



<https://publications.dainst.org>

# iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

R. Malcolm Errington

## The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia (I. Milet 148)

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **19 • 1989**

Seite / Page **279–288**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1150/5517> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1989-19-p279-288-v5517.6

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

## The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia (I. Milet 148)

The long inscription which records the terms of the peace agreement between Miletus and Magnesia-on-the-Maiander has been dated to autumn 196 B.C. ever since its first publication.<sup>1</sup> This dating also plays a large part as a fixed point in a major recent article, which once more asserts that the chronological arguments of F. MEZGER and A. REHM for 196 are generally convincing, and constructs a new chain of reasoning which ends by producing an attractive new dating of REHM's list of Milesian *stephanephoroi*.<sup>2</sup> Before this old orthodoxy becomes even more firmly established it will perhaps be helpful to draw attention to the assumptions on which the dating is based and to assess whether in the light of more recent information and considerations about events in western Asia Minor at this period the old arguments are indeed as strong as they have always seemed to be.

REHM, in his commentary on the inscription, refers to the doctoral dissertation of his pupil MEZGER for detailed arguments on the date, which he himself merely paraphrases.<sup>3</sup> But when we turn to the detailed arguments it is surprising to find that the whole structure is based merely on two argumenta ex silentio:<sup>4</sup> 1) that since no Romans are mentioned in the list of states which joined in negotiating the peace, the document cannot be subsequent to 188, when in connection with the Peace of Apameia Cn. Manlius Vulso and his ten *legati* settled a range of territorial status problems in Western Asia Minor; moreover, since from 192 onwards there was a state of open war between Antiochus and Rome, the local peace must be before 192. 2) Since some members of the Achaian League (including a federal representative)<sup>5</sup> but nobody from Aitolia participated in the

---

<sup>1</sup> F. MEZGER, *Inscriptio milesiaca de pace cum Magnetibus facta*, Diss. München, 1913 (= Programm des K-Humanistischen Gymnasiums in Augsburg für das Schuljahr 1913/1914, München 1914); A. REHM, *Das Delphinion in Milet (Milet I 3)*, Berlin 1914, no. 148 (Sylloge<sup>3</sup> 588).

<sup>2</sup> M. WÖRRLE, *Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos I. Antiochos III., Zeuxis und Herakleia*, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 421 ff. esp. 431.

<sup>3</sup> *Milet I 3* p. 345.

<sup>4</sup> MEZGER 39.

<sup>5</sup> MEZGER 45. It is mere phantasy – as MEZGER seems to have realised (p. 16) – to restore the Damoxenos of Aegium whom Polybios mentions (18.42.6) where the stone merely has ΔΑ[. We have no way of telling whether this restoration is probable or not.

peace-making, this must be after 197, when after Kynoskephalai the Aitolians first became alienated from Rome. The peace then is fitted into the general context of the liquidation of Macedonian possessions in Karia which, as we now know, began immediately after the news of the battle of Kynoskephalai reached Asia Minor,<sup>6</sup> so that when P. Lentulus, the *legatus* who was sent to Asia Minor to supervise the freeing of Philip's possessions there, reached the area in late summer 196, only Bargyilia remained occupied.<sup>7</sup>

Argument 2) is, as MEZGER himself admitted, weak. There could be a dozen reasons why, from all the states of mainland Greece, only Athens (presumably, as «mother» of the Ionians) and the Achaians participated in these peace-negotiations; indeed, an explanation should perhaps be sought for why they were involved at all rather than for why other mainland states were not. It is, however, argument 1) which seems to have convinced subsequent writers not to think much further about the implications of the dating of the peace-treaty (and hence of the war). Argument 1) seems to imply a) that the *legati* of 188 must have made decisions on all outstanding potential objects of dispute in the area and b) that subsequently nothing could be settled without Roman participation; a) is patently absurd, and both it and b) are disproved by all those known cases which stretch on even into the period after the installation of the Roman province Asia, where the parties concerned simply get together to solve their problems, with or without a third party to help, but regularly without Rome. Parallel were of course cases where an appeal was indeed made to Rome, but this was optional and in no way essential.<sup>8</sup> For our purpose the most interesting cases are those of Miletus' own relations with two neighbours in the 180s, with little Pidasa, where negotiations removed potential points of irritation – here apparently without previous hostile activity –<sup>9</sup> and with Herakleia-by-Latmos, where, it seems, hostile actions had indeed gone before.<sup>10</sup> In both of these cases not only were the Romans not involved, but the two parties managed to arrange their affairs quite without outside help of any kind. It is clear, then, that a dating for the peace-treaty between Miletus and Magnesia to the period before 188, which relies merely on the absence of Romans, is quite insecure.

Moreover, the question should at least be raised, as to whether a sizeable war involving four of the largest cities in the area (Miletus with Herakleia against Magnesia with Priene)<sup>11</sup> can reasonably be fitted into 196, when Antiochus III

<sup>6</sup> The inscription from Euromos: M. ERRINGTON, *Epigr. Anat.* 8, 1986, 1 f.

<sup>7</sup> Polyb. 18.48.1.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton, 1950, 113 ff. with notes 81 ff. (vol. 2, 963 ff.). <sup>9</sup> I Milet 149.

<sup>10</sup> I Milet 150 (Sylloge<sup>3</sup> 633), esp. line 37: εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἀμνηστῖαν ὡς ἑκατέρους τῶν προγεγενημένων ἐγκλημάτων κατὰ πόλεμον...

<sup>11</sup> I Milet 148 makes clear that Miletus was supported by Herakleia and Magnesia by Priene. There is no evidence for MEZGER's suggestion that the war, which had doubtless arisen

had already taken Ephesos (ca. 30 km. from Magnesia),<sup>12</sup> Euromos (ca. 20 km. from Herakleia),<sup>13</sup> probably Iasos and Pidasas as well, and while Macedonian troops were still present at Bargylia until summer 196.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, the nearer hinterland, with Tralleis, Alabanda, Alinda and Amyzon, perhaps already Labraunda and Mylasa had probably been an area of influence for Antiochus much earlier, at least since ca. 203, and had been retained despite the activities of Philip V in the area since 201.<sup>15</sup> Yet no king is mentioned amongst the negotiating states. The only reason why historians have not set Antiochus' occupation of Magnesia-on-the-Maiander in 197, parallel to Ephesos (though it lies on the direct main route from Seleucid Ephesos to Seleucid Tralleis) seems to be the independence which it seems to have shown in 196 by fighting this war against Miletus without royal help, though later it was a royal base.<sup>16</sup> But is it really likely when Antiochus' base was so close and his influence all around, that the Milesians would seize precisely this most unfavourable moment to risk a full-scale war against Magnesia, and that they could win the support of Herakleia for this action, while Priene was prepared to support Magnesia, which merely needed to turn to her powerful neighbour Antiochus in Ephesos and Tralleis for help – and yet did not do so? or that Antiochus allowed this war to continue on his doorstep, so to speak, without using the distress of one party or other to extend his influence by helping them? Euromos, already in summer 197, had seen the writing on the wall for its Macedonian protector Philip V and joined Antiochus on its own initiative.<sup>17</sup> Are we to believe that Magnesia, which owed its possession of the disputed territory of Myus to Philip's favour, was not as far-sighted as little Euromos? Given its exposed political and geographical situation it is inherently far more likely that Magnesia also looked around for a new protector and found him in 197 in Antiochus. I do not wish to insist, given the current lack of evidence, that this scenario depicts what actually happened; its purpose is merely to

---

out of a dispute about the territory of Myus, granted in 201 by Philip V to Magnesia (Polyb. 16.24.9), had broken out immediately and lasted the whole five years (ib. 43); but that it was a thoroughly serious affair, with substantial losses to all involved, emerges from the detailed regulations for the peace (esp. lines 50 ff.). Although by the standards of the II Macedonian War or the war between Antiochus III and Rome this was doubtless *ein kleiner Sonderkrieg* (so REHM, ib. p. 347), in that area in 197 or 196 (if that really is when it was) it could probably claim to be the largest amount of actual fighting which took place.

<sup>12</sup> He wintered there 197/6: Liv. 33.38.1.

<sup>13</sup> Epigr. Anat. 8, 1986, 1 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Polyb. 18.48.1; cf. Epigr. Anat. 8, 1986, 6; M. HOLLEAUX, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques IV*, Paris, 1952, 309 n. 2; WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 445–6.

<sup>15</sup> See now J. and L. ROBERT, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I*, Paris 1983, esp. 176 ff.; also H. H. SCHMITT, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Großen und seiner Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1964, 262 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Liv. 37.10.12 ff. So explicitly SCHMITT, ib. 281.

<sup>17</sup> Epigr. Anat. 8, 1986, 1 ff.

make clear that the general plausibility of the traditional date is so slight that if technical arguments drawn from the text of the inscription itself do not absolutely force us to date it in 196, then other possibilities should be very seriously explored.

One of the most interesting aspects of this war was that Miletus was supported by Herakleia-by-Latmos, and not just nominally. The Herakleotai had taken prisoners and had seen some of their own people also taken prisoner.<sup>18</sup> The Herakleotai were therefore active allies. They had not always been so. As it happens, we possess another long document from the Delphinion in Miletus which explicitly makes reference to the existence of a state of war between Herakleia and Miletus, which had lasted sufficiently long to have created a complicated legal situation, involving both private and public interests, and for which, when the two cities got together and made an agreement about *isopoliteia* and other mutual benefits during the 180s, an amnesty for these cases was arranged.<sup>19</sup> The length of these hostilities is not known; but the very fact that an agreement of this kind could be made in the 180s indicates that the intensity of public and private claims must have cooled off to such an extent that the document could begin, as it does, with the assertions that the Herakleotai were *philo*i of Miletus and had taken the initiative in proposing the treaty.<sup>20</sup> This suggests a period of several years, and the claims might perhaps go back to the 190s, to the time when Antiochus III was fighting Rome, when Herakleia joined Antiochus<sup>21</sup> and Miletus supported Rome. The treaty which we possess includes the clause: ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ φίλον, with the proviso that neither party undertake any action contrary to the alliance with Rhodes.<sup>22</sup> This clause makes very good sense in the 180s, in view of the extremely influential position which Rhodes had reached in the area, thanks to the Roman decision in connection with the peace of Apameia.

Now when we possess two chronologically close documents, one of which explicitly contains the agreement that the two parties will cooperate in war, and the other shows us that they had done just that, in the absence of other decisive arguments for the chronological order of the documents, the conclusion is surely legitimate that the treaty of cooperation must come first, since *prima facie* it provides the preconditions for the military action. That this simple conclusion in the case of Miletus and Herakleia has not apparently been drawn until now results from the less than critical acceptance of the incorrect assumption which lies at the root of MEZGER's *argumentum ex silentio*, that after 188 Romans must have participated in such negotiations.

<sup>18</sup> I Milet 148 lines 64 ff.

<sup>19</sup> I Milet 150, lines 36 ff. (text partially quoted n. 10 above). On the precise date see below.

<sup>20</sup> *Ib.* lines 10 ff.

<sup>21</sup> WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 421 ff.

<sup>22</sup> Lines 34–36.

The participant states in the negotiations, it has often been asserted, were all particularly closely associated with Rhodes,<sup>23</sup> and thus fit extremely well into the period when Rhodes was extending her influence in the Aegean, during the 190s. For this reason, it seems, *Καυσιών* was restored in lines 12/13, because *Kaunos* belonged to Rhodes, having been defended against Antiochus already in 197;<sup>24</sup> but the restoration is quite speculative, and (for instance) *Χιίων*, *Ἐρυθραίων*, *Σμυρναίων* or others would equally well fit the gap, since at this point personal names of indeterminable length are also missing.<sup>25</sup> The cities and states which are named in the list (or whose names can reasonably be restored) are as follows: Rhodes, Athens, Knidos, Myndos, Samos, Halikarnassos, *⊂x⊃*, Mylasa or Iasos, Teos, Kyzikos, the Achaian League, Megalopolis, Antigoneia (Mantineia), Patrai.<sup>26</sup> Of the *⊂asiatic⊃* states we know now (though not in 1913) that Teos was closely associated with Antiochus as early as ca. 204,<sup>27</sup> and this close association was continued during the 190s; the same probably applies to Iasos for the period after 197,<sup>28</sup> if this equally possible and plausible restoration (instead of *⊂Mylasa⊃* printed by REHM) should be right; but even Mylasa had perhaps already close contacts with Antiochus in 197.<sup>29</sup> Herakleia itself, one of the participants in the war, may also have been in Antiochus' camp by 196, if the argument from the independent participation in the assumed war of 196, which for this purpose is circular, is left out of account.<sup>30</sup>

Despite the unsatisfactory nature of the evidence for the 190s it seems clear that REHM's statement that the *⊂asiatic⊃* states listed were all in some way dependent on Rhodes at the time of the treaty is incorrect; and this assumption does nothing at all to explain the presence of the mainland Greek states. In fact, the only time when the whole group of states – including the participants in the war – enjoyed the total freedom which they seem to be enjoying in this docu-

<sup>23</sup> E. g. REHM, *Milet I* 3 p. 222: «Fast die ganze Kommission besteht hiernach aus der Bundesgenossenschaft von Rhodos, das mit Milet sympathisieren mußte.»

<sup>24</sup> Liv. 33.20.12.

<sup>25</sup> MEZGER, 14, draws attention to the weakness of the restoration (and makes still other suggestions: Byzantion or Kos); despite this it is printed by REHM, merely with the comment that the restoration of the N is doubtful, and by HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, *Sylloge*<sup>3</sup> 588 with no comment at all about the uncertainty, but a reference to Liv. 33.20.12; H. R. RAWLINGS III, *Antiochus the Great and Rhodes, 197–191 B. C.*, *AJAH* 1, 1976, 12, uses this treaty to support his view that the cities named (including *Kaunos*) had before this been freed by Rhodes from Ptolemaic control.

<sup>26</sup> Lines 3–20. *⊂x⊃* represents the state restored by REHM as *Kaunos*. Mylasa was restored by REHM because of the Karian name *Hyssoldomos* of one of the members of the commission; but the name occurs also at Iasos (*I Iasos* 215 line 6 cf. L. ROBERT, *Opera Minora Selecta*, Amsterdam 1969, III 1505 with n. 5). The stone has *ἰέων*.

<sup>27</sup> P. HERRMANN, *Anadolu* 9, 1965, 41 ff.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e. g. SCHMITT, *op. cit.* (n. 15) 280; 287 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. J. and L. ROBERT, *Amyzon* 139 ff.; SCHMITT, 281.

<sup>30</sup> WÖRRLÉ, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 421 ff. See below.

ment is the period of twenty years immediately following the peace of Apameia. After 188 Rhodes had emerged from the war against Antiochus as the great winner in southern Asia Minor, but more than this, all the negotiating states named in the peace treaty had had their independent status recognised by the Roman *legati*,<sup>31</sup> and the non-Asiatic participants represented in the 180s the most influential free friends of Rome in Greece (Athens, as the <mother> city of the Ionians, had in any case a particular reason for participating).

Moreover, there is further evidence that the type of regional <clean-up> operation represented by this war over Myus was initiated by Miletus more than once in the 180s. The surviving agreement with the small neighbouring community Pidasia straightened out by mutual agreement a whole string of neighbourhood problems;<sup>32</sup> the agreement with Herakleia-by-Latmos four years later<sup>33</sup> had the same general objective. What would be more likely than that, with these problems sorted out, the major remaining dispute in the area, that with Magnesia-on-the-Maiander about the territory of Myus, which Philip V had granted to Magnesia in 201/200, should also be tackled. Magnesia had also been declared independent by the Romans in 188;<sup>34</sup> there was thus no danger that Miletus and Herakleia might seem to be challenging one of the major powers of the area, Pergamum or Rhodes – contrary to their agreement with Rhodes – if they attempted to resolve this problem together in the Milesian interest. The prominence of Rhodes in the peace treaty is wholly compatible with the prominent position of the Rhodian alliance in the treaty between Miletus and Herakleia. Not only did Rhodians head the list of negotiators but Rhodes was also to act as a kind of honest broker in putting the peace treaty into force; she was to receive some of the prisoners of war whom Magnesia had taken and to keep a sealed copy of the agreement until it was published. It is perhaps even conceivable that the Rhodians only then mobilised the <free world> to negotiate peace when her own allies, Miletus and Herakleia, as seems to have happened, had suffered a defeat at the hands of the Magnesians and Prienians.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> The total uncertainty of restoring Kaunos in the inscription has already been indicated. The status of Teos after 188 is disputed, but WALBANK's assessment, *Commentary on Polybius III*, Oxford, 1979, 167–8, that the evidence does not allow the assumption of a real dependence on Pergamon, seems right. The status of Iasos is unknown, but Mylasa was certainly independent (Liv. 38.39.8). As more evidence accumulates, the simple contrast between free states and unfree (perhaps better: independent and dependent) which has dominated the discussion of these relationships in the past, seems increasingly inadequate to describe the much more complex reality of the interdependence of the individual cities and their relationship with Pergamon and Rhodes after Apameia.

<sup>32</sup> I Milet 149.

<sup>33</sup> See REHM, I Milet p. 248. cf. below.

<sup>34</sup> Tac. Ann. 3.62.

<sup>35</sup> According to I Milet 148 lines 67 ff. Miletus had lost more men taken prisoner than had Magnesia.

A prosopographical argument supports this dating. Two members of the Milesian team which negotiated the peace, Theog[enes] son of Leodamas and Antigonos son of [Hekataios] are also known from the agreement with Pidasas, where they were also members of the negotiating committee (*synedroi*).<sup>36</sup> Theogenes fulfilled the same function in negotiating the treaty with Herakleia, as well as being chosen as one of the three Milesians who administered the oath in Herakleia.<sup>37</sup> The coincidence is remarkable, since the Milesians were clearly not short of people capable of doing this sort of job: apart from Theogenes only one other Milesian was a member of both the negotiating committees for the agreements with Pidasas and Herakleia, although they were only four years apart, and this was Minnion son of Leodamas, doubtless Theogenes' brother;<sup>38</sup> additionally, the *stephanephoros* Pasikles of the Pidasas document may have been the Pasikles, son of Philidas, who was to administer the oath in the treaty with Herakleia.<sup>39</sup> The close relationship of these three documents, which indeed REHM drew attention to and which extends to certain aspects of the letter-forms<sup>40</sup> is undeniable, and while a period of fifteen years for the three documents cannot be excluded on these grounds alone,<sup>41</sup> a much shorter period of perhaps 5–10 years would perhaps be more probable.

When then can we precisely date this document and the war which it ended? MICHAEL WÖRRLE has recently used the traditional date of this document to help him adjust the list of Milesian *stephanephoroi* (I Milet no. 124), which REHM had dated 232/1 – 184/3, to end at 190/89.<sup>42</sup> A classic problem – also for REHM, of course – was the search within this list for the name of a *stephanephoros* which would fit the gap in line 90 of the peace treaty. Dated to 196, the name of the *stephanephoros* in the treaty must be one which occurs in the list; and this has remained also for WÖRRLE the least satisfactory part of his argumentation. If we re-

<sup>36</sup> I Milet 148 lines 25–27; 149 lines 3–6. REHM's restoration of [Ἐκαταίο]υ is possible and seems not unreasonable. On the Milesian *synedroi* see H. MÜLLER, *Milesische Volksbeschlüsse*, Göttingen 1976, 20 ff.

<sup>37</sup> I Milet 150 lines 8 and 126.

<sup>38</sup> I Milet 149 line 4; 150 line 2.

<sup>39</sup> I Milet 149 line 1; 150 line 126.

<sup>40</sup> REHM, I Milet p. 246 with table of significant letter forms. REHM's identification (ib. p. 345 n. 4) of the Rhodian negotiator Nikostratos son of Teisylos with the Rhodian Nikostratos (without patronymic) of Polyb. 16.5.1 is however quite uncertain (not even registered as a suggestion by WALBANK, *Commentary II*, ad loc.); he did appear, however, as Rhodian negotiator in the dispute between Samos and Priene in the late 190s; I Priene 37 line 4.

<sup>41</sup> This figure is implied by REHM's dating the treaty with Herakleia to April 180; later (SB München, 1923; *Inschriften von Didyma*, 1958, p. 249 f.) he dated it to 173/2, while still retaining the date 196 for the peace treaty with Magnesia. This would, for this reason alone, be very improbable, and is shown to be quite impossible by the new document from Herakleia (WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 438).

<sup>42</sup> *Ib.* 428 ff.



move the war (and the document) from 196 into the period after 188, this particularly difficult search becomes otiose. Unfortunately the chronological peg, on which REHM hung his absolute dating of the list and which also for WÖRRLE plays a significant part, then vanishes with it.

Nevertheless WÖRRLE's new dating of the list of *stephanephoroi* remains very attractive, and it seems to me that it can perhaps stand, even without the dubious support of an unlikely war and a restored *stephanephoros*. The document from Herakleia-by-Latmos, which WÖRRLE publishes in definitive form and with a thorough commentary, provides a critical link between the *stephanephoroi* of Herakleia (which are, of course, much less well-known) and those of Miletus.<sup>43</sup> Since the finding of the treaty between the two cities it has been known that the year in which the god (Apollo) occupied the *stephanephorate* at Herakleia for the fourteenth time after a man named Demetrios was also the year in which at Miletus Menandros son of Maion was *stephanephoros*.<sup>44</sup> The new document from Herakleia has now provided a chronological peg on which to hang this invaluable correlation and to fix the date within a very few years, since it is dated to the third year of the god after Demetrios son of Demetrios, and for historical reasons this must fall before late summer 193 (*stephanephoros*-year in Herakleia: 193/2), which means that the Miletus-Herakleia treaty must fall before 182/1.<sup>45</sup>

It is more difficult to fix a *terminus post quem*. WÖRRLE argues that the situation at Herakleia created by the Scipios' letter to the city<sup>46</sup> is the precondition for the treaty with Miletus; 190/89 is therefore the earliest possible date for it, and this implies 201/200 as the earliest possible date for the new text from Herakleia. The Scipios' letter is certainly important, but perhaps other considerations would give us a later date. Since the problem of the relationship between Miletus and Herakleia was not solved by the Romans (whose *legati* were still present in western Asia Minor until 188, but are not mentioned in the document) and since both parties agree that the only foreign-political condition worth mentioning in the

---

<sup>43</sup> This connection was noticed by W. AMELING, *Antiochus III., Herakleia am Latmos und Rom*, *Epigr. Anat.* 10, 1987, 19, on the basis of a preliminary publication of the text without commentary by S. ŞAHİN in *Epigr. Anat.* 9, 1987, 55 f.; but since he made the capital error of not respecting the text of SEG II 536, which names a Herakleot *stephanephoros* Demetrios son of Apollonios and conflates him with Demetrios son of Demetrios of the new text (ma-son's error!) his discussion is worthless.

<sup>44</sup> I Milet 150 lines 25–27.

<sup>45</sup> The identification of the *stephanephoros* Demetrios of I Milet 150, whose patronymic is not given, with Demetrios son of Demetrios of the new inscription is the condition of this correlation. That he cannot be the Demetrios son of Apollonios of SEG II 536 (cf. J. and L. ROBERT, *Amyzon* 187 f.) has however been convincingly shown by WÖRRLE, *ib.* 432 f. The *terminus ante quem* is given by the death of Antiochus III's son Antiochus, who is mentioned still alive in the new document, in late summer 193 (cf. WÖRRLE, 430).

<sup>46</sup> Sylloge<sup>3</sup>, 618 (R. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore 1969, 35).

document is their treaty with Rhodes,<sup>47</sup> it seems extremely likely that the Roman settlement of the area had already taken place and that the Roman *legati* had left Asia Minor before the treaty was arranged. This implies, then, an earliest possible date for the treaty, which is dated to the first month of the Milesian year, Taureon (March/April), of spring 187, which fell in the Milesian stephanephorate 187/6 (in Herakleia, where the new year probably began at the summer solstice,<sup>48</sup> this was still 188/7). This means that the new document from Herakleia, eleven years earlier, must be dated at the earliest to Herakleian year 199/8.

Having removed the evidence of independent action by Herakleia in 196 (the active cooperation in the war with Miletus against Magnesia), the events themselves seem to offer no further consideration which would compel a later date. Nevertheless, in view of the well-known campaign which Antiochus III carried out in 197, and which brought him to Ephesos for the following winter (and out of a hostility in principle to unforced extreme possibilities!) it would be at least attractive to set Zeuxis' contacts with Herakleia into this context, whether in 197 or a little later. But let us return to the Milesian *stephanephoroi*, who perhaps offer a further point of view.

As REHM showed, Miletus' treaty with Pidasa is chronologically linked to the Herakleia treaty in such a way that Menandros son of Maion must have been in office as *stephanephoros* not less than four years after the end of the surviving list of *stephanephoroi*, because at least three predecessors, whose names also do not appear on the list, precede him.<sup>49</sup> Since we have seen from the argument up to now that the earliest year for the treaty with Herakleia is the Milesian year 187/6 and the latest 182/1, it is clear even without WÖRRLE's argument from the restored *stephanephoros* in I Milet no. 148 that REHM's sequence of Milesian *stephanephoroi* ending in 184/3 cannot be correct, since it implies pushing the treaty with Herakleia to a date where (because of its link with the new document from Herakleia) it cannot possibly belong. Since for reasons which REHM adduced, and which are reinforced by the new correlation, the long list cannot be moved downwards, the only alternative is a gentle move back in time; and since this is so, the reasons which WÖRRLE has given for letting the list end in 190/89, seem in the present state of our knowledge to provide by far the most plausible solution.<sup>50</sup> This has the historically convincing effect of setting the series of five crisis-stephanephorates of Apollo, with which it concludes, to cover the uncertain years of the cold and the hot war between Antiochus III and Rome from 194/3 to 190/89.

The stephanephorate of Menander son of Maion, and with it the Miletus-

<sup>47</sup> I Milet 150 lines 35–6.

<sup>48</sup> See WÖRRLE, op. cit. 429–30 with notes 20 and 21.

<sup>49</sup> I Milet p. 248.

<sup>50</sup> Ib. 428 ff. esp. 437–9.

Herakleia treaty cannot therefore be placed before 186/5, because at least three other *stephanephoroi* were in office between his year and the end of the list. This extreme dating however would have the effect that the Pidasia treaty (in this case 189/8) must have been negotiated while the Roman *legati* were still actively sorting out such problems in the area, and yet it does not mention them. This seems improbable and is an unnecessary assumption; we should therefore probably move this group of four connected *stephanephoroi*, from the Pidasia-treaty to the Herakleia-treaty, at least one year down, to 188/7 – 185/4.

If this is correct, it in turn has counter-implications at the other end of the correlation for the new document from Herakleia, which in this way would receive a terminus post quem of Herakleian year 196/5 (ca. June 196 – ca. June 195), a date which WÖRRLE, still using the peace-treaty dated to autumn 196, also favoured. It also implies that the war between Miletus (with Herakleia) and Magnesia (with Priene), according to the considerations brought above, will have to be placed no earlier than 185/4, therefore in the second half of the 180s.

*Seminar für Alte Geschichte  
der Philipps-Universität Marburg  
Wilhelm-Röpke-Str. 6 C  
3550 Marburg*