

December 2002

## Milesian Decrees of *Isopoliteia* and the Refoundation of the City, ca. 479 BCE

Vanessa B. Gorman

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*, [vgorman1@unl.edu](mailto:vgorman1@unl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyfacpub>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

Gorman, Vanessa B., "Milesian Decrees of *Isopoliteia* and the Refoundation of the City, ca. 479 BCE" (2002). *Faculty Publications, Department of History*. 15.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/historyfacpub/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Department of History by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# MILESIAN DECREES OF *ISOPOLITEIA* AND THE REFOUNDATION OF THE CITY, CA. 479 BCE

VANESSA B. GORMAN  
*University of Nebraska–Lincoln*

Published in *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham*. Edited by Vanessa B. Gorman and Eric Robinson. Brill, Leiden•Boston•Köln, 2002. Pages 181–193.

Copyright © 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Used by permission.



During the course of the Ionian Revolt, when the outcome still lay in the balance, the Persians swore a horrible vengeance upon the disloyal Greeks. They promised to burn the houses and temples of the Greeks in revolt, castrate their sons, abduct their daughters, and give their land away to loyal subjects (Hdt. 6.9.4). Once the Battle of Lade in 494 BCE proved the supremacy of the Persians, their anger abated somewhat. While they did burn most cities, they left the land in possession of the Greeks, and they generally castrated only the handsomest youths and abducted only the prettiest virgins. Miletos, the instigator of the revolt, received their harshest treatment. Herodotos describes it (6.19.2–22.1), beginning with an oracle:

καὶ τότε δὴ, Μίλητε, κακῶν ἐπιμήχανε ἔργων,  
πολλοῖσιν δεῖπνόν τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα γενήσῃ,  
σαὶ δ' ἄλοχοι πολλοῖσι πόδας νίψουσι κομήταις,  
νηοῦ δ' ἡμετέρου Διδύμοις ἄλλοισι μελήσει.

(19.3) τότε δὴ ταῦτα τοὺς Μιλησίους κατελάμβανε, ὅτε γε ἄνδρες μὲν οἱ πλεῦνες ἐκτείνοντο ὑπὸ τῶν Περσέων ἐόντων κομητέων, γυναῖκες δὲ καὶ τέκνα ἐν ἀνδραπόδων λόγῳ ἐγίνοντο, ἱρὸν δὲ τὸ ἐν Διδύμοισι, ὁ νηὸς τε καὶ τὸ χρηστήριον, συληθέντα ἐνεπίμπρατο. . . . (20) ἐνθεῦτεν οἱ ζωγρηθέντες τῶν Μιλησίων ἤγοντο ἐς Σοῦσα. βασιλεὺς δὲ σφεας Δαρεῖος κακὸν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ποιήσας κατοίκησε ἐπὶ τῇ Ἐρυθρῇ καλεομένη θαλάσῃ ἐν Ἄμψι πόλι, παρ' ἣν Τίγρης ποταμὸς παραρρέων ἐς θάλασσαν ἐξίει. τῆς δὲ Μιλησίων χώρας αὐτοὶ μὲν οἱ Πέρσαι εἶχον τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ πεδῖον, τὰ δὲ ὑπεράκρια ἔδοσαν Καρσί Πηδασεῦσι ἐκτῆσθαι.

. . . (22.1) Μίλητος μὲν νυν Μιλησίων ἠρήμωτο·

(19.2) And then, Miletos, contriver of evil deeds,  
you will be a feast for many and a shining gift,  
your wives will wash the feet of many long-haired men,  
and my temple at Didyma will be a concern to others.

(19.3) And thus these things happened to the Milesians: many of the men were killed by the long-haired Persians, and the women and children were

made into slaves. The sanctuary at Didyma—both the temple and the Oracle—was plundered and burned . . . (20) Then the survivors of the Milesians were taken to Susa. But King Dareios did no further harm to them, but rather he settled them on what is called the Red Sea, in the city of Ampe, near where the Tigris River flows as it empties into the sea. Of the Milesian land, the Persians themselves took possession of the areas around the city and the plain, while they gave the heights to the Karians from Pedasa to have as their own.

. . . (22.1) Thus Miletos was emptied of Milesians.

Some fifteen years later, after the Battle of Mykale in 479 BCE, the Milesians rejoined the historical record, appearing regularly in the literature of the fifth century. Many historians make no comment upon this oddity of a city that is wiped out of existence and then reappears and returns to relative prosperity within fifty years. Other scholars, in particular the commentators on Herodotos, note a problem. At 9.99, a contingent of Milesians appears in the Persian army at the Battle of Mykale and wreaks havoc upon the fleeing Persians. The commentators hesitate to reconcile this passage with the story of the destruction. How and Wells state a commonly held view that Miletos never really lost all of its population: “The expatriation of the Milesians can hardly have been complete, since the Milesians destroy the fugitive Persians after Mycale.”<sup>1</sup> In other words, one passage in Herodotos, about the Battle of Mykale, is arbitrarily used to reject another passage, about the depopulation of Miletos.<sup>2</sup> However, upon examination, the archaeological evidence from Miletos confirms the broad outline of Herodotos’ report, so that, in the absence of strong arguments for preferring the second passage over the first, both should be accepted and rendered into a plausible historical chronicle. Thus, a better question is not whether Miletos was depopulated, but rather how it was repopulated to such an extent that it returned quickly to its status as one of the richest cities in Ionia. The

<sup>1</sup> *Ad* 6.20; cf. Macan *ad* 9.99; Tozzi (1978) 205. An older theory is that the inhabitants of Miletos were indeed transplanted and the city was not restored until at least the mid-fifth century (Wilamowitz (1914) 81; Mayer (1932) 1633–5), but it has been disproved by archaeological finds.

<sup>2</sup> The argument from silence—that no refoundation is mentioned anywhere—is a weak one, especially since Graham ((1992) 70) notes that Eretria, Kamarina, and Priene were destroyed in one historical account, but appear again as functioning polities soon afterwards, without any reference to a refoundation in any of our extant sources.

answer lies in the Milesian colonies and the special treaties of *isopoliteia* that some of them shared with their mother city.

The sack of Miletos and its subsequent depopulation can be supported on several grounds. The fact of the destruction of the city is an unmistakable conclusion derived from the archaeological record. A layer of ash and debris, several meters deep in places, has been found between the classical and archaic levels throughout the city. For example, it is in evidence at the shrines of Apollo Delphinios (the patron god of Miletos) and Dionysos inside the city and at the Temple of Aphrodite at Zeytintepe, west of the city proper.<sup>3</sup> The classical residential areas on the Theater Hill, the Stadium Hill, and Kalabaktepe (a kind of acropolis just south of the city proper), as well as on the plain near the Hellenistic cross-wall, are all built upon terraces constructed by leveling out the debris layer.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the archaic ring-wall was destroyed at the end of the sixth century and not rebuilt until late in the fifth.<sup>5</sup> In sum, this destruction layer has been discovered in every part of the city where the excavation extends deeply enough to include the archaic level. Not a single structure is known to have withstood the sack, and the rubble was often terraced to form a level foundation for later constructions. One must conclude that Miletos was burned to the ground.

Whether or not the city continued to be occupied by Milesians during the years between 494 and 479 is a more difficult question. While it is impossible to use physical remains to prove that a city was not inhabited for such a short period, because the lack of evidence can never be conclusive, one may at least note a complete absence of any building or sherd on the city peninsula of Miletos that can be accurately dated to that time. In addition, Herodotos dwells at length on the depopulation itself, describing it in detail and

<sup>3</sup> Delphinios and Dionysos: Mellink (1974) 114. Dionysos: Müller-Wiener (1977) 135–7; (1977/78) 95; (1988) 35–6. Aphrodite: Gans (1991); Hölbl (1999).

<sup>4</sup> Theater Hill: Kleiner (1961) 47; Mellink (1984) 454; Müller-Wiener and Weber (1985), 31–4. Stadium Hill: Kleiner (1960) 40; Mellink (1974) 114. Kalabaktepe: Graeve (1986) 38–43; (1987); (1990); Müller-Wiener (1986) 100–4; (1988) 32–5; Mellink (1987); Mitchell (1989/90) 103; Brinkmann (1990); Graeve and Senff (1990); (1991); Heinrich and Senff (1992); Kerschner (1995); Senff (1995); (1997); Senff et al. (1997); Kerschner and Senff (1997). Near the south cross-wall: Milet 1.8, 39–40; Graeve (1975) 38.

<sup>5</sup> Esp. Müller-Wiener (1986); Cobet (1997). See also: *Milet* 1.8, 26–38, 116–17; 2.3, 9–11, 51–2, 91ff., 118–20; Kleiner (1961); (1966) 18–21; (1968) 23–32; Stümpel et al. (1997); Schneider (1997).

strongly emphasizing it both by comparing it to Sybaris, another luxurious city famous for its utter destruction, and by including the story about Phrynichos and his ill-fated play (Hdt. 6.21). To argue that Herodotos is simply wrong here or grossly exaggerating an event from his own lifetime that would have been familiar to his audience is to cast doubt upon the reliability of his entire work. It is especially telling that, in recounting the horror inflicted on the citizenry, he completely omits mention of the physical damage to the edifices of the city, perhaps judging it to be minor in comparison (he does report the burning of nearby Didyma). The story he tells is extreme but entirely plausible when seen in light of the Persian treatment of the other Ionian cities that were held less accountable for the revolt: Miletos was made an example and 'emptied of Milesians'.

Further, shifting the surviving population of Miletos to Ampe is an action entirely consistent with a long-standing Near Eastern policy of resettlement. The King would occasionally cause the population of an entire city to migrate to a distant part of the empire. The purposes for this policy varied, but certainly included the need to resettle a fertile area depopulated by other events, to fortify weak border areas, to resettle people displaced in war, and to break up local power bases and so eliminate potential rivals.<sup>6</sup> Herodotos offers instances when this policy is employed, first to settle the Barkans taken prisoner from Libya in Bactria (4.204) and later to settle the defeated Eretrians at Ardericca in Cissia, near Susa (6.119). He also mentions plans to move the entire Paionian nation from Europe to Asia (5.12–15) and allegedly to exchange the populations of Phoenicia and Ionia (6.3). Finally, in the listing of Persian tribute districts, Herodotos includes people resettled on islands in the Persian Gulf (3.93.2). Thus, it is perfectly reasonable to accept that, after demolishing the city, the King would have resettled its inhabitants in order to remove potential trouble-makers from the region of Ionia while at the same time dispensing a lesson to the other Persian subjects.<sup>7</sup>

Once we accept Herodotos' account of the depopulation, we must consider the problem of the resettlement. A significant reduction in population

<sup>6</sup> Oded (1979); cf. Demand (1990) 34–44.

<sup>7</sup> Ambaglio (1975) argues that deportations in Herodotos were never done to exterminate the people, but to destroy their political unity and every possibility of rebellion. The deportees were themselves left with relative autonomy and were free to maintain their customs and language.

is to be expected in a city being rebuilt, and Miletos shrunk from a city perhaps as large as 64,000 in the archaic period to, only about 15–20,000 at the most by the late fifth century.<sup>8</sup> This reduction is reflected among the archaeological finds: they show that the city peninsula was less widely and less densely populated in the fifth century than it had been before the Revolt. Yet as many as 20,000 new settlers cannot be derived from the survivors of the sack and deportation or from the Milesians living abroad. Though never again a major power, constrained first by the Athenian empire and later by the Persians, still the fifth-century city regained much of its former prosperity. This fact is evidenced by the *Athenian Tribute Lists* where, in the first year where the Milesian payment is extant, 450/49, the Milesians are paying 10 talents (*ATL* 1.342 no. 5.v.18), a figure known to be matched or bettered by only six other allies out of eighty-seven extant entries.<sup>9</sup> So where did the new settlers originate? According to the archaeologists, the people returning to Miletos were originally relatively few in number, since they settled first in the highest and safest location, the hill of Kalabaktepe, south of the city proper. New buildings were erected on layers of Persian debris used to terrace the two plateaus with considerable care and at great expense, indicating that the people who did this work probably intended it to be their permanent home. Probably these people straggled back to the site during the interim period after the sack. Before too many years, however, the number of citizens gathered there grew larger than the one hill could house, no matter how thoroughly it was terraced. At this point, they mapped out a new city on the peninsula to the north using the strict orthogonal grid for which Miletos would become famous, but they omitted a city wall. Heavy construction took place in the second quarter of the fifth century, and at about the mid-century mark, once the initial streets and homes were put in place, the settlement on Kalabaktepe was permanently abandoned.<sup>10</sup>

As far as we can tell, the restored city was inhabited by people culturally indistinguishable from the original population. We have direct confirmation

<sup>8</sup> Roebuck (1984) 21–3 (archaic figure); Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) 21 (classical figure). Pounds ((1973) 60; cf. Renfrew (1982) 277) makes a much smaller population calculation for the middle of the fifth century—only 7,500, based on an estimate of 750 people per talent of tribute.

<sup>9</sup> If we include figures in lacunae that are filled in from other lists, of the 125 entries only seven pay as much or more than the Milesians.

<sup>10</sup> Graeve (1986) 42–3; Kerschner (1995) 218.

in the first half of the fifth century for four of the six archaic Milesian tribes, which is in itself evidence only that the new settlers were Ionian.<sup>11</sup> However, the known archaic cult sites at Miletos universally continue in their function during the fifth century, as does the North Marketplace. In addition, Miletos is the only Greek state known to have eponymous *aisymnetai*, and a list of these officials (*Milet* 1.3 nos. 122–9) extends back to at least 525 BCE (if one does not accept a gap of fifteen years caused by the destruction), and perhaps to about 540 (with a gap).<sup>12</sup> A related inscription, known as the Molpoi Decree (*Milet* 1.3 no. 133), gives instructions for the formal inauguration of the new *aisymnetes* and recounts sacrifices and procedures included in the annual Sacred Procession from the Shrine of Apollo Delphinios, along the Sacred Way, and down to the Temple of Apollo at Didyma. This proclamation is pertinent because it is actually an amalgam of several decrees from different times, the chief sections of which date to before 479/78 and to 450/49 BCE (the whole was reengraved ca. 100 BCE). This inscription guarantees that the procession and the inauguration of the eponym bridge the gap between the archaic and classical city. Therefore, lacking any evidence of a change in institutions, nomenclature, or customs of any sort, we must assume that the new settlers had Milesian cultural roots.

The problem remains that the potential sources for these settlers were few. Certainly some would have come from the Milesian refugees who escaped the Battle of Lade and the destruction of Miletos (Hdt. 6.22.3). Others may have been Milesians who made their way back from Ampe. (Either of these groups could have supplied the small army contingent at the Battle of Mykale.) However, while these refugees may have been the first ones back on the site, and they undoubtedly contributed to the refoundation of the city, it is unlikely that their total number was large enough to explain the magnitude of the restored city. Instead, the likely source for many of the new Milesians must have been the citizens of the many Milesian colonies of the Pontos and Propontis. Miletos was probably most famous in the ancient world as the mother city of numerous colonies in the northeast

<sup>11</sup> *Milet* 1.3.277–79 no. 133.1–5; Wiegand (1904) 85 = *Milet Inv.* no. 451. These tribes are confirmed at Ephesos, Samos, and Teos, and four occur in pre-Kleisthenic Athens: Roebuck (1961) 495–507; Ehrhardt (1983) 98–103; Jones (1987) 320–7 *passim* as well. A government reorganization in the middle of the fifth century included a change in tribes, and so rendered later evidence obsolete: see Gorman (2001) ch. 6.

<sup>12</sup> For this office, see Busolt and Swoboda (1920) 1.373–4; Romer (1982).

Aegean and Black Sea. Ancients put the total as high as ninety, while modern estimates run to half of that number.<sup>13</sup> Thus, many colonies would have provided an ample reserve for any number of settlers with the same ancestry and heritage as the original Milesians.

Evidence for this source of citizens may be contained in certain Milesian inscriptions from the fourth century. The first is a treaty with Olbia, an important colony on the north shore of the Black Sea founded in the last half of the seventh century BCE.<sup>14</sup> Occupying a resource-rich area at the mouth of the Borysthenes or Berezan (Dneper) River (Hdt. 4.53.1–3), the Olbians supplemented their agricultural income by acting as intermediaries in the extensive and profitable trade between the Skythians and the Greeks in Ionia and elsewhere.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the colony prospered in the sixth and fifth centuries especially. It had a special relationship with its mother city in the late classical era, as witnessed by the treaty from Miletos, dating before 323 and possibly to 330, and which is discussed thoroughly by Graham.<sup>16</sup> The treaty reads:

τάδε πάτρια Ὀλβιοπολίταις καὶ Μιλησ[ί-]  
οις· τὸμ Μιλήσιον ἐν Ὀλβί(ι) πόλει ὡς Ὀλ-  
βιοπολίτην θύειν ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν βω-  
μῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ αὐτὰ φοιτᾶν τὰ  
δημόσια κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ Ὀλβιοπολί- 5  
τας· εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἀτελείας Μιλησίοις κα-  
θάσσα καὶ πρότερον ἦσαν· ἐὰν δὲ θέλι  
τιμουχιῶμ μετέχειν, ἐπὶ βουλὴν ἐπίτω  
καὶ ἀπογραφεῖς μετεχέτω καὶ ἔστω  
ἐντελής, καθότι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται 10  
εἰσίν· εἶναι δὲ καὶ προεδρίαγ καὶ εἰσκη-  
ρύσσεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐπα-

<sup>13</sup> Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 5.112 (ninety colonies); Seneca, *Ad Helviam* 7 (seventy-five colonies). Cf. Strabo 14.1.6; Ps.-Skymnos 734–7; *Milet* 1.7 nos. 233–6, 239, 240. Bilabel (1920) 13–60 (forty-five colonies); Graham (1982) 160–2 (thirty colonies); Ehrhardt (1983) 96 and *passim* (forty primary and thirty secondary colonies).

<sup>14</sup> Eusebios (95b Helm) assigns the date 647 to Berezan, and archaeological evidence from both sites dates to this same period. There is great debate as to whether Berezan was a separate colony from Olbia. Ps. Skymnos 804–9 = 809–14 Diller; Mela 2.1.6; Hdt. 4.78.3. Certainly Olbia/Berezan is the most thoroughly excavated Greek city in the Black Sea. Modern reports include: Vinogradov (1981); Vinogradov-Kryzickij (1995); Solovgov (1999).

<sup>15</sup> For Skythian art and trade, see Jacobson (1995) 41–5.

<sup>16</sup> *Milet* 1.3 no.136 (Tod 2.270–2 no.195); Graham (1983) ch. 6; Ehrhardt (1983) 233–41. The translation given here is from Graham 100, except that the spelling of ‘Miletos’ has been changed.



ρᾶσθαι ταῖς τριακάσιγ, καθάσσα καὶ  
 ἐμ Μιλήτωι ἐπαρῶνται· ἐὰν δέ τι συμβό- 15  
 λαιον ἦ(ι) τῶι Μιλησίωι ἐν Ὀλβίαι, ἰσχύτω δί-  
 κηγ καὶ ὑπεχέτω ἐμ πένθ' ἡμέραις ἐπὶ  
 τοῦ δημοτικοῦ δικαστηρίου· εἶναι δὲ  
 (ἀ)τελεῖς πάντας Μιλησίους, πλὴν ὅσοι  
 ἐν ἄλλη(ι) πόλει πολιτεύονται καὶ ἀρχείω(μ)  
 μετέχουσιγ καὶ δικαστηρίων. κατὰ ταῦ- 20  
 τὰ δὲ καὶ Ὀλβιοπολίτας ἐμ Μιλήτωι ἀτε-  
 λεῖς εἶναι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν  
 τρόπον Ὀλβιοπολίταις ἐμ Μιλήτωι ὑπάρ-  
 χειγ καθότι καὶ Μιλησίοις ἐν Ὀλβίη(ι) πόλει.

The following are traditional arrangements for the Olbiopolitans and Milesians. That the Milesian in the city of Olbia sacrifice like an Olbiopolitan on the same altars, and partake (5) in the same public cults under the same conditions as the Olbiopolitans. That the Milesian have exemption from taxation at it was formerly. That, if he wish to become eligible for office, he is to come before the Council and be entered on the rolls and be liable to (10) taxation as other citizens are. That they (i.e. the Milesians) have the right of privileged seats at public gatherings, of being announced at athletic contests and of praying at the festival of the triakades, as they pray at Miletos. And that, if the Milesian have a law suit (15) arising from a legal contract, the case shall be tried within five days at the public court. That all Milesians be exempt from taxation except those who in another city exercise citizenship, (20) hold magistracies and take part in the courts. That, on the same terms, the Olbiopolitan be exempt from taxes, and the other arrangements apply in the same way to the Olbiopolitan in Miletos as to the Milesians in the city of Olbia.

This inscription establishes equal citizenship or *isopoliteia* between the two cities, Miletos and Olbia. Citizens from either city could go to the other and enjoy a privileged status: exemption from taxation, the right to sacrifice in the public cults, special seats at public gatherings, and the right to argue law suits in the public court that was reserved for citizens. Also, any citizen of the one city who wanted to obtain full citizenship—especially eligibility for public office—in the other city need only declare himself liable to taxation. This relationship was very unusual, for, while it was common for mother cities to reserve the right to send later settlers to a colony as full citizens, the colonists' right of return was usually strictly limited (cf. Hdt. 4.156.3).

The second significant point is the abrupt beginning that establishes the fact that this decree is a restatement of 'traditional practices' (τάδε πάτρια).

This relationship must have been in effect in the past and then lapsed for some reason before it was reestablished in this treaty. Thus Graham says, 'It may be assumed that the treaty was necessary because these arrangements had been in abeyance. The most obvious reason for this would be the Persian control of Miletus.'<sup>17</sup> Since Miletos was in Persian hands from ca. 540 to 479, and again from 412 to 334, the earlier treaty must have dated either between 479 and 412 or to before 540: Graham thinks most probably the second half of the fifth century, after Miletos had returned to prosperity, or the early sixth century, before the Persian conquest of Ionia.

However, a more likely date for the original treaty of *isopoliteia* is when the city of Miletos was being refounded, probably immediately after the Battle of Mykale. The returning Milesian refugees would have naturally looked to the colonies for additional settlers, and the lure of citizenship in the mother city would have been an effective enticement to bring sufficient numbers of citizens from the colonies—many of them prosperous cities in their own right—back to the ruins of Miletos. A parallel for this action can be found at Teos, which was abandoned to the Persians but then resettled around the second half of the sixth century by settlers from just one colony, Abdera. Afterwards, the two cities may have been very closely linked, sharing not just *isopoliteia*, but *sympoliteia* (one unified government for the two). Furthermore, Graham argues that attempts to refound Sybaris after its destruction ca. 510 were probably undertaken by its colonies, Skidros, Laus, and Posidonia.<sup>18</sup>

If Miletos shared *isopoliteia* with just one colony, this theory would be weak. The case of Teos aside, one single city was not likely to provide the thousands of settlers needed for classical Miletos. However, this relationship of *isopoliteia* existed with Kyzikos as well, a very wealthy city and, according to Eusebios (88b Helm), the earliest colony in the Propontis, dating back to 756 BCE. A treaty between Miletos and Kyzikos (*Milet* 1.3 no. 137) dates to much the same time as the treaty with Olbia, before 323 BCE, and is very fragmentary, breaking off after only 16 lines. After a sudden beginning consisting only of a listing of the people who are swearing the treaty, the remaining extant text reads (ll. 11–16):

<sup>17</sup> Graham (1983) 105.

<sup>18</sup> Graham (1992) esp. 53, 69–70; Demand (1990) 39–43. Graham argues for the colonies as a major source for settlers at Miletos, but does not directly connect the treaties of *isopoliteia* to this incident.

... τὰς μὲν πόλεις φίλας εἶ-  
 ναι ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον  
 κατὰ τὰ πάτρια· εἶναι δὲ τὸν  
 Κυζικηνὸν ἐμ Μιλήτῳ Μι-  
 λήσιον καὶ τὸν Μιλήσιον ἐν  
 Κυζίκῳ Κυζικηνόν, καθότ[ι]  
 [καὶ πρότερον ἦσαν -----]

... the cities be friends for all time according to the traditional arrangements, and the Kyzikene at Miletos (15) be Milesian and the Milesian at Kyzikos be Kyzikene, just as (it was formerly)<sup>19</sup>

Again there is a bald beginning and a reference to traditional arrangements. These are followed by the clear statement of *isopoliteia*: any citizen of the one city who comes to the other may be a citizen there.

What we know about Milesian *isopoliteia* is dependent upon the chance survival of later inscriptions: we have two treaties that are clearly examples of that relationship. Another inscription containing a treaty with Istros may have included similar provisions, but the text is too broken for certainty.<sup>20</sup> One between Miletos and Kios from ca. 228 BCE (*Milet* 1.3 no. 141) also contains some elements of *isopoliteia*, while the fact that Miletos and Amisos issued the same coinage in the third century might also be a sign of such a relationship there.<sup>21</sup> If two or three such inscriptions survive, many more may have been lost. Certainly the original decrees—the ones to which the two inscriptions cited above refer—have not been found. The fact remains that, out of all the Greek mother cities, only Miletos had such a relationship with at least some of its colonies. These treaties of *isopoliteia* may serve as the most important witness to the source of the new population of fifth-century Miletos: any colonist who would return to the mother city would be given full citizenship in exchange for his participation in the rebuilding of Miletos.

In summary, the events described in Hdt. 6.19.2–22.1 are not only plausible, but entirely consistent with the physical and epigraphic evidence from Miletos. Persia sacked the city and killed or relocated the entire population. For the next fifteen years, while Persia still clung to Ionia, some

<sup>19</sup> Graham (1983) 107–8. The restoration is formulaic (cf. line 6 of the Treaty with Olbia).

<sup>20</sup> Lambrino (1927–32) 398; restored by Robert (1928) 171–2 as a treaty of *isopoliteia*.

<sup>21</sup> Ehrhardt (1983) 235, 238.

settlers may have returned from among those who fled the sack or were absent abroad at the time. They settled cautiously on Kalabaktepe, awaiting events. When the Battle of Mykale and subsequent events pushed the Persian authority out of Ionia, the settlers looked to restore their once-famous city to something of its former size and status. They planned out a new, orthogonal city on the ruins of the old, rebuilt on an ambitious scale, and then peopled the site by enticing colonists to join them as full-citizens in the mother city. Economic prosperity recurred quickly, probably in large part because the Milesians were able to exploit their extensive colonial ties and reestablish former trading patterns with alacrity. Thus, in a remarkably short time, Miletos was able to regain much of its former standing in Ionia.

Dedicated to A. J. Graham, the finest example of a teacher-scholar that I have ever known.

#### Bibliography

- Ambaglio, D., 'Il motivo della deportazione in Erodoto', *Storia antica Istituto Lombardo (Rend. Lett.)* 109 (1975), 378–83.
- Bilabel, F., *Die Ionische Kolonisation*, Philologus Suppl. 14.1 (Leipzig, 1920).
- Brinkmann, V., 'Der Westbau (des Kalabaktepe)', *MDAI(I)* 40 (1990), 51–5.
- Busolt, G. and H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 4.1.1, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (München, 1920).
- Cobet, J.s., 'Milet 1994–1995. Die Mauern sind die Stadt. Zur Stadtbefestigung des antiken Milet', *AA* 112 (1997), 249–84.
- Demand, N., *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Norman, OK, 1990).
- Ehrhardt, N., *Milet und seine Kolonien*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main and New York, 1983).
- Gans, U., 'Die Grabung auf dem Zeytintepe', in 'Milet 1990', ed. V. v. Graeve, *MDAI(I)* 41 (1991), 125–86. Pp. 137–40.
- Gorman, V.B., *Miletos, the Ornament of Ionia: A History of the City to 400 B.C.E.* (Ann Arbor, 2001).
- Graeve, V. v., 'Milet. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabung im Südschnitt an der hellenistischen Stadtmauer 1966', *MDAI(I)* 25 (1975), 35–59.
- , '4. Grabung auf dem Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1985', ed. W. Müller-Wiener, *MDAI(I)* 36 (1986), 5–57. pp. 37–51.
- , '1. Grabung auf dem Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1986', ed. W. Müller-Wiener, *MDAI(I)* 37 (1987), 1–81. pp. 6–33.
- Graeve, V. v., with R. Biering and I. Blum, 'Der Schnitt auf dem Gipfelplateau des Kalabaktepe 1988', *MDAI(I)* 40 (1990), 39–43.

- Graeve, V. v., and R. Senff, 'Die Grabung am Sühang des Kalabaktepe', *MDAI(I)* 40 (1990), 44–50.
- Graham, A. J., 'The Colonial Expansion of Greece', *CAH* 32.3 (1982), 83–162.
- , *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1983).
- , 'Abdera and Teos', *JHS* 112 (1992), 44–73.
- Heinrich, H. and R. Senff, 'Die Grabung am Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1991', ed. V. v. Graeve, *MDAI(I)* 42 (1992), 97–134. Pp. 100–4.
- Hoepfner, W., and G.-H. Schwandner, *Haus und Stadt in klassischen Griechenland*, 2nd ed. (München, 1994).
- Hölbl, G., 'Funde aus Milet VIII. Die Aegyptiaca vom Aphroditetempel auf dem Zeytintepe', *AA* 114 (1999), 345–71.
- Jacobson, E., *The Art of the Scythians: the Interpretation of Cultures at the Edge of the Hellenic World*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 8.2 (Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1995).
- Jones, N.F., *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study* (Philadelphia, 1987).
- Kerschner, M., 'Die Ostterrasse des Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1992–1993', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 110 (1995), 195–233. pp. 214–20.
- Kerschner, M., and R. Senff, with I. Blum, 'Die Ostterrasse des Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1994–1995', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 112 (1997), 109–88. Pp. 120–2.
- Kleiner, G., 'Die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1959', *TürkAD* 10.1 (1960), 39–40.
- , 'Bericht über die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1961', *TürkAD* 11.2 (1961), 46–8.
- , *Alt-Milet*, SBFrankfurt 4.2 (Wiesbaden, 1966).
- , *Die Ruinen von Milet* (Berlin, 1968).
- Lambrino, S., *Dacia*, vols. 3–4 (Bucherest, 1927–32).
- Mayer, M., *RE* 15.2 (1932), 1622–49, s.v. 'Miletos (Topographie. Bauwerke)'.  
 Mellink, M. J., 'Archaeology in Asia Minor', *AJA* 78 (1974), 105–30.
- , 'Archaeology in Asia Minor', *AJA* 88 (1984), 441–59.
- , 'Archaeology in Anatolia', *AJA* 91 (1987), 1–30.
- Mitchell, S., 'Archaeology in Asia Minor 1985–1989', *AR* (1989/90), 83–131.
- Müller-Wiener, W., 'Die Grabungskampagne in Milet im Herbst 1977', *TürkAD* 25.2 (1977), 135–40.
- , '1. Michaelskirche und Dionysos-Tempel—Baufunde und Phasengliederung', in 'Milet 1973–1975', ed. W. Müller-Wiener, *MDAI(I)* 27–8 (1977/78), 93–125. Pp. 94–103.
- , 'Bemerkungen zur Topographie des archaischen Milet', in *Milet 1899–1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme, und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung*, ed. W. Müller-Wiener (Tübingen, 1986), 95–104.
- , 'Milet 1976–1986. Ergebnisse aus 10 Jahren Ausgrabungstätigkeit' *AW* 19 (1988), 31–42.

- Müller-Wiener, W., and B.F. Weber, '1. Arbeiten im Stadtgebiet', in 'Milet 1983–84', ed. W. Müller-Wiener *MDAI(I)* 35 (1985), 13–138. Pp. 15–38.
- Oded, B., *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden, 1979).
- Pounds, N. J. G., *An Historical Geography of Europe, 450 BC–AD 1330* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Renfrew, C., 'Polity and Power: Interaction, Intensification and Exploration', in *An Island Polity: the Archaeology of Exploitation in Melos*, eds. Colin Renfrew and Malcolm Wegstaff (Cambridge, 1982), 264–90.
- Robert, L., 'Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions', *BCH* 52 (1928), 158–78.
- Roebuck, C., 'Tribal Organization in Ionia', *TAPA* 92 (1961), 495–507.
- , *Ionian Trade and Colonization* (Chicago, 1984; reprint of New York, 1959).
- Romer, F., 'The *Aisymnêteia*: A Problem in Aristodês's Historical Method', *AJP* 103 (1982), 25–46.
- Schneider, C., 'Grabung an der Stadtmauer 1995', in 'Milet 1994–1995', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 112 (1997), 109–88. pp. 134–6.
- Senff, R., 'Die Grabung am Kalabaktepe', in 'Milet 1992–1993', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 110 (1995), 195–233. Pp. 208–13.
- , 'Arbeiten am Zeytintepe im Jahre 1994', in 'Milet 1994–1995', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 112 (1997), 109–88. Pp. 118–20.
- Senff, R., et al., 'Die Grabung auf dem Gipfelplateau des Kalabaktepe 1995', in 'Milet 1994–1995', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 112 (1997), 109–88. Pp. 122–4.
- Solovyov, S. L., *Ancient Berezan. The Architecture, History and Culture of the First Greek Colony in the Northern Black Sea*, Colloquia Pontica 4 (Leiden, Boston, and Köln, 1999).
- Stümpel, H., et al., 'Stand des geophysikalischen Messungen im Umfeld von Milet', in 'Milet 1994–1995', ed. V. v. Graeve, *AA* 112 (1997), 109–88. Pp. 124–34.
- Tozzi, P., *La rivolta ionica* (Pisa, 1978).
- Vinogradov, J. G., *Olbia: Geschichte einer altgriechischen Stadt am Schwarzen Meer* (Stuttgart, 1981).
- Vinogradov, J. G., and S. D. Kryzickij, *Olbia: Eine altgriechische Stadt im nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum* (Leiden, 1995).
- Wiegand, T., 'Dritter vorläufiger Bericht über den Königlichen Museen begonnenen Ausgrabungen in Milet', *SBBerlin* (1904), 72–91.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., review of *Milet 1.3: Das Delphinion in Milet* by Georg Kawerau and Albert Rehm, *GGA* (1914), 65–109.