

VIII.—Probouleutic Commissioners in Miletus during the Hellenistic Period

FRANCIS W. SCHEHL

I

Due to the scarcity of our literary and epigraphical sources, our knowledge of the constitutional history of Miletus during the Hellenistic period is but fragmentary and leaves many problems unanswered. One of those problems will be studied here, where an attempt is made to define more clearly than has been done the spheres of authority of the *synedroi* and *epistatai*, who frequently appear in Milesian inscriptions.

The following theories have been advanced:

A. *Synedroi*: B. Haussoullier,¹ in the course of his restoration of *LW* 222,² suggested that by *synedroi* in that inscription the *boulê* of Miletus is meant, a view which, as will be shown (below, p. 122) is correct. However, he was wrong in assuming the same for earlier periods of the Hellenistic age; cf. his reference to *OGIS* 213 (see below, p. 116, no. 15), which at the time of his writing was still unpublished; here he takes ἡ γνώμη συνέδρων to refer to a probouleumatic decree of the Milesian *boulê* (*op. cit.*, 152).

His theory was rejected *in toto* by A. Rehm,³ who holds that the *synedroi* constituted a committee which drafted motions for legislative action by the *dêmos* and therefore always directly reported to the popular assembly: he quotes *Milet* I/3.135; 137; 145 and *SIG*² 660 [Michel 480],⁴ to which he later adds (*op. cit.*, p. 405)

¹ *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris 1898) 152 f.

² On this inscription see below, no. 27.

³ *Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen u. Untersuchungen*. Heft III (Berlin 1914) p. 178; this publication will henceforth be quoted *Milet* I/3.

⁴ Republished by Haussoullier, *RevPhil* 1920, 290. This decree from Miletus, concerning the consultation of the oracle of the Didymean Apollo, was dated on the strength of prosopographical considerations, before 228/7 B.C. by Haussoullier, p. 292, whereas the first editor, O. Rayet, *RA* 28 (1874) 104, referred it to the fourth century B.C.; in *LSJ*, s.v. ἀγέρις, the inscription is dated in the third century B.C. The text provides only a procedural parallel in lines 4 ff., since the word *synedroi* does not occur at all. The *θεοπρόροι* have to submit the oracles of the god as the *synedroi* submit to the *dêmos* the drafts for legislation.

OGIS 213. Where *synedroi* functioned, he sums up (p. 405), there was no room for action by the *boulê*.

F. Poland, in his general survey of the institution of the *synedroi*,⁵ clearly distinguishes between two different meanings of the term in the sphere of municipal administration: whereas the term *synedroi* frequently denotes the *boulê* of an individual city, it is, in a few isolated cases, used with the same connotation as *syngrapheis* in Athens, i.e., for a committee which drafted legislation and submitted these drafts to the *dêmos* for action; in this respect he is essentially in agreement with Rehm. For the latter usage of the term he lists the following texts:

- a) for Priene *Inschr. v. Priene* 12;
- b) for Miletus SIG³ 273 [*Milet* I/3.135] (treaty with Sardis⁶); SIG³ 633 [*Milet* I/3.150] (treaty with Heraclea by Latmus⁷); SIG³ 577 [*Milet* I/3.145] (school endowment of Eudemus⁸); SIG³ 683 (letter of the Milesian authorities to Elis⁹); and OGIS 213 (honorary decree for Antiochus, son of Seleucus I¹⁰);
- c) for Ephesus SIG³ 363 (honorary decree of the city; ca. 297 B.C.), and
- d) for Olbia (?) SIG³ 707 (honorary decree of the city; second half of the second century B.C.).

However, from this list SIG³ 683 (arbitration by Miletus between Messene and Sparta; the letter of the Milesian authorities, lines 29–40, is part of the text) must be struck, for we read in lines 29 f., the beginning of the letter, Μιλησίων οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ||'Ηλείων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τοῖς συνέδροις χαίρειν. This passage not only clearly shows that Poland was mistaken in attributing the *synedroi* to Miletus, but also proves that, in combination with *archontes*, the term *synedroi* must refer to the *boulê* of Elis and not to a board of special commissioners. Neither do the *synedroi* of SIG³ 363 belong in this category; the passage, lines 11 ff., [τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον παρα]λαβόντας τοὺς ἐσσήνας καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς Πριηνικοῖς τεταγμένους τὰ [ἐπι|βάλλοντα κατὰ⁽²⁰⁾.]ενον αὐτοῖς ἀποδοῦναι τοῖς προδανείσασιν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὀπλωνήσαντας δοῦναι τὰ

⁵ Article "Συνέδριον," RE 4A (1932) 1345 f.

⁶ On the date see below, no. 13.

⁷ On the date see below, no. 20.

⁸ On the date see below, no. 14.

⁹ Poland mistakenly speaks of a letter to Messene ("bei einer Note an die πόλις Messene"). For the date see below, p. 122.

¹⁰ Not for Seleucus I, as Poland thinks. On the inscription and its date see below no. 15.

ὅπλα | [καὶ τὰ . . . τάλαντα τοῖς τὸ φρούριον διαφυ]λάττουσιν, shows quite clearly that the *synedroi*, functioning with the priests of Artemis, are special commissioners in charge of affairs concerning the refugees from Priene,¹¹ but not, as far as we can see from the context, commissioners with a probouleutic mandate from the *dêmos*. As to *SIG*³ 707, the state of preservation of the first lines leaves the question open as to whether the *synedroi* who submit their motion (cf. lines 1 ff.: — — | . . ἐπι. .⁽⁶⁾ . . ἔσ[εισ]. .⁽⁵⁾ . . | δεκάτη οἱ σύνεδροι εἰ[παν· ἐ]πειδὴ κτλ.), were actually probouleutic commissioners, although lines 24 f., δόξ[αι || τ]ῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, seem to favor this interpretation. F. Hiller v. Gaertringen¹² takes *synedroi* to stand for *boulê* here. Thus Poland's list is reduced to the safe instances from Priene and Miletus.

B. *Epistatai*: Szanto's theory¹³ that the *epistatai* in *LW* 222 were the presiding officers of the Milesian *boulê* will be discussed later (see below, p. 126).

Rehm (*op. cit.*, p. 197 f.) holds that the Milesian *epistatai* may have constituted a committee of the *boulê*, which presided over the popular assemblies, without, however, advocating the decrees of the *boulê* in the popular assembly; therefore the relation between the *epistatai* and the *prytaneis*¹⁴ would be analogous to that between the *proedroi* and the *prytaneis* in Athens during the fourth century B.C., and one could well doubt that the Milesian *epistatai* had any but a purely formal responsibility for the decrees which they introduced in the popular assembly.

A. Heuss¹⁵ remarks that in Miletus and other cities of Asia Minor a board of *epistatai* ("Gremium von Epistatai") existed, who submitted motions to the popular assemblies; for this he refers to *SIG*³ 590 (Milesian decree concerning the Didymea; ca. 196 B.C.; cf. below, p. 115, no. 7) and *SIG*³ 340 (honorary decree from Lindus¹⁶), lines 1 and 49.¹⁷

¹¹ See F. Hiller v. Gaertringen, *SIG*³ 363, notes 9 and 5.

¹² *SIG*³ 707, note 1: "cuius civitatis senatus hic intelligendus sit, ambigitur."

¹³ Article "'Ἐπιστάται," *RE* 6 (1909) 201; so, before him, also H. Swoboda, *Die griech. Volksbeschlüsse* (Leipzig 1890) 84.

¹⁴ On their dealings with the legislative powers see below.

¹⁵ *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus* (*Klio*, Beiheft 39, N.F. 26 [Leipzig 1937]) 29, note 2.

¹⁶ See below, p. 125 f.

¹⁷ His reference to line 40 is apparently a misprint.

II

I will now approach the problem by presenting the epigraphical evidence for the Hellenistic period, to which this study is limited, although the time limits are occasionally transgressed (see below, nos. 1, 11, 12, and 13) in order to introduce the material more fully. The evidence consists for the greater part of prescripts of decrees, which will be arranged in three main groups, decrees

- I. of the *boulê* and the *dêmos*;
- II. of the *dêmos* alone and
- III. of the *boulê* alone.

Group I (*boulê* and *dêmos*) falls into two sections:

Section (a) shows the conventional form of the prescript: ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· ὁ δέϊνα (τοῦ δέϊνος) εἶπεν.

1) *Milet* I/3.142 (treaty with Phygela; before 323(?) B.C.), lines 1 f.: [ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ] τ[ῷ] δήμῳ· Κτήσων | [. εἶπ]εν· ἐπειδὴ κτλ.

2) Th. Wiegand, *VII. Vorl. Ber. Milet*,¹⁸ p. 68 f.¹⁹ (honorary decree for Apame; 299/8 B.C.²⁰), lines 1 f.;²¹ the mover of the decree is Lycus, son of Apollodotus.

3) *Milet* I/3.32 (decree concerning the erection of *anathêmata*; beginning of the third century B.C.), line 1; the patronymic of the mover of the decree, Hegesianax, is left out.

Section (b) shows in addition to the conventional wording the expression γνώμη ἐπιστατῶν, which allows one interpretation only: a probouleutic motion of the *epistatai* was submitted for legislative action. The formula is ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη ἐπιστατῶν· ὁ δέϊνα τοῦ δέϊνος εἶπεν.

4) *Milet* I/3.139 (negotiations with Ptolemy II; ca. 262/0 B.C.;²² part A [lines 1–15] is a letter of Ptolemy II to Miletus, reprinted with an excellent commentary by C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* [Yale Univ. Press, 1934] no. 15; part B

¹⁸ Th. Wiegand, *Siebenter vorläufiger Bericht ueber die von den kgl. Museen in Milet u. Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Anhang zu den *AbhAkBerlin*, 1911.

¹⁹ Lines 4–14 were read differently by M. Holleaux, *REG* 36 (1923) 13 (= Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques 3 [Paris 1942] 110), lines 10–18 by Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 262, note 1; lines 7–15, in Rehm's restoration by letter, are given *SEG* 4.442.

²⁰ So dated by Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 262 on the strength of his restoration of line 19.

²¹ For the sake of economy, prescripts will here be fully quoted only when essential parts are partly or wholly restored, or when their wording deserves special attention.

²² On the controversy about the date see Welles, p. 73.

[lines 16–21] is a decree of the *boulê* and the *dêmos*; part C [lines 22–59] is a decree of the *dêmos*²³), lines 16 f.; Epameinon, son of Hestiaeus, is the mover of the decree.

5) *Milet* I/3.146 (treaty with Mylasa; 209/8 B.C.²⁴), lines 1 f.; Archelas, son of Bion, is the mover of the decree.

6) *Milet* I/3.39 (grant of citizenship to an officer of Cretan mercenaries; ca. 200 B.C.), lines 1 ff.: [ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη ἐπισ]τατῶν· Συ²⁵ | [. εἶπεν· ἐπειδ]ῆ κτλ.

7) *SIG*³ 590 (Milesian decree concerning the Didymea, inscribed and set up in Cos, in the temple of Asclepius, with the Coan dating in line 1; ca. 196 B.C.), lines 2 ff.; Heracleotes, son of Dionysodorus, is the mover of the decree.

Milet I/3.36 a, lines 34–36, as restored by Rehm, *Milet* I/3 p. 198, would constitute a class by itself in group I, since the phrase [ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ], would be followed by [γνώμη πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν μένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ]. However, Rehm, *op. cit.*, p. 406, withdrew his restoration of lines 34 f. The problem presented by this inscription will be discussed below, p. 120 f.

Group II (*dêmos* alone) falls into three sections:

Section (a) has this prescript: ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη ἐπιστατῶν· ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δέινος εἶπεν.

8) *Milet* I/3.138 (city loan floated in Cnidus; 282 B.C.), lines 1 ff.; Episthenes, son of Alcis, is the mover of the decree. It is worth noting that the decree orders (lines 15–17) that the *dêmos* of Cnidus be ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ²⁶ παρὰ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ and that the *prytaneis* and the *epistatai* of Miletus should take care of all the needs of the Cnidian *dêmos*.

9) *Milet* I/3.139²⁷ (ca. 262/0 B.C.), C, lines 22 f.; Peithenous, son of Tharsagoras is the mover of the decree.

10) *Milet* I/3.37 a (decree concerning Cretan mercenaries; 223/2 B.C.²⁸), line 1: ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη{ι} ἐ[π]ιστατῶν· Ἀντίπατρο[s] . . . εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ κτλ.].

²³ See below, no. 9.

²⁴ M. Holleaux, *BCH* 48 (1924) 8 accepts Rehm's date.

²⁵ In his restoration of the inscription A. Wilhelm, *Neue Beitraege* 6 (Vienna 1921) 58, leaves the first two lines as Rehm suggested reading them except for writing [ἐπισ]τατῶν· Συ . . .

²⁶ On the phrase εἶναι ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ see A. Wilhelm, *AnzAkWien* 65 (1928) 135.

²⁷ On the inscription see above, no. 4.

²⁸ Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 199.

11) *Milet* I/3.134 (law concerning the *molpoi* and *prophētai*; end of the first century A.D.), lines 3 f.: ἔδοξε τῷ φιλοκαίσαρι δήμῳ· γνώμη ἐπιστατῶν· ἐπεὶ κτλ. The name of the mover of the decree is left out.

Section (b) shows *synedroi* in the prescript or elsewhere. They either appear (α) in the conventional form as the *epistatai* do, or (β) as *σύνεδροι αἰρεθέντες* or *ἀποδειχθέντες* with a list of their names added, or (γ) together with other city officials.

(α) The instances where the *synedroi* appear in a conventional prescript (ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη συνέδρων· ὁ δεῖνα (τοῦ δέινος) εἶπεν) are the following:

12) *Milet* I/3.137 (sympolity treaty with Cyzicus; before 323 B.C.), lines 1 ff.; the mover of the decree, Philiscus, lacks the patronymic.

13) *Milet* I/3.135; *SIG*³ 273 (treaty with Sardis; before 334 B.C.²⁹), lines 1 ff.; the mover of the decree, Botes, lacks the patronymic.

14) *Milet* I/3.145; *SIG*³ 577 (school endowment of Eudemus; 200/199 B.C.), line 1; the mover of the decree is not mentioned.

15) *OGIS* 213,³⁰ cf. *SEG* 4.470 (honorary decree for Antiochus, son of Seleucus I; 300/299 B.C.³¹), lines 1 f.; the mover of the decree is Demodamas, son of Aristeides.

(β) Here *σύνεδροι αἰρεθέντες* or *ἀποδειχθέντες* appear, with a list of their names added.

16) *Milet* I/3.141 (decree for Cius; 228 (?) B.C. or earlier³²), line 1: γνώμη συνέδρων τῶν αἰρεθέντων, with 10 names in the genitive following; upon the last name εἶπαν follows, which means a break in the construction due to an error of the stone-cutter, who left out <οἱ σύνεδροι οἱ αἰρεθέντες> with or without a repetition of their names; cf. *Milet* I/3.150,³³ where we read after a list of *synedroi* in the genitive (lines 6 ff.) οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ εἰρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ οἱ αἰρεθέντες

²⁹ So dated by Hiller v. Gaertringen, *SIG*³ 273; Rehm had suggested 323 B.C.

³⁰ Lines 1–27 were restored by M. Holleaux, *REG* 14 (1901) 93 ff. (= *Études d'épigr. et d'hist. gr.* 3.112 f.), whose restorations were not used by W. Dittenberger, *OGIS* 213; lines 19–23 were restored by Wilhelm, *Neue Beitr.* 6.55.

³¹ So dated by Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 261, on the strength of his reading of line 34; cf. *Milet* I/3.123, line 17; see also *Milet* I/7 (*Der Suedmarkt u. die benachbarten Bauanlagen*, Berlin, 1924) p. 282; M. Rostovtzeff, *Soc. and Econ. History of the Hellenistic World* I (Oxford 1941) 174, dates the inscription "about 300 B.C.". Haussoullier, *RevPhil* 24 (1900) 245, no. ii, and *Étud. sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didym*. (Paris 1902) 34 ff. had dated the text between 306 and 293 B.C.; Dittenberger, *OGIS* 213, followed him.

³² Dated before 228/7 B.C. by Haussoullier, *RevPhil* 1920, 292.

³³ See below, no. 20.

σύνεδροι; here follow the names of the *synedroi* again, but in the nominative, and after the last, *Ειρηνίας Ειρηνίου*, follows *εἰπαν*.

17) *Milet* I/3.33 a (decree for Cretan mercenaries; 228/7 B.C.³⁴), line 2: [ἐδοξε] τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη συνέδρων τῶν αἰρεθέντων|, upon which the names of the *synedroi* in the genitive follow; 24 names are on the stone; how many have disappeared in the gap between fragment 33 a, line 14, and fragment 33 b, line 5, we have no way of knowing.

(γ) Here the *synedroi* functioned together with other city officials. In two of the inscriptions which belong in this category the text presents no difficulty.

18) *Milet* I/3.147³⁵ (internal loan; 205/4 B.C.), lines 1 ff.: [ἐ]δοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν ἡρημένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλ[α|κ]ῇ καὶ τῶν ἀποδειχθέντων συνέδρων· οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι εἰπαν· ὅπως τὰ ἐνλείποντα κτλ.

19) *Milet* I/3.149 (sympolity treaty with Pidasa; end of winter 175 B.C.³⁶), lines 1 ff.: ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Πασικλείους μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος | τάδε ὠμολόγησαν καὶ συνέθεντο Μιλήσιοι καὶ Πιδασεῖς, ὕπὲρ μὲν τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Μιλησίων οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ εἰρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ οἱ ἀποδει|χθέντες σύνεδροι, ten names follow.

20) *Milet* I/3.150; *SIG*³ 633 (treaty with Heraclea by Latmus; 173/2 B.C., or better spring 173 B.C.³⁷), lines 2 f. (after the date by the *stephanephoros* and the month in line 1): ἐδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν ἡρημένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ | καὶ τῶν ἀποδειχθέντων συνέδρων, with the names of the ten *synedroi* in the genitive; then in lines 6 ff. the text is resumed thus: οἱ πρυ|τάνεις καὶ οἱ εἰρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ οἱ αἰρεθέντες σύνεδροι — here again follow the names of the 10 *synedroi*, now in the nominative — εἰπαν· ἐπειδὴ κτλ (line 10). The same procedure occurs again later in the document; cf. lines 25 ff., the actual diplomatic instrument, where we read: ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· ἐπὶ στεφανη|φόρου ἐν μὲν Μιλήτῳ Μενάνδρου τοῦ Μαίωνος μηνὸς Ταυρεῶνος,³⁸ ἐν Ἑρακλείᾳ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ | τοῦ τεσσερεσκαίδεκάτου τοῦ μετὰ Δημήτριον μηνὸς Γαμηλιῶνος τάδε συνέθεντο καὶ ὠμολόγησαν Μιλήσ[ω]ι καὶ

³⁴ See Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 199.

³⁵ On the inscription see E. Weiss, *JOAI* 17 (1914) Bbl. 257 ff.

³⁶ Dated in 176/5 B.C., more exactly end of winter 175 B.C., by A. Rehm, *SBBayerAk* 1923/viii, p. 13. The date 176/5 B.C. was accepted by Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* II.671, and repeated *SEG* 4.469. Originally, *Milet* I/3, p. 350 ad no. 149, Rehm had dated the inscription in February 182 (?) B.C.

³⁷ So dated by Rehm, *SBBayerAk* 1923/viii, p. 13; noted *SEG* 4.469; formerly dated 180(?) B.C. by Rehm, whom Hiller v. Gaertringen, *SIG*³ 633, follows.

³⁸ The date is here given fully, whereas it is abridged at the beginning of the inscription; cf. line 1: ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Μεν[ά]νδρου, Ταυρεῶνος. The fuller form in

Ἡρακλεῶται συγγραψάμενων μὲν ὑπὲρ Μιλησίων τῶν τε πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν ἡρημένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ τῶν ἀποδειχθέντων συνέδρων; here again follow the names of the 10 *synedroi* (in the genitive).

The last three inscriptions (nos. 18–20 in our numbering) show a close connection between the *prytaneis* and the ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ; this is also the case in the official note of Miletus to Elis, SIG³ 683, lines 29–40, where according to lines 29 f. (quoted above, p. 112) the *prytaneis* and the ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ act as the sole official agents of the city in its dealings with foreign powers. Similarly in the treaty with Pidasia (no. 19) and Heraclea by Latmus (no. 20) they act concurrently with a board of 10 commissioners (*synedroi*). The same is true in the case of an important domestic issue, the floating of an internal loan (no. 18). The constitutional character of the *prytaneis* is easily defined: they must have been a committee of the *boulê*. As to the ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ, nothing is known directly about their constitutional authority and powers, nor can their number be ascertained. However, the epigraphical evidence presented here, especially SIG³ 683, suggests that, together with the *prytaneis*, they exercised executive powers, at least to a certain extent. However, this problem can be brought nearer a solution, if we take into consideration the complete absence of any mention of *stratêgoi* in Milesian inscriptions from the last third of the fourth century B.C. to the beginning of the Imperial period, a fact which in itself is significant. Their office occurs for the last time in centuries in *Milet* I/3.135; SIG³ 273 (here no. 13), dated before 334 B.C.(?), where they are ordered by the *dêmos* to send, in behalf of Miletus, *xenia* to the envoy from Sardis (cf. lines 35 ff.), who will present the Milesian authorities with a list of the citizens of Sardis, appointed to attend to the needs of resident Milesians (lines 21 ff.); in Miletus the *prytaneis* will take care of resident Sardians. The next occurrence of *stratêgoi* is found in LW 222, dating in 17/6 or 16/5 B.C.³⁹ Rehm's suggestion⁴⁰ that their office might have been restored in connection with the restoration of the city's autonomy in 39/8 B.C. is well possible, in fact very likely.⁴¹

lines 25 f. is understandable in view of the highly official character of the treaty, which is here quoted verbatim.

³⁹ See below, no. 27.

⁴⁰ *Milet* I/3, p. 288, note 4.

⁴¹ On the restoration of the city's freedom and autonomy see below, note 56, where the constitutional reorganization is dated in 38/7 B.C. On Milesian *stratêgoi* in the Imperial period see Rehm, *Milet* I/7, p. 300 f. ad no. 204.

The *stratêgoi* who are mentioned in the treaty with Pidasas (no. 20) are not, as Rehm⁴² thought, Milesian officials, but Roman magistrates, consuls or proconsuls as L. Robert⁴³ correctly pointed out. We are faced with the following situation: roughly speaking, the *stratêgoi* are not mentioned after 334 B.C. until they reappear at the beginning of the Imperial period or slightly earlier; it has been mentioned that Rehm thought of connecting their reappearance with the restoration of Miletus' freedom and autonomy in 39/8 B.C. The first mention of the *ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ* in our sources occurs in 262/0 B.C. (*Milet* I/3.139 line 56), the last in 173 B.C. (*Milet* I/3.150). In any case, these two offices never overlapped. As was shown above, p. 118, the *ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ* were vested with executive powers and, in conjunction with the *prytaneis*, represented Miletus in its dealings with foreign powers; their office was, as the participle clearly demonstrates, elective. Thus it would seem possible to see in them the successors of the former *stratêgoi*, whose office, at least in name, was discontinued between ca. 334 B.C. or earlier and the sixties of the third century B.C. for reasons unknown to us. One could speculate on various possibilities for the discontinuance of the office. The catastrophe of 334 B.C., when the city fell to Alexander, could have been the reason for the break of an old tradition, or the year 313/12 B.C., when Antigonos liberated the city from the tyrannical rule of Asander,⁴⁴ who had suspended democratic institutions; cf. the list of the eponymous *aesymnêtai*, *Milet* I/3.123, lines 2 ff.: 'Ἰππόμαχος Θήρωνος ἐπὶ τούτου ἡ πόλις | ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ | Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη. Or one could think of the political changes that took place after Ipsus and Curupedion. Be that as it may, either during the last third of the fourth, or the first third of the third century B.C. the old office of *stratêgoi* was superseded by that of the *ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ*, whose very title proclaimed, in a world dominated by the warring great powers, the defensive character of Milesian policies.

We can now approach

21) *Milet* I/3.36 aa p. 404 (beginning of the second series of decrees dealing with citizenship grant and other privileges for Cretan

⁴² *Milet* I/3, p. 288, note 4.

⁴³ *Villes d'Asie mineure* (Paris 1935) 63, note 7, from p. 62.

⁴⁴ Cf. Hiller v. Gaertringen, "Miletos (Geschichte)," *RE* 15 (1932) 1603; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) 66 f.; see also 873, note 57.

mercenaries; 223/2 B.C.⁴⁵). Rehm read lines 1 f. thus: [ἔδοξε τῶι δ]ήμωι· γνώμη συνέ[δρων τῶν αἰρεθέντων καὶ τῶν ἡρη]μένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακ[ῇ· οἱ σύνεδροι], whereupon from line 3 to line 10 follow the names of the *synedroi* in various states of preservation, two names with patronymics to each line, which means that there were at least 16 *synedroi*. It is impossible to determine their exact number since two blocks beneath the one which bears our inscription are missing.⁴⁶ The pre-script, as Rehm restored it, shows, compared with nos. 18–20, anomalies: in the first place, no mention of *prytaneis* is made, secondly, the *synedroi* precede the ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ. While the second irregularity, which seems less objectionable than the first, cannot be mended on account of what actually stands on the stone, the first anomaly can be eliminated by reading γνώμη συνέ[δρων καὶ πρυτάνεων καὶ] in line 1, which makes the line shorter by one letter, i.e., 41 instead of 42 letters. The participle αἰρεθέντες, which is now removed from line 1, I restore in line 2 and read [τῶν ἡρη]μένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακ[ῇ· οἱ αἰρεθέντες σύνεδροι]. The wording οἱ αἰρεθέντες σύνεδροι has its exact parallel in *Milet* I/3.150 (here no. 20), line 6.⁴⁷ Line 2 of *Milet* I/3.36 aa has, in my restoration, 45 letters as compared to 41 in line 1, which is quite possible. Lines 1 f. should therefore read as follows:

[ἔδοξε τῶι δ]ήμωι· γνώμη συνέ[δρων καὶ πρυτάνεων καὶ]
[τῶν ἡρη]μένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακ[ῇ· οἱ αἰρεθέντες σύνεδροι] κτλ.

That the following lines, which contain a list of *synedroi*, are considerably shorter is understandable: the stone-cutter or the editor of the decree had decided on two names with their patronymics in each line, irrespective of their length. After the list of the *synedroi* we can expect the sentence to continue thus: (last name of the list) [... καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ εἶπαν], with the motivation of the decree following, as actually is the case in 22) *Milet* I/3.36 a, which belongs to the foregoing inscription, but is listed separately here in order to avoid confusion. Rehm had first (*op. cit.*, p. 198) restored lines 34–36 as follows:

[ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι δήμωι· γνώμη πρυτάνεων καὶ τῶν ἡρη-]
35 [μένων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ· οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ [τῇ]
[φυλακῇ εἶπαν· ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· ἐψηφίσθ]αι κτλ.,

⁴⁵ Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 199.

⁴⁶ Rehm, p. 404 ad no. 36 aa.

⁴⁷ Quoted above, p. 117.

and thought (p. 181 and 198) this fragment to be a *probouleuma* (p. 181); however, later he changed his interpretation when the new fragment, *Milet* I/3.36 aa (here no. 21) appeared, and considered finally the whole of *Milet* I/3.36, lines 1–81 (fragment 36 aa included) as the *πρότερον ψήφισμα*, which is mentioned in *Milet* I/3.37 b, line 37 ([... κατὰ τὸ πρό]τερον ψήφισμα). He correctly recognized the fact that line 35 of *Milet* I/3.36 a contains the continuation of the sentence which starts in fragment 36 aa, line 2 — the missing two blocks continue the list of the *synedroi* — and proposed (p. 406) to read fragment 36 a, lines 35 f. thus:

[καὶ] οἱ ἡιρημένοι ἐπὶ [τῇ]

[φυλακῇ εἶπαν· ἀγαθῇ τύχη· κτλ.].

However, my restoration of the first two lines of fragment 36 aa (see above, p. 120) prompts me to suggest reading lines 35 f. thus:

[(name with patronymic) καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ] οἱ ἡιρημένοι ἐπὶ [τῇ]
 ± 14
 [φυλακῇ εἶπαν· ἀγαθῇ τύχη· κτλ.].

This restoration is made on two assumptions: in the first place, on a rough average of 50 letters to the line, which is in keeping with the other fragments of these decrees, secondly that the *nu* in *ἡιρημένοι* (line 35) stands above or slightly to the left of the *theta* in *θεόν* (line 38). Then a space of about 14 letters would be left open at the beginning of line 35 before the first *synedros*. The line has now about 48 letters as compared to 51 letters in line 38 in Rehm's restoration. In this space the name of the last *synedros* must have stood. There is room enough to restore one of the shorter names with a patronymic; cf. for instance the following names of the list of the *synedroi* in *Milet* I/3.36 aa: [Ἡγήμων] Ἑκαταίου in line 5 with 14, Μενίτας Οὐλιάδο[υ] in line 6 with 15, or Λύκος Φαίδωνος in line 8 with 13 letters. If my restoration can stand and if the names of the *synedroi* were arranged in pairs in each of the lines on the missing blocks, their number was uneven.

Milet I/3.38 (list of names of newly created citizens; 223/2 B.C.) a, lines 2 f., ἀναγραφὴ [ἡ σφραγισθεῖς] α ὑπὸ τῶν π[ρεσβευτῶν | καὶ τῶν ἡιρημέ]νων ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ τῶ[ν] συ[νέ]δρων τῶ[ν] π[ροσ] | αιρεθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου,⁴⁸ must remain excluded here since the reading is too uncertain to base an interpretation on.

⁴⁸ In Rehm's restoration, *Milet* I/3, p. 405.

Section (c). In this category belong the following inscriptions.

23) *Milet* I/9.⁴⁹307 (decree for Eumenes II; 163–160/59 B.C.⁵⁰), lines 1 f.: ἔδοξε τῶι δήμῳ· οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ εἰρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ | εἶπαν· ἐπειδὴ κτλ. This is the only inscription which shows the *prytaneis* and the *ἡιρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ* introducing a motion to the *dêmos*: it concerns the city's relations to a foreign power.

24) *SIG*³ 683 (arbitration between the Messenians and Spartans; ca. 140 B.C.,⁵¹ in which a note from Miletus to Elis is included in lines 29–40), lines 29 f., which are quoted above p. 112.

Group III (boulê alone):

25) *SIG*³ 368 iii (honorary decree; 289/8 B.C.), lines 1 f.: ἐπὶ Τελεσίῳ, Ἀθηναίων· | ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ· Πρωτόμαχος Πυλίου εἶπεν· ὅπως | κτλ., presents no difficulty, but the following inscriptions require comment.

26) *Milet* I/2.⁵² a (honorary decree; last third (?) of the first century B.C.), lines 3 f.: ἔδοξε τοῖς συνέδροι[ι]ς· γνώμη ἐπισ[τ]ατῶν· | ἐπεὶ κτλ.

27) *LW* 222; B. Haussoullier, *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris 1898) 151; J. Fontenrose, *Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Arch.* 1.11 (1944) 303 pl. 40 with literature⁵³ (decree of the *synedroi* concerning the *boêgia*; dated in 16/5 B.C. by A. Rehm, *Milet* I/3 p. 275, in 17/6 B.C. by Fontenrose, p. 291⁵⁴), lines 10 f.: ἔδοξε τοῖ[ς] συνέδροις· | [γ]νώμη ἐπιστατῶν· συ[γ]κεχωρήσθα[ι] | κτλ.

The ἔδοξε- clause in combination with τοῖς συνέδροις shows clearly that both in no. 26 and no. 27 the *synedroi* must have been the members of a legislative body. Taking into consideration the usage of *synedrion* and *synedroi* for the *boulê* in numerous cities during the Hellenistic and Roman periods,⁵⁵ we will have to interpret these two inscriptions as decrees of the Milesian *boulê*, which were introduced by the *epistatai*. The *synedroi* of these two texts

⁴⁹ *Thermen und Palaestren* (Berlin 1928).

⁵⁰ So dated by Rehm, *SBBayerAk* 1923/viii, p. 16 f.; repeated *SEG* 4.469; cf. also G. Daux, *BCH* 59 (1935) 227 f.

⁵¹ This date is generally accepted: see L. Robert, *REG* 38 (1925) 39, note 2, and C. Roebuck, *CP* 40 (1945) 165 with note 109.

⁵² *Das Rathaus von Milet* (Berlin 1908).

⁵³ Fontenrose's restoration is not quite satisfactory in parts; cf. J. and L. Robert, *REG* 59/60 (1946/47) 349. I hope to present an interpretation and restoration of that text elsewhere.

⁵⁴ Fontenrose's dating depends on his restoration of lines 1 f., which is open to doubt.

⁵⁵ Poland (see note 5) 1345 f.

have nothing but the name in common with the *synedroi* of the third and second centuries B.C., who so frequently introduced motions in the assemblies of the *dêmos*. The constitutional reorganization of the city, which took place in 38/7 B.C., after Miletus had regained freedom and autonomy in 39/8 B.C.,⁵⁶ is most likely to have been the reason for this different usage of the term *synedroi*.

III

The following facts emerge from a study of the documents presented here.

1. The *synedroi* and *epistatai* never occur concurrently in the documents, if we exclude nos. 26 f., where the term *synedroi* clearly denotes the *boulê* of Miletus.

2. The *epistatai* — nos. 26 f. are again excluded — occur as well in joint decrees of the *boulê* and the *dêmos* (nos. 4, 5, 6⁵⁷ and 7),

⁵⁶ The city regained freedom and autonomy, probably through the intercession of Mark Antony, in the winter of 39/8 B.C.; cf. D. Magie, *op. cit.* 432. The list of Milesian *stephanephoroi*, *Milet* I/3.126, lines 21 f., 'Απολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίου, ὁ χρηματίζων Στρατόνικος. | ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἡ πόλις ἐλευ|θέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγέ|νετο, gives the eponymous of that year. In 38/7 B.C. the constitutional reorganization of Miletus took place as we know from the Didymean inscription of the *hydrophoros* Lenis, daughter of Phontides, republished with commentary by E. Preuner, *Hermes* 55 (1920) 174 ff.: ἐπὶ ταύ[της ὁ δ]ῆμος τὰ[s] | πατρίους ἀρχὰς καὶ νόμους [ἐ]κομίσατο. The inscription is dated by the *stephanephoros* Hegemandros, son of Nicomachus (line 10), whose year of office, according to the list, *Milet* I/3.126, lines 26 f., was 38/7 B.C. The fact that in this list only the restoration of the city's freedom and autonomy is mentioned under the *stephanephoros* of 39/8 B.C., whereas no mention is made of the constitutional reorganization of 38/7 B.C., does not really constitute a difficulty. E. Preuner's suggestion (p. 177) that the events which led to the recovery of the city's freedom and autonomy stretched over both years does not solve the problem, since it does not explain the silence about the events in 38/7 B.C. The solution seems quite simple: the editor of the list apparently considered, as was quite natural, the recovery of freedom and autonomy as the main event, implying the constitutional reorganization, which followed in its wake. This is well in keeping with the general character of the lists of eponymous officials in Miletus (*Milet* I/3.122–128), in which, apart from the entry for 39/8 B.C., only two other additional chronological items occur, both in *Milet* I/3.123: cf. lines 2 ff. (fully quoted above, p. 119) about the liberation of the city by Antigonus in 313/2 B.C. (see Magie, *op. cit.* 68 and 873, note 57), and lines 38 f., where a grant of land by Ptolemy II (see Magie, p. 925, note 20) is mentioned for 279/8 B.C. In his study "Milesische Chronologie von Sulla bis Tiberius," *SBBayerAk* 1939/viii, p. 11 ff., Rehm defends his dating of *stephanephoros* Apollonius in 39/8 B.C. against W. Kolbe, *PhilWoch* 1936, 1193 ff., who had suggested the year 40/39 B.C.; in the interpretation of the inscription, *Hermes* 45 (1920) 174 ff. Rehm follows Preuner; for the question of when Miletus lost her freedom prior to its recovery in 39/8 B.C. see Rehm, p. 19 ff.

⁵⁷ Here the whole *ἐδοξε*-clause is restored, but as the epigraphical situation shows, with great probability.

as in decrees of the *dêmos* alone (nos. 8–11). On the other hand, the *synedroi* never appear in joint decrees of the *boulê* and the *dêmos*, but only in decrees of the latter (nos. 12–17); in nos. 18–21 they act in conjunction with the *prytaneis* and the *ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ*. Rehm's remark (*Milet* I/3 p. 405) that the activities of the *synedroi* were restricted to the sphere of preparing legislative action by the *dêmos* is vindicated.

3. There was no division of competence between the *epistatai* and the *synedroi*. Both functioned in matters of foreign as well as domestic policy, as is shown in the following juxtaposition:

Foreign Policy

<i>Epistatai:</i>	<i>Synedroi:</i>
nos. 4 and 9 (negotiations with Ptolemy II);	no. 12 (treaty with Cyzicus);
no. 7 (decree concerning the Didymea ⁵⁸);	no. 13 (treaty with Sardis);
no. 8 (loan floated in Cnidus);	no. 15 (decree for Antiochus);
	no. 16 (decree for Cius);
	no. 19 (treaty with Pidasas; in conjunction with the <i>prytaneis</i> and the <i>ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ</i>);
	no. 20 (treaty with Heraclea; in conjunction with the same officials as in no. 19).

Domestic Policy

nos. 6 and 10 (grants of citizenship);	no. 14 (school endowment);
no. 11 (sacral law);	nos. 17 and 21 (grants of citizenship);
	no. 18 (internal loan, in conjunction with the <i>prytaneis</i> and the <i>ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ</i>).

4. The *prytaneis* and the *ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ* act both in foreign and domestic affairs, in foreign affairs alone, when communicating with foreign powers (no. 24) or introducing a decree honoring a king (no. 23), in conjunction with the *synedroi*, when introducing the treaty with Heraclea (no. 20) or acting as official representatives of Miletus in concluding the treaty with Pidasas (no. 19).

5. Neither the names nor the number of the board of the *epistatai* is ever mentioned in our documents. On the other hand, the *synedroi* are at times mentioned as a body (nos. 12–15), at times lists are given which contain their names (nos. 16 f. and 19–21). Their number varied. We find a board of 10 *synedroi* in nos. 16, 19 and

⁵⁸ The acceptance of the festival by foreign powers is the tenor of the decree.

20, whereas in two other cases their exact number cannot be determined: in no. 17 their number must have exceeded 24, in no. 21 there were by far more than 16, in fact, as has been pointed out above, p. 121, their number most probably was uneven. It is interesting to note that the number of members who made up the board of the *synedroi* varied with the matter under consideration. A board of 10 men seems to have been the standard procedure in foreign affairs: cf. the decree for Cius (no. 16), the treaty with Pidasa (no. 19) and the treaty with Heraclea (no. 20). In the field of domestic policy their number seems to have been by far greater, as appears from the two grants of citizenship, etc. (nos. 17 and 21). In view of the fact that in these two documents their number cannot be determined, the possibility cannot be denied that there might also have been a standard number of *synedroi* in domestic affairs. That number could well have been uneven as a matter of routine (see no. 21).

The conclusions seem obvious. The *epistatai*, who, as their title would suggest, probably presided over the popular assemblies, seem to have been the only probouleutic commissioners for joint decrees of the *boulê* and the *dêmos*, although this did not preclude motions by individuals (nos. 1-3). One of the *epistatai* acted as spokesman (no. 4-7) on their motions. Whether the *epistatai* were a committee of the *boulê*, as was suggested by Rehm, *Milet* I/3, p. 197 f., cannot be determined. They may well have been elected officers of the *dêmos*.⁵⁹ For this one might be tempted to turn for a parallel to *SIG*³ 340 (honorary decree of Lindus; second half of the third century B.C.⁶⁰), lines 1 ff., ἔδοξε μαστροῖς καὶ Λινδίοις ἐπιστατᾶν <γνώμα>· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπιστάται αἰρεθέντες ὑπὸ Λινδίων | Ἀνάξανδρος Πάγωνος Καμύνδιος, | Λυσίας Λυσικράτους Λαδάρ[μι]ος || Εὐβουλος Εὐθυμάχου Πάγιος | καὶ τοὶ αἰρεθέντες ἄνδρες συναγωνίσασθαι ταῖς δίκαις (follow 30 names) ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἐγένοντο κτλ. However, the phrase, ἐπιστατᾶν <γνώμα>, if supplied correctly, seems to indicate that the ἐπιστάται

⁵⁹ The fact that they later act as probouleutic board in the *boulê* (nos. 26 f.) cannot be relied upon to prove any such connection; the constitutional reorganization of 38/7 B.C. may have been a decisive break in this respect.

⁶⁰ Ch. Blinkenberg's study of the inscription and its date in *Kgl. Videnskabernes Selskab. Archaeol.-kunstn. Meddelelser* 1937, was unavailable to me and known only through the epigraphical bibliography in *REG* 51 (1938) 448, no. 267; the same is true of two articles in *RFIC* 1936 by A. Momigliano (pp. 49-63) and M. Segre (pp. 293-295); see *REG* 51.447, no. 263.

αἰρεθέντες ὑπὸ Λυδίων were different from the *epistatai* who introduced the motion. Otherwise we would have to assume that the *epistatai* proposed the honorary decree for themselves and *τοὶ αἰρεθέντες ἄνδρες*, a procedure which is not very likely, to say the least.⁶¹

In the decrees of the *dêmos* the *epistatai* as well as the *synedroi* could introduce motions. The situation as described above, p. 123 ff., would suggest that the *epistatai* introduced motions, which for some reason needed no special preliminary study; such motions could be routine motions or matters which presented no problems. On the other hand, the board of the *synedroi* took care of more complicated matters, especially when legal issues, external or internal, were involved. Rehm's contention (*Milet* I/3, p. 197 f.) that the *epistatai* probably had only a purely formal responsibility for the decrees which they introduced is not founded on facts.

As to the *epistatai* who introduced motions before the *synedroi*, that is the *boulê* (nos. 26 f.), Szanto's theory (above, p. 113) must be modified to the extent that those *epistatai* probably were the presiding officers of the *boulê*, but only after the constitutional reorganization of the city. That motions of individual members of the *boulê* were possible at the beginning of the third century B.C. and doubtless throughout the Hellenistic period is proved by no. 25.

⁶¹ The *epistatai* of SIG³ 765 (Lindus; 41 B.C.), lines 52 ff., were most probably *ἐπιστάται τῶν ἱερῶν*.