom the *aisymnetes* chose as his companion at the start? As we saw, the third section of the decree lays down the obligations and perquisites of the Onitadae at large; we may assume that the group were busy at the two festivals, the Hebdomaea and the procession to Didyma. Are they not “the priests” already referred to? And are they not the companions of all the members of the new and the retiring boards? The

six retiring members, the *aisymnetes* and the five *proshetairoi*, will each recline next to one of the Onitadae; likewise the six new members.

In any case not a few outsiders have been admitted to the ceremony of the Molpi—the five *proshetairoi*; “the priests,” perhaps to be identified with the Onitadae; the Onitades, sing. They recline together for the three days’ carouse.

After the Hebdomaea we come to the procession to Didyma: “whenever the *stephanephoroi* go to Didyma,” etc. (lines 18–31). Since the shrine at Didyma had been plundered and destroyed in 494, and since the local priesthood had been transported to Persia, we might expect the Molpi of Miletus to take a hand in whatever worship Apollo now received.¹³ And yet, apart from the extraneous matter inserted in lines 20–25, there is no mention at all of any worship of Apollo, only of conveying sacred stones to two shrines of Hecate, “before the gates” of Miletus and “at the doors” at Didyma (lines 25–27), and of singing paeans as the procession passes a number of shrines along the road:¹⁴ “and the paean goes up, first, by (παρά) Hecate before the gates, by Power (Δύναμις), then at the meadow on the height by the Nymphs, by Hermes in the Place of Clamour (ἐν Κελάδῳ), by Tribesman (Φύλιος), beside (κατά) the Horned One (Κεραυίτης), by the statues of Chares” (lines 28–30). The Horned One and Tribesman also receive sacrifice (lines 30–31). In the next section the Onitadae, in baking cakes for Apollo and Hecate, are to keep them separate (lines 36–37). Thus we find that the statutes of the Molpi are not concerned with the great cult at Didyma, but with minor, mainly rustic, gods or heroes who are scattered through the countryside between Miletus and Didyma.

The last section is devoted to the Onitadae (lines 31–40): it begins

¹³For the condition of Didyma at this time see H. W. Parke, “The massacre of the Branchidae,” *JHS* 105 (1985) 59–68, at 61, “The temple of Apollo at Didyma: The Building and its Function,” *JHS* 106 (1986) 121–131, at 123, and *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor* (London 1985) 33–34. A stretch of the Sacred Way excavated recently goes back “to the 7th/6th centuries B.C.,” “Recent Archaeological Research in Turkey,” *AnatStud* 27 (1978) 9–38, at 19, quoting R. Naumann. We can hardly doubt that even in the mid fifth century the procession for Apollo was conducted with a full measure of civic pomp—of which nothing appears in our statutes.

¹⁴If the language is exact, both stones were conveyed to their destinations before the procession set out on the road and the singing began: καὶ γυλλοὶ φέρονται δύο . . . καὶ τίθεται . . . ὁ δ’ ἕτερος . . . τίθεται. ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἔρχονται τὴν ὁδὸν κτλ. (lines 25–27). It may well be that the conveyance of the stones was a preliminary piece of magic, and if so, it is all the more remarkable that the Molpi should insist upon a custom that is plainly Carian, not Greek: see Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Rel.*³⁽⁼²⁾ 1.722. Otherwise ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες rather oddly signifies that the participants in the procession have the stones in hand, ready for conveyance. An Archaic *lex sacra* mentions δύο γυλλοὶ ἐστεμμένοι (*Milet* 1.3 no. 31a = *LSAM* 41 lines 2–3; for the participial form cf. *SEG* 31.985 D 15–16): since the *lex sacra* was likewise displayed in the Delphinium, and since it is close in date to the original statutes, and since these too call for the stones to be wreathed (line 26, ἐστεμμένος), it is probably the same rite. For the rest, the cult of Hecate is early and prominent at Miletus (Ehrhardt 173–175, 476–479); but nothing more is heard of magic stones.

Ἵνιτάδῃσι παρέξις . . . and continues γίνεται Ἵνιτάδῃσιν . . . (lines 31–32, 37).¹⁵ It gives details, very elaborate details, of all their obligations and their perquisites: what materials and utensils they must supply, what cooking and butchering they must perform, what portions of meat and wine they will receive (lines 31–40). In particular, they cook and divide and assign the portions of honour for the *stephanephoroi* (lines 34–36), and receive, as a gift of the Molpi, portions like those of the *stephanephoroi* and still other choice pieces and the hides and the left-over wine and incense (lines 37–40). The amendment of 479/8 B.C. is also devoted to the Onitadae, and so is a second, somewhat later, amendment. “Whatever the Onitadae fail to do, it is decreed by the Molpi under Charopinus,” i.e., in 479/8, “that the *stephanephoroi* make up from the hearth-funds” (lines 40–41). “Whatever the Onitadae are in need of, it is decreed by the Molpi that this be seen to by the *stephanephoroi*” (lines 41–42).¹⁶

The Onitadae then are sacrificial experts who bring their own equipment and take charge of handling the victims and of preparing and dividing the meat. They are so valued that the terms on which they serve are set forth at length in the statutes, and the terms include portions of honour exceeding those of the *stephanephoroi*. When, in the reduced circumstances of 479/8, the Onitadae could not be counted on, the Molpi made other provisions, but these were considered temporary; else the Onitadae would have been dropped from the statutes altogether. The Onitadae seem well suited to play the role which we conjectured for them at the Hebdomaea.

It was obvious from the start that the statutes are not a comprehensive or balanced account of the ritual conducted by the Molpi; analysis has shown what might be called a centrifugal tendency. The Molpi do honour to little shrines in the countryside, and they admit outsiders to their circle, the five

¹⁵“On the part of the Onitadae, provision of pottery, iron-work, bronze-work, fire-wood, water, table dishes, pine-wood for lighting, wicker mats, wooden blocks on which to divide the meat, halters for the sacrificial victims. In the presence of the *stephanephoroi*, lamp and oil. Roasting of organs, boiling of meat, boiling and dividing and assigning of the loin and the fivefold portion which the *stephanephoroi* receive. They shall bake the cakes from a half-bushel of corn for Apollo with a flat shape, and for Hecate separately. There go to the Onitadae from the Molpi all the loins save what the *stephanephoroi* receive, all the hides, three special portions from each victim, the remnants of the incense, the wine remaining in the mixing-bowl, a fivefold portion for the day.”

¹⁶ὅ τι δ' ἂν τούτων μὴ ποιῶσιν Ἵνιτάδαι, ἕαδε Μόλποισιν ἐπὶ Χαροπίνῳ στεφανηφόροις ἀπὸ πάντων ἱστιῶν παρέχεν· ὅ τι δ' ἂν Ἵνιτάδαι χρημίζωσιν, ἕαδε Μόλποισι στεφανηφόροιςιν ἐπιτετράφθαι. I have adopted the usual interpretation of this passage. Conceivably the verb χρημίζωσιν means “go without:” “whatever the Onitadae go without, it is decreed by the Molpi that this be awarded to the *stephanephoroi*.” On this view the two resolves go together in 479/8 B.C. and deal with duties and perquisites respectively: the *stephanephoroi* enjoy the forgone perquisites just as they perform the omitted duties. Duties and perquisites are juxtaposed in the passage which aligns the Onitades, sing., with the retiring *aisymnetes* (lines 17–18).

proshetairoi and the group of Onitadae. What is the background of the *proshetairoi* and the Onitadae?

To take the *proshetairoi* first, it was argued above that the section on the Hebdomaea does not in fact prescribe the manner of their appointment. Later inscriptions show them acting beside the *aisymnetes* (or *stephane-phoros*) at least till the time of Commodus, but tell us nothing more.¹⁷ Our only clue is that they are five in number: the five incumbents of 450/49 B.C. are named in the prescript. A board of five thus prominently named must be somehow representative of the community, though they cannot represent the six Ionic tribes or the twelve subdivisions, the *chiliastyes*.

Now the Athenian regulations for Miletus, which date at least in part from the same year as the statutes of the Molpi, 450/49 B.C., have much to say of a board of five ἀρχοντες, "commandants." These are Athenians, appointed at Athens and sent to Miletus to take control. Part of their work, the largest part, consists in securing the territory of Miletus with garrison-troops. A district that is especially restive or threatened is named at the end of the regulations: Arnasus. Perhaps it is the district later called Argasa, after its chief settlement; Argasa formed one of the five great demes of Miletus. So the commandants may have numbered five because of conditions at Miletus, because five were needed to secure all the territory. This is to anticipate conclusions which we shall draw from our study of IG I³ 21.

The demes of Miletus are not named as such before the Hellenistic period,¹⁸ but the territory which they encompass, including Teichiussa at the south-east and the offshore island of Leros, already belonged to Miletus in the fifth century. That they number five is now certain, since just so many names occur in the epigraphic record, copious as it is, and since these five names are readily understood as denoting natural, and roughly equal, subdivisions of Milesian territory, and since moreover the prophet at Didyma was selected from a slate of five candidates. It is also certain that these demes were not interlinked with the later tribes: apart from the incongruous numbers, five demes and twelve tribes, tribal affiliation is hereditary (as at Athens), but deme affiliation may change over generations (as it does not at Athens), doubtless with one's domicile; different persons may belong to the same deme but to different tribes. Accordingly there is no temptation to

¹⁷The *proshetairoi* appear in several treaties posted in the Delphinium (*Milet* 1.3 no. 143 = *Staatsverträge* 537 lines 41–42; *Milet* 1.3 no. 144 = *Staatsverträge* 538 A 10; *Milet* 1.3 no. 146 = *Staatsverträge* 539 line 53; *Milet* 1.3 no. 150 line 22); in the regulations for the cult of Rome (*Milet* 1.7 no. 203 a 33–37 = *LSAM* 49 B 33–37); and in a dedication from the time of Commodus (*Milet* 1.3 no. 121).

¹⁸For the demes of Miletus see Robert, "Une épigramme de Carie," *RevPhil* 32 (1958) 54–66, at 65, n. 1 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 1.400, n. 1, *Gnomon* 31 (1959) 673 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 3.1638; Piérart, "La constitution de Milet . . ." 439–440, "Athènes et Milet I . . ." 9–15, "Athènes et Milet II . . ." 292–296; Ehrhardt 105–107, 391, 393.

suppose that these demes were introduced by Athens as part of the democratic regime which brought the Cleisthenic tribes and prytanies. Or that they are a later innovation:¹⁹ since they co-existed with the Cleisthenic tribes in Hellenistic and Roman times, they may have co-existed with the Ionic tribes in the mid fifth century.

The five names and the districts which they appear to denote are as follows. The Καταπολίτιοι will live "round the city" of Miletus and perhaps elsewhere on the north coast of the peninsula, eastward as far as Heracleia. The Πλατεῖς will occupy the "flatland," the large but rather infertile plain between Miletus and Didyma. The Ἀργαεῖς will occupy the south coast (including Didyma), rather more productive than the rest of the peninsula.²⁰ The Τειχεσσεῖς are now fixed in the separate plain at the south-east, between the Milesian peninsula and Iasus; they take their name from the fortress near Kazikli which in the sixth century was held by the dynast or governor Chares.²¹ The Λέριοι, though named from Leros, will occupy all the offshore islands, not only the largest and most important.²²

It is a reasonable inference that the five *proshetairoi* of 450/49 B.C. are drawn from these five subdivisions of Milesian territory. The territory and its natural subdivisions were the same then as later. In Hellenistic and Roman times, when the five demes flourished, the board of *proshetairoi* continued as before. In this period the five demes rather than the twelve tribes were likewise represented in the choice of Apollo's prophet at Didyma.²³ Year by year five candidates resorted to the oracle, where lots were drawn to select the next prophet. The five candidates had themselves been chosen by a previous sortition, obviously in the demes. Double sortition as a means of choosing the prophet is probably a late development; it can hardly be attributed to Archaic times, when the oracle was in the hands of a local priesthood, or even to the ensuing period, when there is little sign of activity at Didyma. Nonetheless, prophet and *proshetairoi* together suggest that Apollo, the god of civic reunions, from an early date favoured a certain form of territorial representation at Miletus. A festival of Apollo

¹⁹Piérart ("Athènes et Milet II . . ." 295–296) holds that the demes were first created in the early Hellenistic period, on the grounds that Lorian decrees of this period speak of "Lorians living on Leros," as if to distinguish them from other members of the deme Leros living on other islands, whereas no such distinction is implicit in earlier decrees. But the Lorians may only have learned to use language more precisely.

²⁰The landscape and resources of the Milesian peninsula and of the interior vis-à-vis the south coast are described in several accounts quoted by Robert (above, n. 18) 58, nn. 1, 3, and 64, n. 4 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 1.393, nn. 1, 3, and 399, n. 4.

²¹For Teichiussa see Robert (above, n. 18) 55–66 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 1.390–401; G. Bean and J. M. Cook, "The Carian Coast III," *BSA* 52 (1957) 58–146, at 106–116.

²²For the deme Leros see Piérart, "Athènes et Milet II . . ." 276–283.

²³For the manner of electing the prophet, see Piérart, "Athènes et Milet I . . ." 10–12.

which was fairly common in Ionian cities, as we see from onomastic evidence (month-names, personal names, epithets of Apollo), is the *Κωμαῖα*, a gathering of the territorial units called *κῶμαι*.²⁴ On Thasos the festival came round in early autumn, about the time of the Hebdomaea at Miletus; Hermeias, most likely he of Samos, describes a celebration in the Prytaneium of Naucratis which sounds something like the Hebdomaea (Ath. 4.32, 149d–150a).

The *proshetairoi* figure also in the body of the statutes—in all three sections, though in the second and third under the title *stephanephoroi* which is given to the whole board, including the *aisymnetes*. So they go back before the decree of 450/49, before the amendment of 479/8, right back to the late Archaic period, before the destruction of Miletus. While picturing the three days' carouse, we assumed that the *proshetairoi* always numbered five. It is possible however that there were *proshetairoi* even in days before the territory of Miletus reached its full extent, before it included the offshore islands, or Teichiussa. Those days might have seen three or four demes and as many *proshetairoi*. But in any case the *proshetairoi* joined the *aisymnetes* as representatives of all the territory of Miletus. At a certain moment the *Molpi*, that ancient and exclusive band of "Singers," first opened their ceremonies and their wine-jars to outsiders.²⁵

We turn to the *Ὀνιτάδαι*. Patronymic forms are the rule for the Milesian *phetra*i and *patria*i appearing in much later inscriptions, but this system, did we know it, would not help us, for in the statutes the Onitadae are set apart

²⁴For the *Κωμαῖα* and the month *Κωμαίων* see Robert, "Sur un passage d'Hermeias: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΓΡΥΝΕΙΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ," *REG* 47 (1934) 26–30 = *Op. Min. Sel.* 2.972–976; F. Salviat, "Une nouvelle loi thasienne," *BCH* 82 (1958) 193–267, at 261–263; Robert, *Op. Min. Sel.* 2.983–986; *BullEp* 1973 no. 77 (p. 71 section 66); *Actes du VII^e congrès intern. d'épigr. gr. et lat.* 40. Salviat derives the festival name from *κῶμος* rather than *κῶμη*, and Robert leaves the choice open; but only *κῶμη* suits Apollo.

²⁵The term *προσέταυροι*, meaning "additional companions," may remind us of the *παράσιτοι* of Attica or the *πλατίφουνοι* of Tiryns (*SEG* 30.380, "late 7th cent. B.C."), terms apparently denoting extra persons at a feast or a drinking party. Perhaps they too arose when aristocratic banqueters were joined by representatives of a wider milieu. Unfortunately the fragments, or rather the *disiecta membra*, of the inscription at Tiryns do not show where the *platiwoinoi* and their leaders, *platiwoinarchoi*, came from. The two categories correspond to the *archontes* and the *parasitoi* who serve Athena Pallenis, and who are known from a series of documents: Ath. 6.26–27, 234d–235d, citing Polemon, Themison, and Crates, and quoting several inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries; W. Peek, "Attische Inschriften," *AthMitt* 67 (1942) 1–217, at 24–29 no. 26, two dedications of the later fourth century; cf. R. Schlaifer, "The Cult of Athena Pallenis," *HSCP* 54 (1943) 35–67; D. M. Lewis, "Cleisthenes and Attica," *Historia* 12 (1963) 22–40, at 33–34, 39. Both *archontes* and *parasitoi* represent districts outside Pallene, but the details are problematic. We can only say that, for whatever reason, the cult of Athena Pallenis admitted representatives of some distant places, and the rules for representation probably antedate the Cleisthenic system of tribes and demes.

from any other kinship group.²⁶ The name Ὀνίτης implicit for the ancestor stands on record—not at Miletus, but in other quarters. It is written retrograde in a Naxian inscription, presumably Archaic (*ArchEph* 1914.133 = *SIG*³ 57, n. 13). A son of Heracles is so called—indeed this is one of the most constant names in the several lists of Heracles' sons by his principal wives, Megara and Deianeira. In the earliest list, a Hesiodic papyrus, Onites is one of four sons by Deianeira (Ὀνεΐτην, [Hes.] *Cat.* fr. 25.19 Merkelbach-West); so too in Apollodorus (Ὀνεΐτης *vel sim.*, *Bibl.* 2 [165] 7.8.8); one of three sons by Deianeira in Diodorus (Ὀδεΐτης *vel sim.*, 4.31.1). In a quite different list in the scholia to Apollonius he is one of four sons by Megara (Ὀνίτην, schol. *Argon.* 1.38); in Hyginus he is one of two by Megara (*Ophiten*, *Fab.* 31.6, 32.1, 72.4).²⁷ Two other instances are less helpful. Hesychius registers the name as a hero's, but a lacuna has deprived us of further detail (Ὀνεΐτης ἥρωος ὄνομα, καὶ ἴσως ἂν εἴη . . .). Nonnus gives the name to one of four soldiers of Dionysus who appear together at the moment they are slain in India (Ὀνίτης, *Dion.* 28.112).

We have then a curious distribution of the name. The son of Heracles belongs somewhere in mainland Greece, and we should try to locate him. Though the names and number of the sons by Megara vary greatly, all must be at home in Thebes. The four sons by Deianeira—"Hyllus and Glenus and Ctesippus and Onites," says the Catalogue—are an odd assortment, who were doubtless brought together for the first time by the Boeotian poet (Diodorus omits Ctesippus in order to make him a son of Astydameia instead: 4.37.4).²⁸ Hyllus is eponym of the Dorian tribe Hylleis; Ctesippus is, at least in later days, the reputed ancestor of Dorian chiefs in the north-east Peloponnesus. Glenus is untraceable, but must have been known chiefly as a small boy, since his name means "toy" or "doll" (LSJ s.vv. γλῆνος, γλήνη), and he had a nurse who later went by herself to Messenia, and a vase, now lost and never illustrated, showed "Glenus" beside his father Heracles, doubtless as a boy. In such company Ὀνεΐτης is likely to be the ancestor of someone else on [Hesiod's] horizon; he need not be a Dorian, if he and Glenus make a pair, as Hyllus and Ctesippus appear to do. A Theban, or a pair of Thebans, might well be joined with the two Dorians. A Theban

²⁶It seems quite misguided to compare the Molpi and the Onitade to a *thiasos* and a *genos* in Attica, as Latte does: "Phratric," *RE* 20.1 (1941) 746—756, at 751 = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1968) 428.

²⁷The two sons in Hyginus are "Therimachus" and "Ophites," always in this order; H. J. Rose on *Fab.* 31.6 remarks that such names evoke Heracles as slayer of beasts and snakes. But the names in Hyginus are often, and repeatedly, corrupt, and Rose does not mention the scholium to Apollonius, where "Onites" and "Therimachus" are named together—in that order, with two other names coming third and fourth.

²⁸The evidence is cited by C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* 2 (Berlin 1921) 577, n. 3, 664, 665, n. 5. Robert speaks of "the Ctesippids in Sicyon" (he should have said "in Cleonae"), but the patronymic form is not attested.

name is also appropriate to a soldier of Dionysus. Moreover, the soldier whom Nonnus mentions just before Onites is "Autesion"—another Theban name, borne by the great-grandson of Polyneices who threw in his lot with the Dorians (Hdt. 4.147.1, 6.52.2; etc.). So the distribution is: Miletus, Naxos, Thebes.

The name does not look like Greek. To be sure, it has been customary for commentators on the statutes to derive Ὀνιτάδαι from ὄνος "ass," as a name denoting servile status or else evoking Apollo's sacred animal.²⁹ Yet the first meaning is not appropriate, and the second is far-fetched. And the ending -ιτάδαι would be inexplicable.

According to the statutes the Onitadae bring to Apollo's festivals the skill and equipment needed for an opulent feast; they are handsomely rewarded by the Molpi. Commentators mostly see them as inferiors (and sometimes as all the ordinary members of the band of Molpi, or as the age-group just admitted to membership, notions which are plainly inadmissible). Yet the attention that is lavished on the role of the Onitadae indicates not that they are inferior, but that they are persons of consequence who are new to the worship of Apollo. They receive the choicest portions; in the section on the Hebdomaea the Onitades, sing., i.e., one of them just chosen, is placed on a footing with the retiring *aisymnetes*.

Let us gather up the indications. Honoured newcomers, of non-Greek origin to judge from their name, are now associated with the Molpi at the Hebdomaea and in the procession to Didyma. They are expert in preparing a feast. Someone like them is to be found on Naxos and at Thebes. Can we match these indications?

Miletus has a cult of the Cabeiri, those mysterious alien deities (Hdt. 2.51.2, 3.37.3), known mainly from inscriptions of the early Empire, but beyond a doubt much older, for a Roman governor then confirmed the "ancestral warrant," προγονικά δίκαια, of its ceremonies; the cult *aition* recorded by Nicolaus of Damascus is set in the time of the Neleid kings (*FGH Hist* 90 F 52).³⁰ What is most remarkable is that this cult of the Cabeiri was conjoined with the cult of Apollo at Didyma. Apollo's prophet served the Cabeiri as well and bore the title "High Priest of the Great Gods Cabeiri." The *aition* explains how this association arose. King Leodamas was killed by the wicked Amphitres "at a festival of Apollo as he led a hecatomb to the god along the road:" it is the procession to Didyma. The family and followers of Leodamas took refuge at Assessus, where they were assailed by Amphitres; but after a time the tyrant was overcome, and Miletus was

²⁹So, e.g., Wilamowitz, "Satzungen . . ." 625–626; Vollgraff 425; Hiller von Gaertringen 1596; Poland 514; O. Kern, "Mysterien," *RE* 16.2 (1935) 1209–1314, at 1252.

³⁰For the Cabeiri at Miletus see O. Kern, "Kabeiros und Kabeiroi," *RE* 10.2 (1919) 1399–1450, at 1407–1409; "Κώταρχος," *RE* 11.2 (1922) 1514; Hemberg 137–140; H. W. Parke, *Oracles of Apollo* (above, n. 13) 8–10.

delivered from its troubles, with the miraculous help of two youths who came from Phrygia bearing the sacred emblems of the Cabeiri. The Cabeiri were held in honour ever after; moreover, the kingship was abolished and an *aisymnetes* took power instead (cf. Nicolaus F 53).

A story like this is aetiological; it is intended to account for the origin of the customs which it mentions, in this case the procession to Didyma, the cult of the Cabeiri, the office of *aisymnetes*. The story assumes that the abiding custom re-enacts the momentary action of long ago. The processioners to Didyma lead the sacrificial animals along the road because Leodamas did so once;³¹ at the same time the cult of the Cabeiri is to the fore because through them Leodamas was avenged; the *aisymnetes* is at the head of the procession because he took power just then.³² Assessus must have figured somehow in the ritual. In the story the youths bearing the sacred emblems come up to the wall at night, and at dawn all the people meet in assembly and give a joyous welcome to the youths, who then carry the emblems toward Miletus, while the people follow under arms. From this we may deduce a procession from Assessus to Miletus, doubtless for the purpose of bringing the sacred emblems from the original cult-place to a filial shrine in the city; thereafter, we may conjecture, the emblems were carried to Didyma and back. The story as we have it in Nicolaus is too abbreviated for us to be sure of the details of the ritual. The essential point is clear, however; the cult of the Cabeiri is hereby introduced to Miletus and will be conspicuous in the procession to Didyma.

The Cabeiri and their worshippers resemble the Onitadae in being admitted from outside to the inner circle at Miletus. The correspondence between Cabeiri and Onitadae goes further. Before the Hellenistic period the cult of the Cabeiri is not widespread in the Greek world. Those cults which are arguably old are confined to Miletus; to a few Aegean islands, Chios, Delos, Syros, and especially Paros, in virtue of its mythical name Cabarnis; and to Thebes and Anthedon.³³ If we substitute Naxos for Paros, this is exactly the range of the name Onites. In the sanctuary at Thebes the earliest dedications are of the Geometric period; so it would not be surprising if [Hesiod] took

³¹Another story makes Leodamas responsible for the prophetic office at Didyma as it was known at some period or other (Conon, *FGrHist* 26 F 1.44). After Leodamas outdoes his rival, here called Phitres, by conquering Carystus, a captive woman whom he dedicates at Branchidae is taken to wife by the eponym Branchus; her child, also dedicated by Leodamas, inherits the oracle and becomes the progenitor of a prophetic clan called the Evangelidae.

³²H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (Munich 1967) 2.578, treats our story as evidence that in early Miletus the office of *aisymnetes* was an extraordinary appointment, distinct from the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi, and distinct also from the office of *prytanis* which was exploited by a tyrant or tyrants (Arist. *Pol.* 5.5, 1305a15–18).

³³Hemberg 132–210. For Thebes, see A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* 2 (London 1986, *BICS* Supp. 38.2) 66–110.

note of it. Heracles is often linked with the Cabeiri (Hemberg 290–292); perhaps his sons Onites and Glenus are the pair whom the Thebans called “the Cabeirus” and “the Boy.” The mystic ritual of the Cabeiri is little known except for the excavated traces at Thebes—which show that eating and drinking had a very large place.³⁴ The Onitadae are expert in preparing a feast.

In Nicolaus’ *aition* the two youths—who come from Phrygia at the bidding of their gods, and also in fulfilment of an oracle of Apollo—are named Τόττης and Ὀννης. As others have remarked, they are virtual Cabeiri (although our sources disagree about the number and the nature of the Cabeiri, they are quite commonly identified with another pair of youths, the Dioscuri). It may well be that in an earlier version the Cabeiri themselves appeared at Miletus or Assessus and gave the necessary help; the missionary youths would be easier to understand if such a version had been rationalized, as so often, in the Hellenistic period. At all events the names undoubtedly derive from ritual, whether they are divine epithets or priestly titles. On Chios, which has a cult of the Cabeiri (Hemberg 140), we find the patronymic Τοττεῖδαι; these descendants of Τόττης (or conceivably of *Τοττεύς) form one of two large kinship groups, tribes no doubt, appearing in membership lists of the later fourth century which probably indicate a reform of this period.³⁵ Does Ὀννης stand to Ὀνιτάδαι as Τόττης to Τοττεῖδαι? In a foreign name the stem might well appear now as Ὀννητ-, now as Ὀνιτ-.

But the name occurs only in the nominative Ὀννης, and only here in Nicolaus, in a Constantinian excerpt *de insidiis*—which gives cause for misgiving. Another excerpt a few pages earlier deals with “the sons of Onnes,” οἱ Ὀννεω παῖδες (Nicolaus F 1), i.e., the sons of the first husband of Queen Semiramis. His name too is Ὀννης (Diod. 2.5.1, 6.10), and though the nominative form is not used in the excerpt, it doubtless appeared in Nicolaus and met the eye of the excerptor. A rare coincidence. There is no reason to suppose that this Assyrian of old, whether real or mythical, took his name from Phrygia or the religion of the Cabeiri; if it is not the same name, then we need not suppose that the Phrygian youth declined his in the same way, gen. Ὀννεω. It is quite possible that the coincidence is a mistake. The excerptor read of Ὀννης the husband of Semiramis; when he came to the episode at Miletus, perhaps he saw a name that was only similar to Ὀννης,

³⁴Schachter 2.98–103, 108–110. Eating and drinking are also conspicuous in the sanctuary of the Great Gods of Samothrace: S. G. Cole, *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace* (Leiden 1984) 36–37.

³⁵M. Guarducci, “L’istituzione della fratria . . . 1,” *MemLinc* ser. 6 15 (1937) 5–103, at 97 nos. 20.2–3, 21.1; W. G. Forrest, “The Tribal Organization at Chios,” *BSA* 55 (1960) 172–189, at 172 no. 1.1, 174 no. 3.1, 10, 181 A 2–3. The likeness of Tottes the Phrygian and the kinship group Totteidae has often been noted: Guarducci 66; Hemberg 139, n. 2; Forrest 176; Parke, *Oracles of Apollo* (above, n. 13) 227, n. 12.

not the same—but by a common inadvertence he reproduced the same form. If so, the Phrygian youth may have borne the very name Ὀνίτης.

In the *aition* the cult of the Cabeiri is brought from Phrygia to Assessus and then, in a seeming procession, from Assessus to Miletus. To take the second stage first, it has been usual since Rayet and Wilamowitz to identify Assessus with the fortress at Sakisburnu a few miles east of Miletus, which commands the roads leading north and west from the interior; the remains and the location suit our story, as they also suit Herodotus' account of Athena's temple at Assessus (1.19, 22.4).³⁶ At the time the followers of Leodamas fled to Assessus, it was held by a local ruler "whom Leodamas had formerly installed." No doubt it was in origin a Carian settlement. In a Hellenistic tale of unhappy love a lad named Antheus who lives as a hostage in the royal household of Miletus appears to be a Carian from Assessus. Some lines of Alexander Aetolus quoted by Parthenius describe him as "offspring of King Assessus;" he wears "a Lelegian garment," Λελεγήιον εἶμα, made by his mother Hellamene (Parthen. *Narr. Amat.* 14.5 = Alex. Aet. fr. 3 Powell = *FGrHist* 496 F 1). It is true that Parthenius' own narrative begins, "From Halicarnassus, ἐκ δὲ Ἀλικαρνασσοῦ, there was a boy Antheus of royal line living as hostage with Phobius." But since Alexander Aetolus does not refer at all to Halicarnassus, and since it is surprising to be told that Halicarnassus was once subject to Miletus and that its king was called "Assessus," we should emend the familiar name to one much less familiar, ἐκ δὲ Ἀσσησσοῦ; the mistake was all the easier because the legendary founder of Halicarnassus, well known in his own right, was named Anthas.³⁷

Assessus then is here represented as a Carian town subject to Miletus, though still ruled by its own line of kings. To be sure, the term "Lelegian" is often distinguished from "Carian," but Herodotus identified them (1.171.2), and both are used for the original natives round Miletus. In Herodotus it is the Carians who are subdued by the Ionian settlers of Miletus (1.146.2–3); other sources mention Lelegians as well, or instead (Aristobulus, *FGrHist* 139 F 6; Str. 13.1.58, p. 611; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 8.5). Herodotus thought that the Carians were called Lelegians while they still lived on the islands (1.171.2). Such island stock has proved notoriously hard to find, but as we just saw, the cult of the Cabeiri is common to Miletus and the islands;

³⁶Wilamowitz, *GGA* 168 (1906) 635–640 = *Kl. Schr.* 5.1.372–375; 176 (1914) 72. Cf., e.g., Hemberg 138; Parke, *Oracles of Apollo* (above, n. 13) 8.

³⁷One might also expect Parthenius to give the father's name if it differed from the place-name; whence Naber's conjecture ἐκ δὲ Ἀλικαρνασσοῦ (Ἀσσησσοῦ) παῖς Ἀνθεύς. Although Halicarnassus has both a founder Ἀνθας (-ης) and a kinship group Ἀνθεάδαι, there is no presumption that Ἀνθεύς belongs there too (despite Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 703). The last name is an obvious choice for one in the bloom of youth; it is doubly appropriate to the agrarian ritual which inspired the myth (below, n. 43).

perhaps it has contributed to Herodotus' formulation. In the names of Miletus' early rulers a Carian element vies with the Greek. Leodamas and Ἀμφιτρῆς are rivals in Nicolaus (*FGrHist* 90 F 52–53), Leodamas and Φίτρης in Conon (*FGrHist* F 1.54, where they both belong to the royal house). Whereas Nicolaus' form has been half assimilated to Greek, Conon's form can be recognized as the Carian name usually rendered Πίγρης, but appearing as Πίτρης in the tribute-quota list of 429/8 B.C. (*IG* I³ 282 IV 49).³⁸

We might reasonably suppose that the cult of the Cabeiri was proper to the natives, Carian or Lelegian, who occupied Assessus in early days. The *aition* however derives the cult from "Phrygia;" no more specific indication is given. This is sometimes taken at face value, and thought to be confirmed by other sources who assert a Phrygian origin for the Cabeiri in general.³⁹ Yet the sources are only theorizing, and the theory is likely to have shaped the *aition*. In religion theories of origin have always tended to the exotic; it was the opinion of many Athenians that the family and office of the Eleusinian hierophant came from Thrace. The Milesians, it now appears, were proud to say that the cult of the Cabeiri came from Phrygia. The theory has left its mark elsewhere. In Parthenius the king whose wife loved Antheus, one "Phobius," afterwards handed over the kingship to "Phrygius," evidently a brother (*Narr. Amat.* 14.5). Phrygius king of Miletus is himself the hero of a love story, taking a wife from Myus (*Call. Aet.* frs. 80–83; etc.).⁴⁰ "Phrygius" like "Phitres" stands for the Carian element at Miletus.

Assessus was always remembered as an early Carian stronghold: the memory must have been assisted by the cult of the Cabeiri. The association of this cult with Miletus' cult of Apollo shows that at a certain moment the Greeks did their best to conciliate the Carians of Assessus. The same effort is seen in the statutes of the Molpi, if the Onitadae are rightly identified as priests or other servitors of the Cabeiri. The fortunes of Assessus are not of

³⁸[Πίτ]ρ[ες] is here restored, as ruler of Syangela, by analogy with *IG* I³ 259 V 16 of 454/3, where the form is Πίκρες. "The tau in line 49 is firm:" Bradeen and McGregor 18.

³⁹So Str. 10.3.19–20, 472 = Stesimbrotus *περὶ τελετῶν*, *FGrHist* 107 F 20; schol. *Apoll. Argon.* 1.917. Kern accepts the Phrygian theory (above, n. 30, 1400–1403); Hemberg rejects it (323).

⁴⁰The girl, Pieria, comes from Myus to attend a festival of Artemis at Miletus; when Phrygius sees her and falls in love, she makes him promise to end the unequal war between Miletus and Myus. Phrygius of Miletus and Pieria of Myus are much like Diognetus of Erythrae and Polycrite of Naxos (Parthen. *Narr. amat.* 9; *Plut. Mul. virt.* 17, 254b–f; etc.), and somewhat like Acontius of Ceos and Cydippe of Naxos (*Call. Aet.* frs. 67–75; etc.), or like Hermocrates of Athens and Ctesylla of Ceos (*Ant. Lib. Met.* 1). All these stories reflect the same custom, in which families from different cities arrange betrothals at a spring reunion, a festival of Artemis and Apollo which is either the Thargelia (at Miletus) or the Delia (on Naxos and on Delos) or the Pythia (on Ceos). At Miletus the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi must have been prominent in the festival (cf. *Milet* 1.7 no. 203 a 26–31 = *LSAM* 49 B 26–31); so observers would say that in early days the king was there instead.

course the whole story of relations between Greeks and Carians round Miletus. Carians once occupied all the territory hereabouts and are responsible for place-names like Didyma and Argasa. The Greeks of Miletus were often bitter enemies, as we see from Herodotus (1.146.2–3). We should consider the evidence for one group of oppressed and angry natives, the Gergithes.

In Heracleides Ponticus the Gergithes are not identified as natives, but rather as the popular faction, ὁ δῆμος, οἱ δημόται, as opposed to “the rich” (Ath. 12.26, 523 F–524 B = Heracleides fr. 50 Wehrli); in the Suda they are “the crowd and the hand-workers,” ἡ τὴν βῆθ καὶ οἱ χειρώνακτες (s.vv. Γέργηθες, περιβολή, τὴν βῆθ). The Suda however further explains that the name “Gergethes” was so used by Milesians living “in the periphery,” οἱ ἐν τῇ περιβολῇ, evidently a term for the countryside; these Milesians are also “the rich” (s.v. Γέργηθες). Since the rich and the hand-workers are elsewhere depicted as factions within the city of Miletus (Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 32, 298c–d, using the term χειρομάχα rather than χειρώνακτες), some distortion has occurred; whether our sources are at fault, or passions at Miletus, we cannot say. It is clear that the Gergithes are country-folk. The atrocity which Heracleides imputes to them takes place in the country, on threshing floors where the children of the rich are trampled by oxen. The reprisals of the rich, who burn their victims in a coat of pitch, produce an omen, the burning of a sacred olive tree, and an oracle which deplores “the slaughter of the unwarlike Gergithes,” as if they were a race apart. That they are virtual Carians is indicated by the town Γέργα in the Carian uplands east of Miletus, with its curious chauvinistic inscriptions which blazon the name “Gerga;”⁴¹ Gergithes are also known as natives of the Troad, and there too we find an upland town named Gergis (Hdt. 5.122.2, 7.43.2; etc.). The Gergithes round Miletus recall the Πεδιεῖς round Priene, known from documents of the period of Alexander and Lysimachus.⁴² The Pedieis too were country-folk, living in mere villages; they hated the Greeks of Priene, and when Priene was attacked by the forces of Demetrius in 287, the Pedieis used the opportunity to massacre and pillage.

If threshing floors and oxen are any guide, the Gergithes grew corn and

⁴¹For Gerga see G. Bean, “Gerga in Caria,” *AnatStud* 19 (1969) 169–182; *Turkey Beyond the Maeander* (London 1971) 201–207.

⁴²For the Pedieis see 1) *IvPriene* 1 = A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks* (Norman, Okla. 1980) 146 = S. N. Sherwin-White, “Ancient Archives: The Edict of Alexander to Priene, a Reappraisal,” *JHS* 105 (1985) 69–89, at 80–81, line 10, of 334 B.C., as restored by Heisserer; 2) *IvPriene* 3, lines 14–15, of about the same date; 3) *IvPriene* 14 = *JHS* 105 (1985) 85–88, line 6, of ca 285 B.C.; 4) *IvPriene* 15 = Welles, *Royal Correspondence* no. 6 = *JHS* 105 (1985) 76–77, line 14, of the same date, as restored by Hiller; 5) *IvPriene* 16 = Welles, *Royal Correspondence* no. 8 = *JHS* 105 (1985) 88, lines 10–18, again perhaps of the same date. For conditions at Priene, see Sherwin-White 77–87 and earlier work referred to at 79, n. 6 and 82, n. 109.

must have occupied some of the best land near Miletus. The corn-land included Assessus, for the temple of Athena caught fire while invaders burned off the standing corn (Hdt. 1.19.1).⁴³ Herodotus' story of Lydians wasting the corn-land is oddly similar to Heracleides' story of Milesians persecuting Gergithes. Both the temple of Athena and the sacred olive catch fire accidentally, when the Lydians burn the crops or when the rich Milesians burn their victims. Both Alyattes and the rich Milesians apply to the Delphic oracle and are rebuffed. Herodotus had his story from Delphi (1.20); Heracleides will have drawn on a collection of verse oracles ascribed to Delphi (so Wehrli on fr. 50). The one story is modelled on the other, and so it is likely that both concern the same place and that the sacred olive belongs to Athena of Assessus.

The horrors described by Heracleides are undatable, and enmity between the Gergithes and the rich Milesians of the countryside may have lasted over a long period. According to Herodotus (5.28–30.1), the days of Miletus' greatest prosperity in the late sixth century were ushered in by an external arbitration which put to rest two generations of strife. The contending factions are not identified, but the procedure ascribed to the arbitrators is suggestive. They first survey the whole territory of Miletus and then entrust the government to the few land-owners whose fields are found to be well-kept, on the grounds that those who look after their own interest can best look after the public interest. It appears from this that the peace and security of the countryside were at issue. If so, the arbitration must have dealt with the Gergithes.

When did this arbitration take place? Herodotus speaks of Naxos and Miletus as flourishing on the eve of the Ionian revolt, in ca 500 B.C. From at least the time of Darius' Scythian expedition, ca 512, down to 494 Miletus was under tyrants, Histiaeus or Aristagoras. It is sometimes held that the tyranny goes back to the arbitration, but this view requires us to discount all the details in Herodotus as a parable out of season (cf. How and Wells *ad loc.*). The arbitrators gave power to an oligarchy of rich land-owners: "they ordered the rest of the Milesians, who had been at odds, to obey these men" (Hdt. 5.29.2). Herodotus plainly thought that the period of prosperity began with an oligarchy and continued under the tyrants; and there is no reason to disbelieve him. At Miletus as elsewhere in Ionia the later tyranny

⁴³Note too that the story of Antheus, son of the eponym Assessus, is another ritual *aition*, and the rite in question was conducted at the sowing of the corn. 'Ανθεύς "Blossomer" and his mother Ἑλλαμενὴ "Sheaved" (< *φ*ελ- "wind," "twist," cf. ἐλλεδανός) should be compared with Φριγὸς "Bristling," i.e., like a ripe ear of corn, and his sister Ἑλλη "Sheaf." Phrixus and Helle, who live in the corn-lands of Thessaly, personify an undoubted rite of the autumn sowing; the ram-sacrifice and the magic fleece bring the rain-cloud, Νεφέλη, and dispel the drought that parches the seed corn. The sacrificial victim personified as Antheus is slaughtered in a well, another piece of rain magic; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.13.

owes more to Persian methods of control than to any local development (cf. Hdt. 6.43.3, Mardonius' reversal of Persian methods). The tyrants set up by Persia, even more than other tyrants, will have left existing institutions in place;⁴⁴ evidence to be considered below suggests that after 479 oligarchic government was easily resumed. On this reckoning the period of true oligarchy between the arbitration and the tyranny need not have lasted very long in order to be fondly remembered by Herodotus' informants.

Before the arbitration there were two generations of strife (Hdt. 5.28). In the days of Alyattes and Periander Miletus was firmly ruled by Thrasybulus. Thrasybulus' span is hard to gauge;⁴⁵ and in any case the earlier tyranny continues after him for an unknown interval—it might be a few months, or many years—with two names in Plutarch, Thoas and Damasenor (*Quaest. Gr.* 32, 298c). Plutarch says that after these tyrants were overthrown, Miletus was torn between two factions, the rich and the hand-workers, until the rich won out; Plutarch's factions are reasonably equated with Herodotus' period of strife, lasting two generations.⁴⁶ It seems impossible that Thoas and Damasenor were overthrown before ca 600 B.C.; the arbitration cannot be earlier than ca 540. But the overthrow is probably somewhat later, and the generations may be somewhat longer. The most comfortable date for the arbitration is ca 525 B.C.

The list of the *aisymnetai* of the Molpi as eponyms of the civic year begins in 525/4 B.C. It is natural to think that the list began to be faithfully kept just when strife ended and a stable government was organized.⁴⁷ On general grounds it seems very likely that the wealthy "Singers" gave a lasting shape to their ritual under the oligarchy and were allowed to go on by the tyrants.

⁴⁴Aristagoras, moreover, was not averse to treating with the oligarchs of Naxos (Hdt. 5.30.1).

⁴⁵The only datable event in Thrasybulus' career is the end of the war with Alyattes, in which Periander is also concerned (Hdt. 1.20; whence Polyaeus 6.47; Frontinus 3.15.6). Ancient chronographers put this in 612, modern reckoning in ca 602: H. Kaletsch, "Zur lydischen Chronologie," *Historia* 7 (1958) 1–47, at 13, 36, 47; A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, Pa 1979) 252.

⁴⁶The inference is generally made: so, e.g., Halliday *ad loc.*; Hiller von Gaertringen 1594–1595; Berve (above, n. 32) 1.102, 2.579; G. L. Huxley, *The Early Ionians* (London 1966) 79–80; L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 214. Note however that according to Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3b *Kommentar* 1.414, Thoas and Damasenor cannot be dated even roughly. I do not think that the phrase τῶν περὶ Θόαντα καὶ Δαμασῆνορα τυράννων is so odd that τυράννων must be deleted (Halliday, Berve), or that χειρομάχα should mean "Close-fighting" rather than "Handicraft" (Jeffery). It is true that Plutarch does not mention the countryside, but there is no reason why he should. His account of the ensuing oligarchic government will be examined further on, apropos of the banishment decree.

⁴⁷So Hiller von Gaertringen 1595–1596; but it is fanciful to describe the new order as a "theocracy" attractive to Persians. Although the list begins afresh in 525/4, the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi must have served as eponym since at least the middle of the seventh century, when the practice was carried to Olbia and probably to Sinope: Ehrhardt 192–203.

And since in this ritual the *aisymnetes* inaugurates the civic year, it is also natural to think that the ritual took shape just when the list of *aisymnetai* began. It was argued above that the statutes are designed to promote the unity of Miletus and the countryside; the chronological agreement between the statutes and the arbitration supports this conclusion.

The arbitrators were Parians—whom “the Milesians chose out of all the Greeks,” says Herodotus, without saying why. We infer that Paros had a stable government, we infer that she was friendly to Miletus;⁴⁸ yet this is not enough to set her apart from all other Greeks. It is however distinctive of Paros that she possessed a cult of the Cabeiri imprinted in ancient myth and associated with the Greek cult of Demeter.⁴⁹ Paros then was familiar with the same native stock and beliefs as existed at Assesus; she too had come to terms with them. Herodotus surely thought of the Cabeiri when he emphasized the choice of Paros, as also when he spoke of Lelegians on the islands. “Cabeiri” were important to Herodotus’ scheme of things: it was a standard name for certain gods recurring in Greece and Egypt and the early Pelasgian domain (2.51.2, 3.37.3, cf. Hemberg 74–78), as standard as the names of the Olympians.

Thus all our indications converge on the year 525/4 B.C. This, it seems, is when an oligarchy was established by external arbitration; when peace and security came to the countryside and Miletus grew more prosperous than ever; when the ritual of the Molpi was made a civic ceremony; when several *proshetairotai* joined the civic ceremony as representatives of the several subdivisions of Milesian territory; when the civic authorities chose to honour rural shrines along the road to Didyma; above all, when the Onitadae as outsiders were brought into the inner circle of Miletus.

As already said, eating and drinking were to the fore in the worship of the Cabeiri, and so they are too in the statutes of the Molpi, but in a setting typically Greek, and indeed typically oligarchic: what we might call the magistrates’ carouse. In later days the custom became general, spreading from oligarchy to democracy, and everywhere in the Greek world magistrates and councillors celebrated the beginning and the end of their year of service with some festivity (cf. the Suda s. ἡμέρα ἐορτῆς, citing Dem. 19 *De*

⁴⁸In an anecdote which is not above suspicion Paros, Erythrae, and Samos arbitrate between Andros and Chalcis apropos of a disputed settlement in Chalcidice, and Paros alone sides with Chalcis (Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 30, 298a–b). However we interpret this occasion, it can have little similarity with the internal conflict at Miletus. W. G. Forrest, *CAH*² 3.3.259–260, finds it significant that a Parian arbitration is mentioned by the travellers de Tournefort and Pitton in the early eighteenth century; a word about conditions then would have been welcome.

⁴⁹On Paros the traces of the Cabeiri consist, first, of late inscriptions mentioning the Great Gods as conjoined with Hermes, a group recurring in Thebes and other places, and, second, of the mythical names Cabarnis, Cabarnus, and the priesthood called *kabarnoi*. These names are associated with Demeter, but so is the cult of the Cabeiri at Thebes; the association seems to be a very early trait. See Hemberg 171–172.

falsa leg. 190). Yet even then oligarchs had more license; the Theban oligarchy of 379 B.C. furnishes the most notorious example of the magistrates' carouse.⁵⁰ In the Archaic period the custom was far more restricted. In 525 B.C. it was a heady privilege for the Onitadae to be admitted to the company of the *stephanephoroi*, and for one of them to be accorded the same consideration as the retiring *aisymnetes*.

In sum, the purpose of the original statutes is to unify the territory of Miletus by giving its representatives, Greek and Carian, a part in official ceremony. In 479/8, as soon as Miletus is refounded, the ceremony is revived, but in straitened circumstances. The Molpi resolve to conduct the ritual without the Onitadae, if necessary; the outlying territory is not secure. The effort of conciliation is not renounced, however; otherwise the Onitadae would have simply been omitted. Since the Molpi seek to perpetuate the same ceremony, they and others in the city are men of the same stamp as before—oligarchs. In the period after 479 Miletus is divided, the oligarchs holding power in the city, another faction or factions established elsewhere.

The next step is the decree of 450/49. Miletus again controls all its territory, for the prescript names the board of five *proshetairoi* who represent all five demes or divisions. The original statutes are inscribed and displayed in the new Delphinium; the Molpi swear to abide by them hereafter. The government is still an oligarchy.

III THE BANISHMENT DECREE

The banishment decree, *Milet* 1.6 no. 187 = Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 366–367,⁵¹ has like the statutes of the Molpi been subject to misunderstanding: the names of those proscribed are heard as a Neleid dynasty who now, supposedly in the late 440s, give place to a democracy.⁵² And like the statutes the banishment decree has also been disallowed as evidence, on the grounds that the date is uncertain and that neither the offenders nor the authorities can be identified (so Gehrke 24–27). It is indeed true that in the period to which the decree is assigned by epigraphic and archaeological indications combined, i.e., in the years immediately following 479, our knowledge of events at Miletus is a blank, so that we are left to guess the

⁵⁰Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.4–7; Nepos 16 *Pelop.* 9.4–11.4, *De gen. Socr.* 4.577c. Cf. F. Croissant and F. Salviat, "Aphrodite gardienne des magistrats: Gynéconomes de Thasos et polémarches de Thèbes," *BCH* 90 (1966) 460–471, at 465–470, who emphasize the ritual background of the carouse.

⁵¹Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." re-edits the text from Rehm's photograph. He was told that the stone was missing from the Berlin Museum, but it has come to light again: Ehrhardt 517, n. 1297.

⁵²So G. Glotz, "Une inscription de Milet," *CRAI* 1906.511–529; Barron 1–6. Many others have accepted their results, most recently Cataldi 176–177, 219–220.

occasion of the decree. Yet the term *epimenioi* for the board of officers who enforce the decree is, as we shall see, diagnostic of the government in power: it is an oligarchic government, and the decree like the statutes shows that the oligarchic regime of the late sixth century was restored after 479.

The base inscribed with our decree once supported a stele on which, it is generally agreed, a prior decree of similar import must have been displayed. Base and stele were set up at the north-west corner of the North Market, next to the Bay of Lions—a very conspicuous position. Moreover, the installation must have taken place almost as soon as the city was reoccupied after 479. The North Market was laid out and built up in the course of the fifth century, but the base was not aligned with the perimeter of the Market, and it rested at a lower level than the ground level which was established by the earliest buildings.⁵³ In the opinion of experts the letter forms of the inscription likewise point to the early fifth century, i.e., to the years just after 479.⁵⁴ In the absence of comparative material from the ensuing period, it was possible to suggest that Milesian writing developed slowly, and so that the decree might be rather later, perhaps as late as the 440s; but a recently published inscription shows letter forms slightly more advanced, and since this inscription labels an Archaic statue as belonging to one of the six Ionic tribes, it can hardly be later than the mid century (above, note 6).

One other consideration supports the early date. Our decree does not originate with the democracy which held sway in the second half of the fifth century, witness the term *epimenioi* as interpreted below; yet it was not objectionable to the democracy, for the base was not removed nor the inscription effaced. Accordingly this sentence of banishment was not imposed in the period immediately preceding the democracy, during which the oligarchs harried the democrats ([Xen.] *Const. Ath.* 3.11). It must go back to an earlier day, when measures were taken which the democracy might endorse—as at the re-founding of the city in 479.

The decree names several offenders—one or more in the lost beginning, and two brothers in the lines that remain.⁵⁵ The names are not distinctive of any dynasty or program,⁵⁶ and we can only surmise what faction is under ban. The Nympharetus who is father of one or more of the offenders and

⁵³G. Kleiner, *Die Ruinen von Milet* (Berlin 1968) 15, 50, 53 fig. 29; Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 380–381.

⁵⁴A. Rehm, apud Th. Wiegand, "Vierter vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der königlichen Museen zu Milet," *ArchAnz* (1906) 1–41, at 16; *Milet* 1.3 p. 282; Meiggs and Lewis, *GHI*² p. 107; Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 377; Meiggs, *Athenian Empire* 565.

⁵⁵Barron (3) held that our decree occupied the whole stele before spilling over onto the base, so that a great many offenders must have been named. But this arrangement is very unlikely: Meiggs, *Athenian Empire* 564–565.

⁵⁶Against the Neleid hypothesis see Wilamowitz, *GGA* 176.75, n. 1; Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 368–370; Gehrke 26–27. Nor there is reason to say with Earp (146–147) that the offenders sound more like oligarchs than supporters of tyranny.

whose property is forfeit bears the same name, and is of the same generation, as the *aisymnetes* of the year 503/2 (*Milet* 1.3 no. 122 I 24), who served under the tyrant Aristagoras during his Persian period. Perhaps then these are Persian creatures. Such people must have made themselves more unpleasant than ever during the period 494–479,⁵⁷ and it would be natural for those refounding Miletus in 479 to condemn them in the most signal fashion, and for all who came after to uphold this condemnation.⁵⁸

A board of “monthly” officers, οἱ ἐπιμήνιοι, are to enforce the decree, rewarding anyone who kills an offender, or putting an offender to death if captured; one of their number, ὁ ἐπιμήνιος singular, is to bring the matter forward, *scil.* at a meeting of the council or the assembly; each succeeding board, ἐπιμηνίη, is to do likewise. On this showing the *epimenioi* might be either the presiding committee of the council or a board of magistrates. That they are in fact the presiding committee of the council is shown by the analogy of *epimenioi* attested in three colonies of Miletus (Istrus, Odessus, Cius) and in other Ionian cities.⁵⁹ Later in the fifth century, as we see from that decree datable to 437/6 or 413/2 or 404/3 (*Klio* 52 [1970] 165–166), the presiding committee were called *prytaneis*, as at Athens—though at Miletus the tribes they represented numbered twelve, not ten. Before this Miletus had *prytaneis* of a different kind—in early days a single *prytanis* with wide powers, later a board of magistrates, possibly six in number. It has therefore been suggested that when a democracy was first established at Miletus in the mid fifth century, the term *prytaneis* was avoided for the presiding committee of the council—the old-style *prytaneis* having just been set aside—in favour of the neutral term *epimenioi*, “monthly” officers.⁶⁰

Even if we grant what has already been ruled out, namely that the banishment decree might be as late as the mid century, there are still serious objections to this view of the *epimenioi*. Down to 1970 the earliest evidence for Athenian-style *prytaneis* was a decree of 380/79 B.C. (*SBBerl* 1901.911 = *LSAM* 45); the new decree, whether of 437/6 or 413/2 or 404/3, leaves a much shorter interval for the euphemistic *epimenioi*, between five years and forty, roughly speaking. As we shall soon see, Athens’ imposition of democracy can be no earlier than the 440s, for the Athenian regulations of

⁵⁷Berve, (above, n. 32) 1.106, conjectures that in the 480s Persia set up another tyrant over the stricken city, so that Plutarch, *De Her. mal.* 21.859d, in speaking of a tyrant Aristogenes expelled by Sparta, will refer to an immediate consequence of the battle of Mycale. Berve also conjectures that it was oligarchs who opposed both Persia and the tyrants as Persian creatures, inasmuch as Mardonius preferred to rely on democrats. All this is tenuous but not implausible.

⁵⁸Hiller von Gaertringen, who assigns the banishment decree to this juncture, points to the public curses of Teos (1598); but these are concerned with future offences. Moreover, as we can now see more clearly (cf. *SEG* 31 [1981] 984–985), it is a democracy at Teos which is assailing reactionary elements.

⁵⁹E. Szanto, “Ἐπιμήνιοι,” *RE* 6.1 (1907); Piérart, “Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . .” 376, n. 46; Gehrke 24, n. 39; Ehrhardt 210–213, 517–518.

⁶⁰Earp 147, n. 19; Barron 4–5; Gehrke 24–25.

450/49 or shortly after speak of “the *prytaneis* of the Milesians”—obviously old-style *prytaneis*, the leading magistrates of the city (if these were Athenian-style *prytaneis*, they would of course exclude the euphemistic *epimenioi* altogether). If then the *epimenioi* are Athenian-style *prytaneis* under another name, this prevarication began and ended between the middle or late 440s and the date of the new decree, as early as 437/6 or as late as 404/3: a strained hypothesis.

More importantly, the term *epimenioi* for a presiding committee was traditional in Ionia (above, note 59). We must wait for Hellenistic inscriptions to provide most of the instances, including those from Milesian colonies, but a decree of Eretria takes us back to the very beginning of the fifth century (*IG XII Supp.* 549 lines 4–6). On this evidence it cannot be maintained that the *epimenioi* of Miletus were a late innovation. A term so widely current must come down from an early period—from the seventh century, if Miletus was the model for her colonies, Cius and Istrus and Odessus. During the Hellenistic period we may suppose that the office was often democratic; but it goes back to the days of oligarchy, which at Miletus ended with Athens’ intervention. When the banishment decree was set up in the North Market, Miletus was ruled by an oligarchy.

The *epimenioi* of Miletus are known to us from literature under another name. We should recall that the term is also used for cult officials, public or private (much like *ἐποποιοί*, the two words serving to gloss each other), and that the two meanings have a common origin: monthly sacrifices were conducted at monthly meetings of the council (Ehrhardt 212–213, 519). The monthly ritual at Miletus stands behind one of Plutarch’s aetiologies (*Quaest. Gr.* 32, 298c–d), which has not been well understood and needs to be quoted in full.⁶¹ “Q. Who are the ἀειναῦται at Miletus? A. After the tyrants round Thoas and Damasenor were overthrown, two factions held the city, one called *ploutis*, ‘Wealth,’ the other *cheiromacha*, ‘Handicraft.’ Then the well-to-do prevailed and brought affairs into the hands of their faction: they would take counsel about the most important matters by embarking on their ships and putting out some way from land, and when they had ratified their decision they would sail back to land. And on this account they were called *aeinautai*, ‘Perpetual Sailors’.” It is obvious and agreed that this explanatory tale, like others of the genre, is fanciful: we cannot believe that the authorities at Miletus ever made a practice of going for a cruise, as it were, in order to conduct affairs of state with perfect confidentiality. But what has prompted the fancy?

Two ingredients are easily discerned. First, the term *aeinautai*, “Perpetual

⁶¹His source, as usual in the *Greek Questions*, cannot be identified. Halliday *ad loc.* suggests the Aristotelian *Constitution of Miletus*, but almost any of the ten other writers on Miletus who are listed by Jacoby, *FGrHist* 489–496, would do as well. It hardly matters. The *aeinautai* were once important in Miletus, and the few factual details presupposed by the *aition* must have been widely known for long after.

Sailors:" it gives rise to the notion that certain persons of consequence were typically aboard ship. Other evidence to be cited in a moment confirms that such a term existed, not only at Miletus but also in two or three cities of Euboea. Second, the notorious antagonism between the well-to-do and others in the city of Miletus during the period when power rested with the well-to-do: this gives rise to the notion that the well-to-do somehow exercised power while aboard ship. Is this all? Most scholars think it is, and they accordingly regard the *aeinantai* as a class of people, a merchant aristocracy or the like, who were called by this name because they owned ships and went to sea, or because they maintained and commanded the war-fleet.⁶²

It is not so. What the *aeinantai* did aboard ship was to "take counsel about the most important matters," ἐβουλευόντο περὶ τῶν μεγίστων, and to "ratify their decision," κυρώσαντες τὴν γνώμην. This language is proper to a council or an assembly; Plutarch's source knew the *aeinantai* as a council or an assembly. Being the well-to-do, they must form a council. Hesychius defines *aeinantai* as "the name of an office, *arche*, at Miletus;"⁶³ *arche* may of course denote a council as well as a magistracy.

The evidence from Euboea is conformable. A base found at Eretria records a dedication by the *aeinantai*, dating from the end of the fifth century: "The herm was set up by the *aeinantai* in the term of Timandrides and Timarchides and Scythes;" either councillors or magistrates may set up a herm; the three men named in the dating formula may or may not be of the number of the *aeinantai*.⁶⁴ On a stele of the early fifth century, to judge from the lettering, "found near the Venetian castle" at Chalcis, several names are listed under the heading *aeinantai* (IG XII 9.923 lines 2–5); the stone probably comes from Histiaea, since two of the men are identified as citizens of Orobiae, in the territory of Histiaea. Here too either councillors or magistrates might be in view. A much later inscription, from the third century, "found at Chalcis" though placed in the museum at Eretria, gives us an honorific decree of "the *koinon* of the *aeinantai*," to be posted in "the

⁶²Wilamowitz, *SBBerl* 1906.78 = *Kl. Schr.* 5.1.175; E. Ziebarth on IG XII 9.909; Busolt, *Gr. Staatskunde* 1.177, n. 4, 211; Halliday *ad loc.*; N. M. Kontoleon, "Οἱ Ἀειναῦται τῆς Ἐρετρίας," *ArchEph* 1963 [1965] 1–45; B. Bravo, "Remarques sur les assises sociales, les formes d'organisation et la terminologie du commerce maritime grec à l'époque archaïque," *Diald'HistAnc* 3 (1977) 29. A different view of the Euboean *aeinantai* is taken by S. C. Bakhuizen, "Iron and Chalcidian Colonization in Italy," *Meded* 37 (1975) 15–26, at 22, and *Chalcis-in-Euboea. Iron and Chalcidians Abroad* (Leiden 1976) 32: it is a term coined in the fifth century to denote levies of seamen.

⁶³Hesychius may draw either on Plutarch's source or on some other historian of Miletus (cf. above, n. 61), but not on Plutarch himself, as Halliday suggests; for it is only by inference that we recognize Plutarch's *aeinantai* as an *arche*.

⁶⁴They are not Polemarchs, as B. C. Petrakos thought when publishing the inscription ("Dedicace des AEINAYTAI d'Eretrie," *BCH* 87 [1963] 545–547); cf. *BullEp* 1964 no. 406. Kontoleon's speculations (above, n. 62) are also unconvincing; cf. Roussel (above, n. 7) 218, n. 28.

shrine" (*IG* XII 9.909 lines 3–4, 7–8). These *aeinantai* are a private corporation. On Euboea then the term is attested from the early fifth century onward, Histiaea (as it seems) giving the earliest instance, Eretria the next, and either Eretria or Chalcis the latest. It is reasonable to assume that at Eretria as at Histiaea the institution goes back to the late Archaic period.

Returning to Plutarch, we note that the *aeinantai* used to deliberate "by embarking on their ships and putting out some way from land," ἐμβαίνοντες ἐς τὰ πλοῖα καὶ πόρρω τῆς γῆς ἐπανάγοντες; afterwards "they would sail back to land," κατέπλεον. Now it was mischievous or whimsical of Plutarch's source to say that the council deliberated aboard ship. But when he spoke of councillors embarking on ships, putting out to sea, and then putting in again, was this connexion with ships and sailing purely imaginary? It seems unlikely, inasmuch as the term *aeinantai* does require explanation, and these details are not implausible if we look at them in a different light.

The presiding committee of any council had the duty of offering sacrifice at regular intervals, witness the Hellenistic prytany decrees of Athens, which honour successive committees chiefly on this account.⁶⁵ At Athens the sacrifices were most often addressed to Apollo and Artemis, the two deities who on the evidence of the Athenian calendar of months were foremost in civic worship. Apollo and Artemis are as prominent at Miletus as at Athens, but here the leading civic cult was conducted at the Delphinium, beside the Bay of Lions;⁶⁶ the situation and the epithet *delphinios* show that Apollo was a god of sea-faring.⁶⁷ In early days sea-faring was of far more concern to Miletus than to Athens, and we might expect her council to propitiate Apollo *delphinios* and other requisite deities. The commonest rite used by sea-farers was the *embaterion* or embarkation rite, performed aboard ship at the start of a voyage; a civic version took place when the sailing season opened, on behalf of the whole fleet.⁶⁸ Plutarch's story suggests that the council of Miletus conducted the embarkation rite month by month throughout the season.

The term ἀειναῦται now comes into focus. Linguistically the nearest analogue to these "Perpetual Sailors" is the "Perpetual Feeders" of Athens—ἀείσιτοι, those dining at public expense in the Prytaneum or the Tholos.⁶⁹

⁶⁵S. Dow, *Prytaneis* (Princeton, N.J. 1937, *Hesperia* Supp. 1); B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Councillors* (Princeton, N.J. 1974, *Agora* 15).

⁶⁶Graf, "Apollon Delphinios" 7–9; Ehrhardt 130, 142–143, 148, 154, 421–422, 440, 442.

⁶⁷Graf, "Apollon Delphinios" 6–7, doubts the connection with the sea—unjustifiably, I think.

⁶⁸See D. Wachsmuth, ΠΟΜΗΙΜΟΣ Ο ΔΑΙΜΩΝ. *Untersuchungen zu den antiken Sakralhandlungen bei Seereisen* (Berlin 1967) 319–326. Apollonius of Rhodes describes a sacrifice to Apollo ἄκτιος and ἐμβάσιος which takes place on the shore on the eve of the Argonauts' departure (*Argon.* 1.402–518); the story of the Argonauts owes much to Miletus.

⁶⁹It is misguided to argue, as Kontoleon does (above, n. 62), that the first element of ἀει-ναῦται is an old preposition equivalent to ἐπί.

The *aeisitoi* of the Tholos are the clerical and ritual functionaries needed for the work of Athens' council; civic routine has made these men into "Perpetual Feeders," as it has made the councillors of Miletus into "Perpetual Sailors."

In the banishment decree the presiding committee of the council are called *epimenioi*; as we saw, this term likewise evokes the ritual duties which they perform. We also saw that *epimenioi* are attested at Eretria, again as a presiding committee, about the same time as at Miletus. Since *aeinautai* appear at Eretria just a little later, we can be fairly sure that both here and at Miletus the two terms are used interchangeably. The third-century inscription from Eretria or Chalcis gives us *aeinautai* as a private corporation. It is not surprising that in later times the civic term should be adopted by private persons celebrating the embarkation rite; the civic term *epimenioi* was adopted more generally by private groups.

It was remarked above that Plutarch agrees with Herodotus in describing a period of strife followed by an oligarchy; the *aeinautai* belong to the regime dated by Herodotus and the statutes of the Molpi to the years after 525 B.C. The *epimenioi* are found pursuing traitors soon after 479. Thus the banishment decree like the statutes shows that in the reoccupation of Miletus after 479 the government was an oligarchy similar to the oligarchy of the late Archaic period. This government lasted for some considerable time, so that even when a democracy came to power the banishment decree was left in place in the North Market as a memorial of the remoter past.

IV THE ATHENIAN REGULATIONS FOR MILETUS

The Athenian regulations for Miletus, *IG* I³ 21, have been a hive of controversy. There is uncertainty or disagreement about the date and the broad historical context; about the implied posture of affairs at Miletus; and about the substance and intent of Athens' regulations.⁷⁰ On some points, however, an orthodox position has been established, and my understanding of these is close to orthodoxy.

It is the dating of the regulations which has provoked the widest disagreement: either 450/49; or the following year; or a later year, perhaps as late as 442; or 426/5; or a later year, perhaps as late as 406/5. In Mattingly's assault against the usual criteria of epigraphic dating, especially three-bar sigma, *IG* I³ 21 has been hurled at the opposition again and again, but without real effect.⁷¹ His preferred date of 426/5 is not a suitable context, nor is it required by any internal feature of the decree, not by the technical nomen-

⁷⁰The fullest studies are Bradeen and McGregor 24–70 and Cataldi.

⁷¹See Mattingly, and also at *Historia* 25 (1976) 40–42, and his earlier contributions as listed in the heading to *IG* I³ 21. J. D. Smart, "The Athenian Empire," *Phoenix* 31 (1977) 245–257, at 250–251, puts so little stock in letter forms that he dates the regulations to 406/5, restoring archon Callias in the prescript. E. Bloedow, "Hipponicus and Euthydemus (Euthynus),"

clature nor by archon Εὐθύνος, who dates a previous set of regulations for Miletus (lines 61, 88).⁷² It is true, but it does not signify, that the archon of 426/5 is the only archon of this name otherwise attested (*IG* I³ 369 line 5, etc.).⁷³ For in the literary tradition the archon of 426/5 also appears as Εὐδῆμος (Diodorus, Athenaeus), as does the archon of 431/0 (again Diodorus and Athenaeus) and the archon of 450/49 (Diodorus, Anon. Argent.). The remnant of an archon date in a fragment of comic *didaskaliai* suggests that the archon of 431/0 was really Εὐδῆμος (*IG Urb. Rom.* 215 line 3 = Mette, *Urk. dram. Aufführungen* VI A 1 line 3).⁷⁴ If the literary tradition is wrong in two cases, 426/5 and 431/0, it is as likely as not to be wrong in the third, 450/49. We need not hesitate to accept the obvious implication of our decree: that the archon of 450/49 was really Εὐθύνος. At least three other men named Εὐθύνος, and also one named Εὐθύνοος, a name indistinguishable from the other in fifth-century writing, are on record in Classical Athens (*PA* 5656–5659), so that we should not be surprised to find two archons of this name in successive generations, in 450/49 and 426/5.⁷⁵

On the evidence of letter forms our inscription antedates ca 445, and therefore the Euthynus of lines 61 and 88 is the archon of 450/49. Yet as everyone allows, the year of Euthynus does not by itself fix the date of the decree, for the present regulations are avowedly additional to others enacted under Euthynus; accordingly 450/49 is the upper limit, and ca 445 the lower. Another consideration has been invoked to narrow the dating further. If the prescript of this *stoichedon* inscription is restored so as to include an archon date in line 3, the space available for the archon's name appears to be just seven letters;⁷⁶ within this period the only archons suitably named are

Chiron 11 (1981) 65–72, at 67, favours Mattingly's dating, and K. Meister, *Die Ungeschichtigkeit des Kalliasfriedens* (Wiesbaden 1982) 120, n. 332, insists upon it. Balcer is altogether undecided (27–28).

⁷²Mattingly's earlier arguments from nomenclature were answered by Bradeen and McGregor (65–66). The similarities of phrasing which he now finds in *IG* I³ 78, the first-fruits decree, and in *IG* I³ 68, Cleonymus' decree about the tribute, are not more compelling: *Historia* 25 (1976) 40–42; "The Athenian Decree for Miletos . . ." 114–115.

⁷³Most of the evidence for the archons in question is given by Hill, *Sources*² 398–399, and need not be repeated here.

⁷⁴Both Moretti and Mette restore the archon date as ἐπὶ Εὐ(θυ)δ[ήμου] so as to agree with Diodorus, but Εὐδῆμος would do very well as a fifth-century archon (cf. *PA* 5385–5412). The date in question, a victory of Telecleides, cannot be 450/49, as proposed by Mattingly in *ΦΟΡΟΣ. Tribute to B. D. Meritt* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1974) 98–99.

⁷⁵According to Mattingly, "The Athenian Decree for Miletos . . ." 115–117, the incidence of repeated names in the archon list, especially of those which are uncommon names, makes it unlikely that "Euthynus" would appear twice at the interval of a generation; but his own statistics do not bear him out. Note in passing that *PA* 5653, another supposed "Euthynus," has proved to be "Euthoenus" instead (Mattingly 115, n. 14).

⁷⁶That is, with the crowding of iota and the *daseia* which is usual in this inscription. The irregularities in the *stoichedon* pattern suggested to Bradeen and McGregor (30–33) that an Ionic text was converted into Attic at the last moment.

Εὐθους himself and Πεδιδεύς in the following year, 449/8. This line of restoration, taken together with the letter forms and the presumed historical context, has seemed to many to impose the date 450/49.⁷⁷ The inference is indeed tempting, but it must be resisted. In the fifth century an archon date is not mandatory in the prescript of decrees on stone;⁷⁸ and line 3 can be restored just as plausibly without the archon date.⁷⁹

To round off the matter of dating we may anticipate the argument and say that other evidence does not in fact reduce the limits 450/49–ca 445. The revolt of Miletus known to [Xen.] *Const. Ath.* 3.11 comes after the regulations, but can be dated only roughly, within either of the periods 449–447 or 446–443 (section v below); on this showing the regulations might still be as late as ca 445. In some eyes the regulations are ensnarled in that mighty nexus of events which we call the “Peace of Callias.” It has been held that the regulations, in providing for an Athenian garrison at Miletus, must precede the Peace of Callias (Bradeen and McGregor 38). But it has also been held that the Peace of Callias first gave Athens the opportunity to tyrannize over the allies, as by issuing the regulations (Balcer 28). In either case the pivotal year is 449, the notional date of this notional dispensation.⁸⁰ The Peace of Callias is a joker in the pack; it makes a better game to play without it.

As to the content of the decree, the prevailing view has always been that Athens is here dealing with Milesian oligarchs. Admittedly this view was often bolstered with a false suppletion of lines 6–7 which introduced the *aisymnetes* of the Molpi and his *proshetairoi*; these ceremonial figures are not wanted, and are excluded by the traces.⁸¹ Yet] *hoi prytanes hoi Miliesion* (line 65) can only be the old-style board of magistrates, as in a dedication of the late sixth century (*Milet* 1.3 no. 129).⁸² They cannot be the rotating committee of the council, who would not be described as “the *prytaneis* of

⁷⁷In this respect *IG* I² 22 of 1913 and *IG* I³ 21 of 1981 are in firm agreement, displaying the restoration in the text.

⁷⁸Fornara (474, n. 11) compares *IG* I³ 78, the rules for first fruits at Eleusis, likewise undated by archon. It is, he says, the same “kind of decree,” i.e., a commissioners’ report adopted by the Assembly; but the subject matter is no closer than in many other undated decrees.

⁷⁹For example, [τάδε τοῖς Μιλεσίοις *hoi chosyngraphes* κτλ. (Cataldi). The restoration of Foucart adopted by Mattingly (114) less feasibly assumes an error in the preserved letters.

⁸⁰Note however that interest has revived in an earlier date for the Peace, whether real or fictive or abortive: J. Walsh, “The Authenticity and the Dates of the Peace of Callias and the Congress Decree,” *Chiron* 11 (1981) 31–63; Meister (above, n. 71) 6–31; E. Badian, “The Peace of Kallias,” *JHS* 107 (1987) 1–39.

⁸¹The suppletion of *proshetairoi* goes back to Hiller von Gaertringen, and was expanded in different ways by Oliver and Woodhead. For the improved reading of line 7 see Bradeen and McGregor 39.

⁸²Meiggs 27; Earp 143–144; Barron 4; Bradeen and McGregor 58; Cataldi 178, 209. In the Hellenistic period the *prytaneis* of Miletus were again a board of magistrates, probably six in number: F. Gschnitzer, “Prytanis 7,” *RE Supp.* 13 (1973) 764; H. Müller, *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse* (Göttingen 1976) 38–39, 54. They are doubtless a revival of the earlier board.

the Milesians," but rather, like their Athenian counterparts, as the *prytaneis* who hold office from time to time or at a given time.⁸³ The fragmentary context suggests that these *prytaneis* are to take an oath on behalf of Miletus, a responsibility which would fall on the highest magistrates.⁸⁴ Thus the regulations show that Miletus was still governed by an oligarchy in 450/49, and perhaps even for a few years after that; in this they agree with the statutes of the Molpi, as interpreted above (section II).

The regulations, drawn up by Athenian commissioners (lines 1, 3), are very fragmentary, but it is clear that Athens has intervened hugely in the affairs of Miletus, sending out five commandants, ἄρχοντες, to take charge (lines 4–6, 35, 39, 45, 62, 71, 82), and either dispatching or requisitioning troops (lines 10–15), and enforcing loyalty to Athens (lines 27–28), and setting up judicial procedures for a variety of offences (lines 28–51), and also, as it seems, making restitution for certain local fines and taxes of the past (lines 51–61).⁸⁵ It is sometimes thought that the section about troops calls for Milesians to serve under Athenian command, but in view of subsequent references to an Athenian garrison and guard-ships (lines 75, 85), it is more likely to be concerned with the conveyance of the garrison and the commandants.⁸⁶ In the judicial section we find a rather elaborate apparatus, including both the commandants and *epimeletai* (line 40), for trying some cases at Miletus and referring others to Athens, and perhaps for respecting reciprocal arrangements in mercantile litigation. It is not clear whether the apparatus is needed only because Athens' power has been or may soon be challenged, or also because Athenians and Milesians will henceforth have more to do with each other.

At the last, after mention of the oath-taking, some odds and ends are dealt with: further powers of the Athenian commandants (lines 73–77: only the commandants can be in view), and the security of a place called Arnasus (lines 81–83). The commandants must ensure that the people of Arnasus are kept under control: ὁππὸς ἂν ἄρχοντ[α]. Athens' Council must look to the security of the place: ἐπι | μελέσθω δὲ ἡ | ε βολ[ῆ τῆς φ]υλακῆς.

Why did Athens intervene at Miletus, issuing first the regulations under Euthynus, then the present regulations? The usual answer is that Miletus has been subdued after revolting from Athens; Athens reasserts control with successive regulations. Yet everyone knows that Miletus was paying tribute

⁸³Gehrke (22) thinks that these *prytaneis* may just as well be a rotating committee, Athenian-style. But see *IG I²* p. 369, index of *sermo Atticus*, for the manner in which Athenian decrees of this period refer to the rotating committee.

⁸⁴Bradeen and McGregor 57–58; Cataldi 209–210.

⁸⁵For this matter of restitution see Bradeen and McGregor 52–56; Cataldi 200–207.

⁸⁶Bradeen and McGregor 40, after Lewis and Bengtson. No doubt it is also possible that Milesians are being detailed to serve with the Athenian garrison and with an Athenian patrol at sea: Cataldi 180–182.

for at least two years before the year of Euthynus, since 452/1; a new fragment of the first tribute-quota list, to be considered below (section v), shows her paying right from the start, in 454/3. So the putative revolt is long over, and Athens has been remarkably slow to impose a settlement, and even now continues to tolerate an oligarchy; only after a second revolt in the 440s will she see her way to installing a democracy. Because of these difficulties it has been argued that only the present regulations are prompted by the revolt, and that the reference to Euthynus' year is to the *status quo ante* (Fornara; Cataldi 175–178). But the present regulations cannot be the sequel to the oligarchs' revolt of the 440s, for as we have just seen, Miletus is still governed by oligarchic magistrates, the *prytaneis*.⁸⁷

The truth is that these regulations do not at all presuppose a revolt.⁸⁸ We can point to regulations which Athens undoubtedly drew up for subjugated cities, and they are quite different from ours. The regulations for Chalcis in 446/5 contain a threatening oath by the Athenians; a submissive oath for the Chalcidians, with dire penalties for failing to swear; and peremptory decisions about hostages, taxes, and law-suits (*IG I³ 40*). The previous regulations for Eretria were similar (*IG I³ 39*). In 439/8 the Samians were made to swear abjectly (*IG I³ 48*), and some years earlier the Colophonians likewise (*IG I³ 37*). The earliest oaths in the series come from Erythrae, one for councillors and the other perhaps for citizens at large (*IG I³ 13–14*); it is commonly inferred that Erythrae too had been disloyal, maybe more than once. No such oath is prescribed for Miletus; the oaths which we hear of after the body of the decree (lines 69–72, perhaps 65–72) are to uphold the terms of the decree, and it is likely that both sides swear to the same effect.

What the regulations unmistakably reveal is internal conflict at Miletus. Steps are taken to secure Arnasus: the outlying territory is opposed to the city. Money and property are restored to persons who have suffered exactions in the past; to receive such consideration from Athens they must be

⁸⁷Two attempts have been made to explain why, supposing that Athens is about to install a democracy after the oligarchs' revolt, oligarchic *prytaneis* still appear in the regulations. Mattingly, "The Athenian Decree for Miletos . . ." 117, n. 26, while placing the regulations in 426/5 or soon after, leaves it open whether these are Athenian-style or old-style *prytaneis* (he dismisses out of hand the date 437/6 for the new decree with Athenian-style *prytaneis*); if old-style, "the reference could be to the past (however recent)." This seems very unlikely on general grounds, and the context, admittedly fragmentary, indicates that at this point the authorities on either side, at Athens and at Miletus, are being charged to uphold the regulations (cf. above, n. 84). Cataldi (178) thinks that the *prytaneis* belong to a regime which is discredited and about to be replaced by a democracy, but is still functioning. We must then suppose either that this board of *prytaneis* held power during the revolt, or that a new board has taken office with Athens' consent; neither is credible.

⁸⁸Mattingly in E. Badian, ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg* (Oxford 1966) 207, said that if the regulations were to be dated in 450/49, they must have been prompted by *stasis* rather than revolt; but he went on to argue, as often since, for 426/5.

democrats opposed to the ruling oligarchy. In general, the judicial processes set up by Athens should favour others than the oligarchs, notably the democrats. It thus appears that Athens, while joining hands with the oligarchy, endeavours to reconcile and reassure the opposition. The regulations are in contrast with Athens' treatment of some other cities, in which the democrats are given exclusive power and license.

It is because of the unsettled conditions that the five Athenian commandants are so prominent. Our regulations provide almost the earliest surviving mention of such commandants overseas, ἀρχοντες in the narrow sense, as distinct from *phourarchoi* and *episkopoi* and other officials. They continued to be sent out as long as Athens' empire lasted—always to places where a military presence was required, though they might also take a hand in civil affairs, as at Miletus.⁸⁹ What significance if any attaches to their number, five, at Miletus? Sciathos had only one commandant (*IG* I³ 110 lines 19–20), Samos more than one (Thuc. 1.115.5). Elsewhere the number is doubtful. Had Cos “a commandant” or “commandants” after it was fortified by Alcibiades? The mss of Thucydides are divided (8.108.2).⁹⁰ On Lesbos it may be Athenian officials in the wider sense who are referred to as ἀρχοντες (Antiphon 5 [Herodes] 47).⁹¹ When a phrase like “the ἀρχοντες in the cities” appears in Athenian documents,⁹² it is always the iterative plural, which would be used even if a single commandant were the rule; sometimes the phrase may include lesser officials. There is no telling whether a board of five existed in other cities.⁹³

As we saw before (section II), the territory of Miletus has five natural divisions, the five demes of Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions. The five *proshetairoi* who are named in the statutes of the Molpi arguably represent these five divisions; the statutes too belong to 450/49, the year of Euthynus. In the regulations steps are taken to secure part of the outlying territory, the place called Ἀρνασός. “Arnasus” had some importance in the mid fifth century, and it is a little odd that the name is never found in the inscriptions of Miletus. The name that is most like it is Ἀργάσσα, the deme that includes

⁸⁹W. Schuller, *Die Herrschaft der Athener im ersten Attischen Seebund* (Berlin 1974) 42–48, 156–158.

⁹⁰Though editors have preferred the singular, there are no grounds for choice; see Andrewes *ad loc.*

⁹¹Schuller rightly says that these are Athenian “archons” abroad, not archons at Athens, or any other board at Athens (above, n. 89, 44, n. 236); but it is also true that in this context as often elsewhere the “archons” abroad may be any Athenian officials.

⁹²The ἀρχοντες or the ἀρχαί abroad are referred to at *IG* I³ 34 lines 6–7; 101 line 54; 122 lines 5–6; 156 lines 5–8; 282 I 11–12; *GHI*² 45 sections 1, 3, 4, 10. In 114 lines 9, 11 the restoration of ἀρχοντες “at Abdera” is too uncertain to be considered.

⁹³Five Athenians are sent to Chalcis to administer the oath of loyalty (*IG* I³ 40 lines 45–57); the Assembly chose them, as it seems to have chosen the five commandants for Miletus (*IG* I³ 21 lines 4–5, as restored). But this is a different task, and another isolated instance.

Didyma and, one may suppose, much of the south coast.⁹⁴ Ἀρνασός may be a variant, or a mistake. If so, the regulations are expressly concerned with one of the five divisions. Perhaps the five commandants were set over the five divisions.

However this may be, there is tension at Miletus at the time of the regulations, tension between oligarchs and democrats, between the city and the place called "Arnasus." Other evidence agrees. The statutes of the Molpi and the banishment decree show that after 479 oligarchs held power in the city but met with opposition elsewhere. The statutes further show that the countryside, or part of it, was restive in 479/8 but was reconciled in 450/49. The tribute lists will show that Leros and Teichiussa were at odds with the city in 454/3 but were brought in by 450/49. Finally, [Xenophon] says that at a certain moment Athens gave decisive support to the oligarchs of Miletus, Μιλησίων εἶλοντο τοὺς βελτίστους (*Const. Ath.* 3.11).

The conclusion then is that Athens intervened at Miletus not because she revolted but because she was divided against herself, oligarchs ruling in the city and others holding out in the countryside. Since oligarchy was the traditional government of Miletus, going back before the desolation, it is not surprising that Athens chose to strengthen this government as the best means of reuniting the Milesians. The first set of regulations was drawn up in 450/49, the second before ca 445. When the oligarchs revolted shortly thereafter, the Athenian garrison and commandants may have already been withdrawn; if not, they failed to stop the revolt.

V THE TRIBUTE-QUOTA LISTS

From 454/3 onwards the tribute-quota lists should throw light on the fortunes of Miletus. If Miletus does not pay tribute, she is in revolt from Athens (but because no list is fully preserved, non-payment can never be proved conclusively). If at some point the tribute is reduced by half, from ten talents to five, conditions in the city have changed: perhaps Athens has quelled revolt and imposed strict control; perhaps oligarchy has been replaced by democracy. If outlying settlements pay tribute as well as the city, or instead of the city, the Milesians are beset by stasis. Two reconstructions have been offered, and are still maintained by opposing camps. In the one reconstruction Miletus revolts but once, in the 50s, and the end of the revolt, in ca 452, marks the beginning of democracy.⁹⁵ In the other Miletus revolts

⁹⁴For the deme Ἀργασα see Wilamowitz, *GGA* 168 (1906) 640 = *Kl. Schr.* 5.1.375; Robert (above, n. 18).

⁹⁵Piérart, "Les ἐπιμήνιοι . . ." 377–388; Gehrke 17–31, esp. 29–31. Piérart however has changed his mind (see below, n. 100).

twice, in the 50s and again in the 40s; the earlier settlement leaves the oligarchs in power, the later brings democracy.⁹⁶

In the light of the results obtained so far (sections II–IV) the first reconstruction is inadmissible: Miletus was still governed by an oligarchy in 450/49. Must we then embrace the second reconstruction? It has often been pointed out that two revolts in short order do not make a very attractive hypothesis, especially when both are due to oligarchs, though Athens has intervened firmly in the meantime. This difficulty leads some to postulate a wholesale expulsion of Neleids, so that the earlier rebels may be distinguished from the later. The truth is that the second reconstruction like the first rests on false premisses. A fresh approach is wanted.

Before turning to the tribute-quota lists, we should examine the passage of [Xenophon] already referred to several times (*Const. Ath.* 3.11). In the subject cities, says [Xenophon], Athens favours the people, the democrats, over the oligarchs—not unreasonably. For whenever Athens has supported oligarchs, it has not turned out to her advantage. “Within a short time the people were enslaved in Boeotia. And when she chose the better sort in Miletus, within a short time they revolted and massacred the people. And when she chose Sparta over Messenia, within a short time Sparta subdued Messenia and made war on Athens.”

These three examples are taken from a time well past, for [Xenophon] makes the point that Athens learned from them and is now consistent in favouring the people. And unless Athens was very slow to learn, they must belong roughly to the same period; if the examples seem oddly assorted, perhaps it is because they happened close together. In point of chronology this is all that [Xenophon] can tell us. We know the dates of Athens’ intervention in Boeotia, and, less securely, of the Messenian Revolt, and so we seem to know also that they just overlap. It is unlikely however that [Xenophon] knew as much; less likely still that he took care to place his three examples in chronological order. On each occasion Athens’ policy went wrong “within a short time.” The repeated phrase is due entirely to didactic emphasis, and in the light of Boeotia and Messenia it can mean a good ten years; but it might also mean a year or two.

At Miletus then [Xenophon] says that Athens supported oligarchs, and that they revolted; we infer that Athens subdued the revolt and imposed a democracy. Now Athens was supporting oligarchs in 450/49 and shortly after, when she issued the regulations. She had imposed a democracy by the time of that decree datable either to 437/6 or to a much later year, 413/2 or

⁹⁶Meiggs, “The Growth of Athenian Imperialism,” cf. *The Athenian Empire* 562–565; *ATL* 3.225–227, cf. 149–154; Earp; Barron; C. Leduc, *La constitution d’Athènes attribuée à Xénophon* (Paris 1976) 225–227.

404/3. In fact it must have been imposed before the year 441, when Athens intervened on Samos at the instance of Miletus. This evidence dates the revolt between 449 and 441; the tribute-quota lists reduce the limits further.

It will be helpful to see the evidence in tabular form. The entries for the years in question must be compared with the entries for other years, and so I take the tribute-quota lists year by year from 454/3 down to the last we know of, in 415/4; the assessment decree of 425 is also included.⁹⁷

454/53	I	1	Mile[sians?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 259 III 19
			ALSO:		
			Milesians from Leros	3T	<i>IG</i> I ³ 259 VI 19–20
			Milesians from Teichiussa	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 259 VI 21–22
453/52	I	2	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 260
452/51	I	3	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 261 II 28
451/50	I	4	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 262 (but cf. the lacuna after “Latmians” in II 16)
450/49	II	5	Milesians	10T	<i>IG</i> I ³ 263 V 18
449/48	II	6	THE MISSING LIST		
448/47	II	7	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 264
447/46	II	8	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 265 I 108
446/45	III	9	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 266
445/44	III	10	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 267
444/43	III	11	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 268
443/42	IV	12	Milesians	5T	<i>IG</i> I ³ 269 I 33
442/41	IV	13	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 270 I 31
441/40	IV	14	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 271
440/39	IV	15	Milesians	5T	<i>IG</i> I ³ 272 II 11
439/38	IV	16	[Milesians?]	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 273 I 31 (plausibly restored)
438/37	V	17	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 274 III 4
437/36	V	18	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 275
436/35	V	19	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 276
435/34	V	20	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 277
434/33	VI	21	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 278
433/32	VI	22	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 279 I 64
432/31	VI	23	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 280 I 60
431/30	VI	24	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
430/29	VII	25	[Milesians?]	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 281 I 14 (plausibly restored)
429/28	VII	26	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 282
428/27	VII	27	?	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 283
427/26?	VII	28?	Milesians	?	<i>IG</i> I ³ 284 lines 15–17
			Leros	?	
			Teichiussa	?	(not 3T)

⁹⁷The order and the dating are given as in *IG* I³; they are secure only as far as no. 23, *IG* I³ 280. For a similar table see Piérart, “Athens et Milet II . . .” 288–290. Piérart places *IG* I³ 283 in 426/25 and *IG* I³ 284 in a previous year: “Deux notes sur la politique d’Athènes en mer Égée (428–425),” *BCH* 108 (1984) 161–176, at 172–176; “Athens et Milet II . . .” 298–299. These uncertainties do not affect the present argument.

426/25?	VIII	29?	?	?	<i>IG I</i> ³ 284, if this is not list no. 28
Assessment of 425			Milesians, Leros, Teichiussa	?	<i>IG I</i> ³ 71 I 121–122
425/24	IX	30	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
424/23	IX	31	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
423/22	IX	32	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
422/21	X	33	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
421/20	X	34	Milesians, Leros, Teichiussa	10T	<i>IG I</i> ³ 285 I 88–90
420/19?	X	35?	?	?	<i>IG I</i> ³ 286
419/18	X	36	?	?	(no fragment preserved)
418/17	XI	37	?	?	<i>IG I</i> ³ 287
417/16	XI	38	?	?	<i>IG I</i> ³ 288
416/15	XI	39	Milesians, Leros, Teichiussa	10T	<i>IG I</i> ³ 289 I 36–38
415/14	XI	40	Milesians	10T	<i>IG I</i> ³ 290 I 9

No entry has survived for 450,⁹⁸ but Miletus was still ruled by the oligarchy in the following year, when ten talents were paid. The revolt and the imposition of democracy must come between the ten-talent payment of 449 and the five-talent payment of 442, and either before or after 446, when Miletus paid a sum which is not preserved on the stone. The reduction of tribute from ten talents to five no doubt took place when the revolt was put down, whether it was a concession to the democracy or a consequence of other punitive exactions, an indemnity (say) or a confiscation of resources. As between the periods 449–447 and 446–443, the sum paid in 446, if we only knew it, would give the answer. Until new evidence appears, the choice remains open.⁹⁹ In either case the revolt need not have lasted for the whole period that is available; it seems unlikely that Miletus, lacking both walls and ships, could defy Athens for three or four years.

To place the revolt of Miletus in the 440s, within the limits mentioned, satisfies all our evidence. Yet for the past seventy years nearly everyone has agreed in placing the revolt, or else the first of two revolts, between ca 456 and ca 452.¹⁰⁰ The reasons have been that the city of Miletus does not appear

⁹⁸It has very likely been swallowed up in the lacuna at *IG I*³ 262 II 17–25.

⁹⁹In favour of the first period it may be said that list no. 7 of 448/47, from which Miletus is missing, happens to be rather well preserved (*IG I*³ 264); cf. Meiggs, "The Growth of Athenian Imperialism" 27. There is a complication, however. It was argued by the authors of *ATL* (3.35–47, 49, 257) that Miletus with other cities of a "southeastern group" made two full payments in 446, both recorded in a sort of appendix to the main list—at *IG I*³ 265 I 108 and again at II 75, where Miletus and her tribute are restored *in vacuo*; one of the payments, it is held, has been deferred from the previous year, for the "southeastern group" are missing *en bloc* from *IG I*³ 264. The net result is to reduce the first interval of unattested payment, and if the "Peace of Callias" and the "Congress Decree" were in the air in 449/8, the year of the omitted list, the interval might vanish altogether. All this is too hypothetical to weigh in our reckoning.

¹⁰⁰Earp (142, n. 2), echoed by others since, traces the doctrine back to A. G. Dunham, *A History of Miletus* (London 1915) 132–138, a work which does not appear in the comprehensive bibliography of *ATL* 4.235–278, covering the years 1752–1953. The only subsequent dissenters known to me are Mattingly (above, n. 88) and Piérart in "Milet dans la première liste de tributs" 163–167, and "Athènes et Milet II . . ." 290, n. 55.

in the first two tribute-quota lists of 454/3 and 453/2, but only in the third of 452/1, when it is assumed to have paid the same very high tribute as in 450/49, ten talents; that in the first list two splinter groups, Milesians from Leros and Milesians from Teichiussa, pay separately, the first group three talents and the other perhaps the same; and that in 450/49 Athens intervened at Miletus, and in that year or soon after sent troops and commandants to Miletus to take control. None of these reasons is cogent. The last has already been dealt with; the Athenian regulations for Miletus, *IG I³ 21*, do not at all presuppose a revolt (section iv). Neither do the separate entries for the splinter groups at Leros and Teichiussa, as the following considerations will show.

From 452/1 down to the Archidamian War Leros and Teichiussa are not mentioned; Miletus alone pays tribute. But during the Archidamian War and the Peace of Nicias, when Miletus was certainly not in revolt, the tribute records have separate adjacent entries for Miletus, Leros, and Teichiussa. At first, in a tribute-quota list assigned by Meritt and his colleagues to 427/6 or 426/5 as no. 28 or no. 29, the three groups pay separately (*IG I³ 284* lines 15–17, where the sums are not preserved save part of Teichiussa's, which is not the quota on three talents). In the assessment of 425 and in later lists they pay jointly—in the assessment the collective sum is lost (*IG I³ 71 I 121–122*), but in the lists it is the quota on ten talents (*IG I³ 285 I 88–90*, list no. 34 of 421/0; *IG I³ 289 I 36–38*, list no. 39 of 416/5). The last list of all names Miletus alone, with the quota on ten talents (*IG I³ 290 I 9*, list no. 40 of 415/4).

It is true that the first list of 454/3 differs from the later records in that the city of Miletus is not named just ahead of the splinter groups at Leros and Teichiussa (*IG I³ 259 VI 19–22*); after Teichiussa the stone breaks off, but if the city of Miletus appeared elsewhere in this list, it was doubtless because her payment was received at a different time. During the Archidamian War, and particularly during the siege of Mytilene in 428/7, Athenian control must have been so tight that the three places paid at the same time. The upshot is that the splinter groups installed at Leros and Teichiussa in 454/3 and again in 427/6 or 426/5 point to internal dissension, not to revolt. When the three places are named as paying jointly in the assessment of 425 and in the following lists, we cannot know whether the dissension persists, or a habit of record-keeping.

We come to the first reason mentioned above. It was the absence of "Milesians" proper from the list of 454/3, and from the next year's list as well, which first opened the door to the theory of a revolt in the 50s. In 1970 a new fragment of column III of the list of 454/3 was discovered in the Agora;¹⁰¹ it fits exactly above the old fragment 6 of columns III and IV, and

¹⁰¹Meritt; Piérart, "Milet dans la première liste de tributs;" *IG I³ 259 III 5–21*.

also falls into place beside the old fragment 2, known only from early copies, which includes some quota sums belonging at the right of the names in column III. The entry in line 19, for which no quota is preserved, is Μιλε[. Here then are the Milesians proper; the list of 454/3 gives the same three groups as the later records noticed above. The theory of revolt, gratuitous before, is now impossible.

Yet the theory has not been given up. Here is how the text of column III lines 17–20 (all that will concern us) are presented in the first publication of 1972 and again in *IG I³* of 1981.

Αὐγάντ[ιου: ΔΔ]Δ† † † † †
 Νεοπο[λῖται ἐκ^{vv}]
 Μιλέ[το ἐν Λευκῶι]
 Ἀκρ[οτερίω]ι: ΗΗΗ

“Miletos in 454/3 was in revolt from Athens,” says the editor;¹⁰² therefore the name in line 19 is not what it appears to be, Μιλέ[σσιου, and the names in the lines before and after are not the ordinary city-names they appear to be, Νεοπο[λῖται and, e.g., Ἀκρ[όθοιοι]ι. Instead these three lines disclose a group of people otherwise unheard of and unguessed at, living at a site otherwise unheard of and unguessed at: “New-towners from † Miletus in White † Promontory.” Let “White Promontory” be the Halicarnassus peninsula and also the *litus Leuca* located on this coast by Pomponius Mela (1.85). Let the “Neopolitai from Miletus” be the Neapolis located at or near Caryanda by both Mela and Pliny (*HN* 5.107) and also represented by a single Hellenistic coin (*BM Caria*, etc. pl. 23.1). Then we may postulate that a third group of Milesian exiles, more fluttered than those others at Leros and Teichiussa, removed to the Halicarnassus peninsula and settled in “a small town called Neapolis,” which “may have existed previously” and which “certainly continued to exist after they had returned home.” Thus Meritt.

The first question is whether this supplement fits the traces.¹⁰³ The old fragment 6, which gives the reading at the end of line 20 (final letter of

¹⁰²Meritt 406. The footnote attached to this sentence directs us to the page of *ATL* (3.253) on which in 1950 Meritt and his colleagues, pointing to the absence of Miletus from quota lists before the third, set down these words: “*We infer* that before this time Miletos was in revolt.” In 1972 the inference became a premiss. Consider too the opinion of Bradeen and McGregor (69): “It is part of the fascination of our studies that additional evidence is ever likely to appear, to confirm or confound the historian’s reconstruction. So it is now . . . the evidence of this new fragment supports the reconstruction that we have advanced of the fate of Miletos in the first assessment-period”—i.e., it *supports* the theory of revolt!

¹⁰³In this I follow Piérart (“Milet dans la première liste de tributs” 164–166). Gehrke (19, n. 10) chooses to discount the epigraphic difficulties without addressing the main issue: whether there are any grounds at all for restoring the lines as Meritt does. Or rather, Gehrke turns the argument on its head: because the later tribute records name “Milesians,” “Leros,”

the name, interpunct, quota sum), also has something of line 19, but no letters, although Μιλέ[το ἐν Λευκῶι] should reach to the end of the line; the stone however is too ruinous to be decisive. The old fragment 2 gives the quota sums down to either line 17 or line 18; if there is a sum for line 18, Νεοπο[λῖται ἐκ ὧν] is excluded.

It depends on how we interpret the dubious and conflicting reports of Pittakys (1835) and of C. O. Müller (*apud* Boeckh in 1851).¹⁰⁴ Pittakys gives the numeral ΔΗ††† ΔΔ for line 17 (as it seems) and nothing further. Müller gives Δ† for line 17 and ΔΗ††† ΔΔ^p for line 18, evidently a variant of Pittakys' numeral for line 17. It has been held that in reproducing Müller's copy Boeckh somehow transposed the initial letters of column IV line 17, Διδυμοτ-ει | χῖται.¹⁰⁵ This is desperate—all the more so, when Müller's copy makes better sense than Pittakys' for Aege, the city of column III line 17. From Pittakys' numeral ΔΗ††† ΔΔ and also from Müller's ΔΗ††† ΔΔ^p Meritt deduces [ΔΔ]Δ††† ||, 33 1/3 drachmas, which he calls the "normal" quota for Aege.¹⁰⁶ In fact she renders this quota only in the third and fourth assessment periods, from 446/5 onwards (*IG* I³ 266 II 16, etc.). The quota which is attested for Aege in the first and second assessment periods (*IG* I³ 262 I 6, list no. 4 of 451/0; 264 IV 4, list no. 7 of 448/7; 265 II 61, list no. 8 of 447/6), and again after the fourth assessment period (276 VI 16, list no. 19 of 436/5, the name restored with certainty; 280 II 59, list no. 23 of 432/1), is 50 drachmas, [Δ]:¹⁰⁷ Müller's Δ† will be the right-hand part of this numeral. Pittakys no doubt omitted such a small remnant and went on to the next line. So the last numeral recorded by both Pittakys and Müller belongs in line 18 as the quota of Neapolis, and the line cannot be part of the Milesian entry.

The sense of the restoration is also unsatisfactory. The Neapolis attested later was only a small town. It is wishful to suppose that the town was founded in the fifth century by Milesian exiles, or even that it existed before

"Teichiussa" beside each other and the first quota-list does not, the reading "Mile[sians]" is excluded and a restoration like Meritt's is "required." For Balcer (22, 30, n. 33) Meritt's reading is self-evident—though he misrepresents it, both in English translation and in ungrammatical Greek, as "Neopolitai in Miletos."

¹⁰⁴Piérart (*ibid.*) compares Pittakys' and Müller's numerals throughout fragment 2; as he says, Müller's "should be preferred," but only slightly. He also quotes Boeckh's judgment that Pittakys was so "inaccurate" as to be "unusable" (166, n. 14).

¹⁰⁵So A. B. West and B. D. Meritt, "The Reconstruction of *I.G.* I², 191," *AJP* 47 (1926) 171–176, at 174.

¹⁰⁶From the text and apparatus of *IG* I³, as also from Meritt, "The Tribute Quota List of 454–453 B.C." 405, one would think that Aege's quota was squarely attested except for the first two figures.

¹⁰⁷At *IG* I³ 281 II 26, list no. 25 of 430/29 B.C., Aege's quota becomes 53 1/3 drachmas; but 50 drachmas is to be assumed for the whole period from 437/6 to 432/1, as no doubt also from 454/3 to 447/6.

they came, and that the name continued thereafter, although the exiles soon left. "New-town" is an odd name for a temporary refuge; if however the name belonged to an earlier community on the site, would it be adopted by Milesian exiles? Even odder is the use of ἀκρωτήριον, "cape" or "promontory," to denote the Halicarnassus peninsula. Meritt also proposed a shorter supplement for lines 19–20: Μιλέ[σιοι ἐν τοῖ] | ἀκρ[οτερίῳ]ι: HHH "Milesians in the promontory."¹⁰⁸ This is doubly unsatisfactory: the promontory is again the Halicarnassus peninsula, and it has no name. Cataldi (217) proposes Μιλέ[σιοι ἡοι ἐν] | Ἀκρ[οτερίῳ]ι: HHH. He regards "Promontory" as a proper name, and identifies it with Poseidium, Cape Monodendri. "Promontory" however is an unlikely name, and in contrast to Leros and Teichiussa, Cape Monodendri is ill suited to shelter and support a community of exiles.

The only credible reading in line 19 is Μιλέ[σιοι and a quota sum. The Νεοπο[λίται of line 18 and the Ἀκρ[of line 20 cannot be identified with assurance, but the uncertainty is no reason to deny that they too are tribute-paying communities. Since Neapolis comes next to Aege on the stone as it does on the east coast of Pallene, Neapolis of Pallene is the leading possibility in line 18—perhaps a duplicate entry, since the name appears again a little further on, with the quota usual for Neapolis of Pallene (*IG* I³ 259 III 28). Line 20 gives us some city or other beginning with the common term ἄκρος, e.g., Ἀκρ[όθιοι]ι or Ἀκρ[ορείται]ι.¹⁰⁹

We may sum up our results. In 454/3 Athens received tribute from the city, from the "Milesians" proper, as well as from the splinter groups at Leros and Teichiussa. The civic government did not control the outlying territory, though this territory was likewise subject to Athens. The same disunity prevailed in 427/6 or 426/5, according to a later list. According to the statutes of the Molpi, it also prevailed in 479/8, when the Onitade as representatives of the outlying territory were no longer taking part in civic ceremony. But the disunity which we see in 479/8 and in 454/3 was repaired in 450/49 or just before. In this year Athens lent support to the civic government, as she did again shortly after, when she also made provision for securing Arnasus in the outlying territory; and in 449 the city of Miletus paid ten talents of tribute, a large sum which reflects the large resources now controlled by the city. So between 454/3 and 450/49 the city and the outlying territory were reunited. Precisely when, we cannot say; for Leros and Teichiussa do not appear in the fragments of the three intervening tribute-quota lists, and although the city of Miletus appears in the list of 452/1, the quota sum is not preserved.

¹⁰⁸Meritt, "The Tribute Quota List of 454–453 B.C." 406–407. Gehrke regards this as another "possibility" (19, n. 10).

¹⁰⁹Meritt, "The Tribute Quota List of 454–453 B.C." 406, rejects Neapolis of Pallene as well as two other cities so named, and also Ἀκρόθιοι οἱ ἐν Ἀθῶνι.

For a short time, whether it was one year or several, the Milesian oligarchs whose rule had been strengthened paid tribute on behalf of the reunited state. Then, within the years 449–447 or 446–443, they revolted from Athens and massacred their democratic opponents. Athens suppressed the revolt and established an Athenian-style democracy.

Such is the picture that emerges from the tribute-quota lists, when these are combined with other evidence.

VI CONCLUSION

The documents which we have examined at length, together with a few other items, allow us to distinguish five stages in the political history of Miletus. 1) In 525 B.C., after a long period of bitter strife, an oligarchy was set up which brought peace and prosperity by uniting the city and the countryside in a program of conciliation. The oligarchic constitution was left in place by the tyrants and continued down to 494. (The statutes of the Molpi; also Herodotus on the Parian arbitration, Heracleides on the Gergithes, Nicolaus on the Cabeiri, and Plutarch on the *aeinantai*.) 2) After 479 oligarchs returned to power in the city but were resisted by some, so that Miletus was weak and divided. (The statutes of the Molpi, the banishment decree, the tribute-quota lists.) 3) Towards 450, with Athenian support, the oligarchs won control of all Milesian territory and promised the same fair treatment as of old. (The statutes of the Molpi, the Athenian regulations for Miletus, the tribute-quota lists; also [Xenophon].) 4) Sometime in the years 449–447 or 446–443 the oligarchs revolted from Athens and massacred their opponents. (The tribute-quota lists; also [Xenophon].) 5) By 442 at the latest Athens put down the revolt and established a democratic government on the Athenian model. (The tribute-quota lists; also [Xenophon].) Within this framework there are some interesting details of how the oligarchy functioned. All told, it is not much; yet it is far more than we have for any other Ionian city in the same period.¹¹⁰

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
BROCK UNIVERSITY
ST. CATHARINES, ONTARIO
L2S 3A1

¹¹⁰I am grateful for the comments of the two anonymous readers.