Hellenistic Didyma and the Milesian Past*

Noboru Sato

Introduction

Following the arrival of Alexander the Great in Miletus, drastic political changes occurred in there and in other Greek city-states in Asia Minor. This period was also a crucial turning point for Didyma, an extra-urban sanctuary of Miletus. This occurrence of change is presumably an observable indication of one of the major structural shifts in the late classical and early Hellenistic periods. What impact did these political and cultural changes have on Milesian mythical narratives and historiographies? This study aims to examine Hellenistic myths and historiographies concerning the Didymaeum, the temple of Apollo Didymeus, focusing on the influence of contemporary Milesian religious and diplomatic activities and on interactions with Hellenistic rulers and other Greek city-states.[1]

1. Miletus and Didyma in the late classical and early Hellenistic periods

For most of the fourth century BCE, Miletus was under the authority of the Achaemenid Persian Empire. Soon after the end of the Peloponnesian War, control of Ionia, a region on the west coast of Asia Minor, including Miletus, was conceded to the Persians. Miletus apparently remained under the power of Tissaphernes, the Persian satrap of Lydia and Ionia, starting in at least 401 BCE but perhaps beginning earlier. No source suggests that the Milesians resisted the Persians even after Tissaphernes died in 395 BCE. The Achaemenid control of Miletus and other Asiatic

* This paper is based on my conference paper delivered at the Third Euro-Japanese Colloquium on the Ancient Mediterranean World held at the British School at Athens in 2014 and at the Asia Minor Seminar at Kyoto University in 2016. I thank the participants at these conferences for their comments, especially Dr. Alexander Herda for his careful reading of my manuscript, his encouragement and his many insightful suggestions. I also thank the anonymous reviewers of *JASCA* for their comments and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research 18H03587, 19KK0296, 21K00940.

[1] In her recent book, *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World*, Oxford 2019 (*Polis Histories*), R. Thomas surveys various aspects of polis- and island histories in the Greek world. Focusing on "Milesian histories" among others (esp. 91–94, 195–201, 228–260), she discusses their general tendency to narrate political figures' lives and events. My paper focuses on the Milesian myths and histories related to the sanctuary of Didyma and examines their dynamism in the early Hellenistic period.

Greek *poleis* was formally confirmed with the King's Peace in 386 BCE. At the end of the classical period, however, Miletus was returned to the Greek side when it was besieged, captured, and liberated by Alexander the Great in 334 BCE, early in his great eastern campaign. After Alexander died, the Milesians maintained good relations with the Hellenistic dynasties in general, although their relationships with some rulers were strained.[2]

The beginning of the Hellenistic period was also an important turning point for the mantic sanctuary of Didyma. By the late Archaic period, this sacred precinct had become renowned for its oracle among the Greeks and the residents in the surrounding area.[3] At the beginning of the fifth century BCE, however, Didyma was plundered and damaged by the Persians, either under Darius I or Xerxes, and lost its function as a place of oracular consultation.[4] After the Persian wars, Miletus, which gradually recovered from the destruction,[5] did not neglect the sanctuary of Didyma. In the middle of the fifth century BCE, the Milesians passed a decree according to which the Molpoi, a prestigious cult association, would make a periodical sacred procession from the temple of Apollo Delphinius in Miletus along the Sacred Way to the sanctuary of Didyma.[6] The cultic procession was presumably conducted in this period. However, unfortunately, the inscription does not reveal how often the

[2] The control of Tissaphernes: Xen. *Anab.* 1.1.6, 1.2.2; Polyaenus, *Strat.* 7.16. The King's Peace: Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31. Alexander's expedition: Arr. *Anab.* 1.18.3-19.11; Diod. Sic. 17.22. Liberation from Asander: Diod. Sic. 19.75.1-5. On Miletus in this period, see A. M. Greaves, *Miletos: A history,* London 2002 (*Miletos)*, 133–134; V. B. Gorman, *Miletos, the Ornament of Ionia*, Ann Arbor 2001 (*Miletos*), 146, 236–242; H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, New York 1985 (*Oracle*), 35–43.

[3] N. Ehrhardt, Didyma und Milet in archaischer Zeit, *Chiron* 28 (1998) (archaischer Zeit), 11–20.

[4] Hdt. 6.19 (Darius I in 494 BCE); Ctesias 27; Strabo 14.1.5, 11.2.4, 17.1.43 (Callisthenes *BNJ* 124 F 14); Paus. 1.16.3, 8.46.3 (Xerxes in 478 BCE). K. Tuchelt, Die Perserzerstörung von Branchidai-Didyma und ihre Folgen archäologisch betrachtet, *AA* (1988), 427–438; Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 146. The archaic temple of Didymaeum was damaged by the Persians, but recent archeological research suggests that a fire during the Persian invasion of Didyma only affected parts of the archaic temple of Apollo. See *e.g.*, U. Dirschedl, Didyma, Türkei. Der archaische Apollontempel (‚Tempel II') in Didyma und die Genese der monumentalen ionischen Sakralarchitektur (Publikationsprojekt). Die Arbeiten des Jahres 2018, *e-Forschungsberichte des DAI* 2019-2, 138–146.

[5] Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 147–151; A. Herda, Copy and paste? Miletos before and after the Persian Wars, in E. Capet et al. (eds.), *Reconstruire les villes: modes, motifs et récits,* Turnhout 2019 (Copy and paste), 91–120.

[6] *Milet* I 3, 133. On the sacred procession of the Molpoi, see Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 176–186; A. Herda, *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma,* Mainz 2006 (*Neujahrsprozession*); A. Chaniotis, The Molpoi Inscription: Ritual. Prescription or Riddle?, *Kernos* 23 (2010), 375–379. The inscription is a Hellenistic copy of the original decree from 450/49 BCE. Scholars have discussed when the inscription was published and when the core part of the sacred law was fixed.

ceremony was actually performed, the scale of the ceremony, or how long it was performed. Thus far, archaeologists have uncovered no material proving the continuity of the procession during the fifth century BCE.[7] However, it is clear that the damaged Archaic temple of Apollo in Didyma was not reconstructed until the late classical period. The Didymaean oracle also remained silent until the late fourth century BCE. After the arrival of Alexander, however, the oracle finally resumed operations and the Milesian ambassadors brought numerous oracles to the Macedonian king at Memphis in Egypt in 331 BCE, according to Callisthenes.[8] Although the real function of the Didymaean oracle in the early Hellenistic period has not been elucidated, Hellenistic Didyma produced many oracular statements, as inscriptions attest from the late third century BCE.[9]

Around the same time, the citizens of Miletus also started a new ambitious building project: the refoundation of the gigantic Temple of Apollo Didymeus, one of the largest temples in the ancient Greek world.[10] The first phase presumably began between 334 and 300/299 BCE under two architects, Daphnis of Miletus and Paeonius of Ephesus, who had completed the great temple dedicated to Artemis Ephesia at Ephesus, another gigantic temple in the Greek world.[11] This project must have aroused the Milesian citizens' interest and inspired local pride. However, the delay and difficulty in its construction probably also occupied the Milesians' attention. It remains unclear when the reconstruction was initially planned or

[7] Herda denies there was any serious interruption of the cultic procession after the Persian wars (A. Herda, Apollon Delphinios–Apollon Didymeus, in R. Bol, U. Höckmann und P. Schollmeyer (Hrsg.), *Kult(ur)kontakte*, Rhaden 2008 (AD-AD), 21–22, 36–37, 58, 64). However, Slawisch expresses skepticism regarding its continuity in the fifth century BCE (Epigraphy versus Archaeology, in C. Gates, J. Morin, and T. Zimmerman (eds.), *Sacred Landscapes in Anatolia and Neighbouring Regions*, Oxford 2009, 29–34; Id., Processions, Propaganda, and Pixels: Reconstructing the Sacred Way between Miletos and Didyma, *AJA* 122-1 (2018), 101–143). Cf. K. B. Gödecken, Beobachtungen und Funde an der Heiligen Straße zwischen Milet und Didyma, *ZPE* 66 (1986), 217–253.

[8] Callisthenes, *BNJ* 124 F 14a = Strabo 17.1.43.

[9] Parke, *Oracle* (n.2), 35–36; J. Fontenrose, *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*, Berkeley and London 1988 (*Didyma*), 15–16. The first "historical" oracles following Alexander's arrival at Miletus, according to the literature, are dated in 228/7 BCE. However, the absence of oracle inscription does not necessarily mean that the mantic sanctuary was not in operation in the late fourth and early third centuries. Particularly in the earliest phase of the protracted reconstruction project of the Temple of Apollo, the oracle could have been operated in a different manner than in later phases.

[10] K. Tuchelt, *Branchidai-Didyma: Geschichte und Ausgrabung eines antiken Heiligtums,* Mainz am Rhein 1992, 15; Parke, *Oracle* (n.2), 48–50; Id. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma, *JHS* 106 (1986) (Temple), 121–131. Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 16–18.

[11] Vitr. *De arch.* 7. Praef. 16.

actually began. The literature reveals, however, that the construction did not gain momentum until the Seleucid dynasty finally provided generous financial support in the early third century BCE.[12]

2. The Didymaeum as a facilitator of diplomatic action

The sanctuary of Didyma was not only a financial burden but also a facilitator of diplomatic action for the Hellenistic Milesians. They could and did use its status as a religious center to establish good relationships with outsiders, especially Hellenistic dynasties. While the Greek *poleis* in the classical period were mainly concerned with their cities' local gods,[13] the Hellenistic rulers could, or perhaps needed to, justify their diplomatic and military policies and their rule over increasing areas by expressing their piety toward many deities associated with various city-states, and especially toward the gods worshiped at pan-Hellenic or regional religious centers. Although some dynasties showed concern for one temple or deity, their benevolence was not restricted.[14] Thus, many Greek poleis, especially those with major religious centers, such as Miletus, could use their sanctuaries and ritual cults to establish good relations with Hellenistic kings.[15]

Notably, the first Didymaean oracles after the restoration were diplomatic. According to Callisthenes, as previously mentioned, the Milesians sent envoys to Alexander the Great in Egypt with oracles concerning, for example, Alexander's descent from Zeus, his victory, and Darius's death; as a message of allegiance to the new ruler, this collection of oracles was almost obsequious. There is no evidence that Alexander or his colleagues consulted Apollo Didymeus or solicited these

[12] D. Steuernagel, Der Apollontempel von Didyma und das Orakel in der römischen Kaiserzeit, in D. Erker und G. Schörner (Hrsg.), *Medien religiöser Kommunikation im Imperium Romanum*, Stuttgart 2008, 123–140 discusses the financial difficulty concerning the construction of the Didymaeum up to the Roman Empire.

[13] On "*polis* religion," see C. Sourvinou-Inwood, What is *Polis* Religion? in O. Marray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, 295–322; Id., Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion, in *Annali dell'Institution Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Sezionedi Archeologia e Storia Antica* 10 (1988), 259–274 [now reprinted in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion,* Oxford 2000, 13–37, 38–55]. On the classical Greek attitude toward the sanctuaries of the other poleis, see I. Polinskaya, Shared Sanctuaries and the Gods of Others: On the Meaning of "Common" in Herodotus 8.144, in R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Valuing Others in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden 2010, 43–70.

[14] B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002, 43.

[15] Interestingly, in the mid-fourth century BCE, the Milesians under the Persian rule dedicated an honorific statue of Idrieus and Ada, Mausolus's siblings and successors, at Delphi (*Syll.*^{3} 225). This may suggest that the Milesians in this period had not yet regarded the sanctuary of Didyma as a strong facilitator of diplomatic action.

oracles.[16] Instead, it was the Milesians who sought to establish a good relationship with the king, using their (once) renowned sanctuary for their initiative.[17] Certainly, Callisthenes praised Alexander and his achievement and, therefore, his accounts are regarded as containing many unreliable details.[18] However, at least the Milesians had a clear reason to attempt to establish good relations with the new ruler: Miletus was the only Ionian city that resisted Alexander in 334 BCE, and the political situation was not settled by 332 BCE.[19] Moreover, to establish and express a good relationship with Alexander, the Milesians apparently used their political/religious "past." In 334/3 BCE, they granted Alexander the title of *stephanephoros/aisymnetes*, the "eponymous annual magistrate" of Miletus, a role that traditionally played essential religious functions. Furthermore, the Milesians located Alexander in their local history by engraving for publication the brand-new epigraphic list of *stephanephoroi/aisymnetai*, which starts from 525/4 BCE, and inscribing the name of Alexander at the end of the list.[20] Around the same period, the city of Miletus seems to have initiated its plan to rebuild the once renowned but now damaged Archaic temple of Apollo in Didyma. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that once Alexander arrived, the Milesians attempted to forge a good relationship with this

[16] By contrast, Alexander was involved in the construction or reconstruction of other important sanctuaries in this area, such as in Priene and in Ephesus (*RO* 86 A = *I.Priene* 156; Strabo 14.1.22).

[17] Callisthenes, *loc. cit*. (n.7); cf. Parke, *Oracles* (n.2), 35–37.

[18] C. Morgan, Divination and Society at Delphi and Didyma, *Hermathena* 147 (1989), 17–42 is skeptical of the idea that Didymaean oracle actually functioned immediately after the liberation of Miletus. On unreliability of Callisthenes, see *e.g.*, T. S. Brown, Callisthenes and Alexander, *AJPh* 70 (1949), 225; R. D. Milns, Callisthenes on Alexander, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 19/20 (2006), 233–37. Recently, J. P. Nudell, Oracular Politics: Propaganda and Myth in the Restoration of Didyma, *AHB* 32 (2018), 44–66, has convincingly shown that Alexander did not seem to be involved in the reconstruction of the Didymaeum. He even assumes that the story of the Milesian ambassadors bringing oracles to Alexander was fabricated, perhaps under the influence of the Seleucid and the Milesian effort to enhance the prestige of Didyma after the death of Alexander. However, Callisthenes was a contemporary to this event. To me, it is plausible that the Milesian envoys visited Alexander in Egypt and referred to the once well-known oracular sanctuary of Didyma, even if they did not bring the oracles that Callisthenes claims.

[19] Alexander's siege of Miletus: Arr. *Anab.* 1.18.4-19.6; Diod. Sic. 17.22; Strabo 14.1.7. Greek envoys to Alexander in Egypt: Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.1; Curt. 4.8.12; Strabo 17.1.43. On the war in the Aegean area after Alexander moved eastward in 334, see S. Ruzicka, War in the Aegean, 333–331 B.C.: A Reconsideration, *Phoenix* 42 (1988), 144.

[20] *Milet* I 3, 122–128. Alexander's name is inscribed at *Milet* I 3, 122, col. II, l. 81. See also R. K. Sherk, The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV. The Register Part III, *ZPE* 93 (1992), 229–232. The part from 525/4 to 334/3 BCE shows a uniformity of lettering, suggesting this part was inscribed at the same time. Afterward, the name of the official was added annually to the list. On the date of *Milet* I 3, 122, see P. J. Rhodes, Milesian *Stephanephoroi*: Applying Cavaignac Correctly, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 116.

new powerful ruler by using the authority of their mantic sanctuary, even if it did not fully function as it did after the mid-third century BCE. Although Callisthenes may have concocted some details, his description of the rebirth of the oracle at Didyma presumably reflects some sort of actual Milesian diplomatic activity in relation to Alexander.

Although how effective such diplomatic measures would have been during the age of Alexander remains unknown, they were effective in the case of the Seleucid dynasty. Two inscriptions around 300 BCE state that Seleucus I had long shown kindness to Miletus and the sanctuary of Didyma, and that his wife, Apame, and their son Antiochus had provided generous financial support for the development and improvement of the temple at Didyma.[21] In 288/7 BCE, Seleucus I dedicated a gift of many golden and silver vessels and offered sacrifices at the temple. An inscription containing an inventory of these gifts and a message from the king emphasized the king's initiative and his wish for prosperity for the Milesians and the sanctuary of Apollo Didymeus.[22] These examples clearly demonstrate the dynasty's deep concern for the Didymaeum and Miletus, to which the sanctuary belonged. The Seleucids may have aimed to use Apollo as their dynastic patron god and the Didymaean oracles for their political propaganda.[23]

What is unlikely, however, is that the royal family showed their concern for this sacred precinct in a unilateral manner without any influence from Miletus. Notably, Demodamas, the Milesian citizen who proposed honorific decrees concerning the members of the dynasty in return for their financial support, also served Seleucus II as a military leader.[24] Other Milesian elites as well could plausibly have been

[21] *I.Didyma* 479, 480; W. Günther, *Das Orakel von Didyma in hellenistischer Zeit*, Tübingen 1971 (*Orakel*), 23–43.

[22] *I.Didyma* 424; Günther, *Orakel* (n.21), 44–50.

[23] App. *Syr.* 56; Diod. Sic. 19.90.4; Just. 15.4; Lib. *Orat.* 11.99; *I.Erythrai* 205.74-75. Indeed, rivalry with other monarchs, such as Lysimachus, who ruled the Greek city-states on the western coast of Asia Minor after the battle of Ipsus in 301 BCE, may have also motivated them to make such a generous contribution. The Seleucids presumably sought to extend their influence over the area they did not rule through their enormous financial assistance to the important regional sanctuary. However, as H. S. Lund, *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship,* London and N.Y. 1992, 136–138 argues, we should avoid understanding the Seleucid devotion to Didyma exclusively from a political point of view. Their religious motivation should not be underestimated.

[24] Plin. *HN* 6.49; K. Nawotka, Demodamas of Miletus, Seleucus I and Apollo, *MHEMOH* 7 (2008), 135–152; M. Widmer, Apamè. Une reine au cœur de la construction d'un royaume, in A. Bielman, I. Cogitore et A. Kolb. (dir.), *Femmes influentes dans le monde hellénistique et à Rome,* Grenoble 2016, 25–27. In his recent paper, Nawotka emphasizes the Milesian initiative to promote the cult of Apollo at Didyma and Demodamas's influence over the Seleucid royal court (Apollo, the Tutelary

sufficiently close to the dynasty to encourage its involvement in the restoration and development of the oracular sanctuary at Didyma.[25] Moreover, according to a letter from Seleucus II, the Milesians gave him a sacred crown from "the *adyton*" of the Didymaeum. Clearly, the citizens of Miletus used the religious authority of Didymaean Apollo to consolidate their good relationships with the Seleucids.[26]

The regional situation in western Asia Minor may have also led the Milesians to realize the importance of their mantic sanctuary as a facilitator of diplomatic action. Some refoundations of Ionian cities and temple-building activities are attested starting from the mid- to late fourth century BCE: for example, Ephesus, Priene, Kolophon, Teos, and Magnesia Sipylus. Hellenistic dynasties often granted these Greek cities favors. In fact, monarchies in this period were generally expected to "do good to all and thus rule and preside over a willing people, earning their love by his beneficence and humanity."[27] Surrounded by other Greek cities and competing with each of them for royal favor, the Milesians may have attempted to distinguish themselves from the others by claiming importance owing to their city's ancient or mythical origin and the high dignity of the Temple of Apollo Didymeus.

Using the Didymaeum as a means of facilitating diplomatic action, the Milesians and other people around the city must have expanded their consciousness of the mythical and historical past concerning the sanctuary. In the following sections, the mythical narratives and historiographies concerning the Didymaeum that circulated in the Hellenistic period are investigated, elucidating how they were influenced by contemporary domestic and international situations.

3. The wisest sage at the Didymaeum

The Didymaeum is mentioned by Callimachus, a Hellenistic poet active in the third century BCE, in a story of Thales, one of the seven sages and the cultural hero

God of the Seleucids, and Demodamas of Miletus, in Z. Archibald and J. Haywood (eds.), *The Power of Individual and Community in Ancient Athens and Beyond,* Swansea 2019, 261–284).

[25] R. Meijering, Religious Support and Political Gain: the Seleucids, Miletus, and Didyma, 301–281 BC, *Talanta* 46–47 (2014–2015), 244–245 highlights the importance of the Milesian soldiers in the Seleucid army.

[26] *I.Didyma* 493; Günther, *Orakel* (n.21), 66–95.

[27] Polyb. 5.11.6. On Hellenistic kings' benefactions toward the Greek cities in Asia Minor, see K. Bringmann, The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism, in A. Bulloch et al. *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World,* Berkeley, L.A. and London 1993, 7–14; J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor,* Oxford 2000. On the refoundations of Ionian cities and temple-building activities, see *e.g.*, R. Billows, Rebirth of a Region, in H. Elton and G. Reger (eds.), *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Paris 2007, 33–44.

of Miletus.[28] In retelling the story of the gift for the wisest sage, the poet places the action in Miletus, following Leandrius of Miletus.[29] In his *Iambics*,[30] Callimachus says that a certain Arcadian, Bathycles, died and left a *phiale* (libation bowl), with the command that it be given to the best sage.[31] It was initially given to Thales, but he passed it to another sage. After being passed around, it finally returned to Thales. He then, according to Callimachus, sent it to Apollo Didymeus and composed the following verse: "Thales gives me to the lord (sc. Apollo) of the race of Neileus (sc. the Milesians), / Having twice received this as a prize."

Callimachus seems to have intentionally chosen this version of the story in which Thales dedicates the *phiale* to the Didymaeum. In fact, another Milesian version of this story seems to have preceded Callimachus, according to which, "Thales, son of Examyas, a Milesian, [dedicates this] to Apollo Delphinius," not to Apollo Didymeus.[32] Fontenrose suggests that in the original legend, Thales may have dedicated his *phiale* at the Delphinion in Miletus, not at Didyma, and that the inscription on it "may have inspired the legend with Apollo Didymeus substituted for Delphinius and with a dedicatory epigram and an oracle invented for it."[33]

International politics around Miletus may have affected Callimachus's selection of the Didymaeum. Scholars have argued that Callimachus's strong interest in Didyma reflects the Ptolemaic dynasty's expansion policy.[34] Certainly, epigraphical evidence shows Ptolemaic interest in Miletus in the 270s and 260s. When Seleucus I Nicanor died in 281 BCE, Ptolemy II Philadelphus started expanding his area of influence in Anatolia, and in the course of his campaigns, he donated a piece of land

[28] On the cult of Thales in Miletus, see A. Herda, Burying a sage: the heroon of Thales in the agora of Miletos, in O. Henry (ed.), *2èmes Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFEA : Le Mort dans la ville, Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra–muros en Anatolie, du début de l'Age du Bronze à l'époque romaine,* İstanbul 2013, 67–122. Thomas, *Polis Histories* (n.1)*,* 243–245 points out Thales's Milesian connection in historical narratives.

[29] On various versions of the dedication of the gift for the wisest sage, see *e.g.*, A. Busine, *Les Sept Sages de la Grèce Antique*, Paris 2002.

[30] *Diegeseis* 6, 8ff. = p. 163 Pfeiffer.

[31] Callimachus *Iambics* 1.52-63 (Fr. 191 Pfeiffer) tells a different tradition about Bathycles's cup.

[32] Leandrius *BNJ* 492 F 18 (N. Sato, Maiandrios of Miletos and (?) Leandr(i)os of Miletos (491–492), *Brill's New Jacoby*. [visited April 13, 2014] <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/maiandrios-of-miletos-and-leandr-i-os-of-miletos-491-492-a491_492>)

[33] Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 66 n.5.

[34] A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics,* Princeton 1995, 166–172; N. Ehrhardt, Poliskulte bei Theokrit und Kallimachos: das Beispiel Milet, *Hermes* 131 (2003) (Poliskulte), 269–289; M. Brumbaugh, Kallimachos and the Seleukid Apollo, *TAPA* 146-1 (2006), 61–97. Cf. Thomas, *Polis Histories* (n.1)*,* 252.

to the Milesians in 280/79 BCE.[35] The Milesians made honorific statues for Philotera, Philadelpus's sister, and his sister-wife Arsinoe.[36] Arsinoe also received a cult in Miletus, at the latest after her death in 270 or 268 BCE.[37] In 260 BCE, following the difficult time caused by the Chremonidean War, Philadelphus sent his envoys, including his son, to the Milesians to persuade them to renew their alliance with the king by showing the contributions from him and his father to Miletus.[38]

However, as far as we know, nothing clearly affirms the Ptolemaic dynasty's particular interest in the sanctuary in Didyma.[39] Presumably, having researched the Milesian past and observing the political and cultural situation of his age, Callimachus himself found the Didymaeum attractive to the Ptolemaic kings and his followers and selected a story on the dedication of the *phiale* to the sanctuary. The Hellenistic poet must have noticed the Milesian effort to reconstruct the temple of Apollo in Didyma and the Seleucid dynasty's generous contribution by the time he was composing his poetry. He might not have chosen the this holy place as the important setting without the Milesian and Seleucid efforts to enhance the authority and the sanctity of the oracular sanctuary. What seems likely is that not just the Ptolemaic general diplomatic policy but the Milesian and Seleucid economic and diplomatic activities by that time significantly influenced the Hellenistic poet's choice of a particular version of mythical traditions.

---

[35] *Milet* I 3, 123, ll.38-40. G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire,* London and New York 2000 (*Ptolemaic Empire*), 38; J. D. Grainger, *The Syrian Wars,* Leiden 2010, 77.

[36] *I.Didyma* 115.

[37] *Milet* I 7, 288, 289.

[38] *Milet* I 3, 139.

[39] The dedication of the statues of Ptolemaic royal families to Artemis in Didyma (see above n.32) does not necessarily prove the Ptolemaic dynasty's particular interest in the sanctuary. It is the Milesians who decided to make the dedication to the goddess in the sanctuary. Previously, they had placed a statue and inscriptions for Apame, Seleucus I's wife, in the sanctuary of Artemis in Didyma (*I.Didyma,* 113, 480). Ehrhardt argues that Naucratis's economic contribution to the reconstruction of the Didymaeum may attest to Ptolemy's concern over the sanctuary (Poliskulte (n.34), 288–289. Cf. W. Günther, Spenden für Didyma. Zu einer Stiftung aus Naukratis, in K. Geus und K. Zimmermann (Hrgs.), *Punica – Libyca – Ptolemaica. Festschrift für Werner Huß, zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen, Studia Phoenicia* 16, Leuven 2001, 185–198). Although Naucratis may have needed Ptolemy's consent, this assumption does not necessarily prove that Philaderphus was particularly interested in the sanctuary in Didyma. Naucratis itself had a long relationship with Miletus. Miletus was one of the cities whose citizens settled in Naucratis and founded its own sanctuary in the Archaic period (Hdt. 2.178; Strabo 17.1.8), though the actual relationship between Miletus and Naukratis is disputed. Cf. N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien: vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen*. Frankfurt 1988 (*Kolonien*), 87–90; J. W. Drijvers, Strabo 17.1.18 (801C): Inaros, the Milesians and Naucratis, *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 16–22.

4. The Legend of Branchus

A story of Branchus, the eponymous ancestor of the Branchidae, a family of hereditary prophets in charge of the Didymaean oracle, is recounted by Conon, a mythographer active in the Augustan period, whose collection contained several myths popular among the Hellenistic poets and prose writers.[40] In the thirty-third story in his *Diegeseis*, Conon tells the tale that Smicrus, a boy from Delphi, sailed to Miletus following an oracle. There, he married the daughter of an elite Milesian family, and their son, Branchus, who was beloved and endowed with the gift of prophecy by Apollo, later declared oracles at Didyma. Thus, Branchus became the mythical founder of the oracle of Didyma. On the one hand, whether the version chosen by Conon dates back to an earlier period or was a version created in the Hellenistic period remains unclear. Certainly, the legend of Branchus dates back at least to Hipponax of Ephesus, an iambic poet flourishing in the late sixth century BCE.[41] On the other hand, as scholars have suggested, the Hellenistic mythographic tradition undeniably influenced Conon's narratives.[42]

Conon's version notably contains both a Delphic element and a Milesian element: Branchus's Delphic origin, and his Milesian family on the maternal side. The Delphic origin of Branchus was evidently known to Hellenistic intellectuals. Callimachus wrote a poem concerning Branchus, naming Daetes as his paternal ancestor (F 229.7). Daetes was the father of Machaereus, the priest at Delphi, who either killed Neoptolemus or helped Orestes kill him.[43] Although it remains uncertain whether this story belongs to the same tradition followed by Conon, clearly, the Hellenistic poet consciously chose the myth connecting the origin of Didyma and Delphi. As in the aforementioned case with the story of Thales, Callimachus's choice of the topic of the Didymaeum was presumably influenced by Milesian and Seleucid diplomatic and economic activities concerning the sanctuary as well as by the Ptolemaic political interest in Miletus.[44] In other words, the

[40] S. Blakely, Conon (26): Biographical Essay, *Brill's New Jacoby*. [visited April 4, 2014] <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/Conon-26-a26>; M. K. Brown, *The Narratives of Konon. Text, Translation and Commentary on the Diegeseis*, München/Leipzig, 2002 (*Konon*), 1-6, 8–14.

[41] Hipponax fr. 105 West. See A. Herda, AD-AD (n.7), 21, n.67.

[42] Brown, *Konon* (n.40), 232, 298; A. Henrichs, Three Approaches to Greek Mythography, in J. Bremmer (ed.) *Interpretation of Greek Mythography*, London 1987, 245.

[43] Asclepiades of Tragilos *FGrH* 12 F15; Pherec. *FGrH* 3F 64a with Jacoby, Scholion on Euripides *Andr.* 53; Brown, *Konon* (n.40), *loc. cit.*

[44] See above pp. 7–8 and nn. 33–38.

contemporary international political and cultural situation may have shaped the Hellenistic mythography of the Didymaeum.

The focus on Branchus's Delphic origin may have also reflected a contemporary interest of the Hellenistic Milesians.[45] As we have seen above, they obviously sought to enhance the authority of the oracle in Didyma, which was once obsoleted for one and half centuries. Tracing its origin to Delphi, the most influential oracular temple in the ancient Greek world, could certainly serve this purpose. The Milesian interest in connecting the Didymaean oracle with Delphi is also suggested in the renewal of the oracle's operation after its refoundation. Following a 150-year gap, the Archaic practice in Didyma could not resume with all the same forms. Instead, as scholars have argued, the oracle in Didyma was probably reformed based on the model of the Delphic oracle:[46] A woman was chosen as *prophetis*, recalling the Pythia of Delphi. The oracles were composed in hexameter verse, although this technique had probably been abandoned at Delphi by the late fourth century BCE. These features obviously reveal the Milesian effort to elevate the sacredness of the oracle of Didyma by using the authority of the Delphic oracle. Presumably, some elite Milesians contributed to the creation of the system by which the renewed oracle operated, either by providing their knowledge of oracles and other rituals or by inviting experts on oracles from outside. Although a lack of evidence prevents us from reconstructing the process by which the Didymaean oracle was recreated, parallel examples are available from other cities, where city elites often led the revival of religious cults.[47]

The claim of "Milesian" blood of the Branchidae, that is, the Milesian mother of Branchus, which appears in Conon's version, may have also reflected the interest of Milesians in the Hellenistic period. After the oracle was restored, Milesian citizens, rather than the family of prophets, became directly involved in its actual operation. At its restoration in the late fourth century BCE, the Milesians established the new offices of *prophetes*, candidates for which were chosen by lot from among Milesian

[45] Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 107. Cf. Brown, *Konon* (n.40), *loc. cit.*

[46] Parke, *Oracles* (n.2), 40–42; Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 78–79; A. Greaves, Divination at Archaic Branchidai-Didyma, *Hesperia* 81 (2012), 177–206.

[47] A. Chaniotis, Negotiating Religion in the Cities of the Eastern Roman Empire, *Kernos* 16 (2003), 177–190; Id., Ritual Dynamics in the Eastern Mediterranean, in W. V. Harris (ed.), *Rethinking Mediterranean*, Oxford 2005, 141–166; S. Hotz, Ritual Traditions in the Discourse of the Imperial Period, in E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*, Liège 2006, 283–296.

citizens nominated by the demes.[48] The Milesian elites who served as *prophetes* took pride in this role.[49] Although it is implausible that a wide range of Milesians could occupy the position, the election of the *prophet* and his operation of the oracle evidently became one of the most important works of the city of Miletus. The Milesian lineage of their mythological forerunner Branchus may have contributed to validating the authority of these newly established priests who were selected among the local citizens.

Competition or communication with other sanctuaries may have influenced the foundation myth of Didyma regarding its emphasis on the Delphic and Milesian origins. Among others, a foundation legend of the sanctuary of Clarus also has a Delphian element blended with local factors. In this legend, Manto, the daughter of Teiresias, once dedicated to Delphi as a first fruit, set out for Asia Minor at the behest of an oracle and established an oracular shrine at Clarus. According to some traditions, Manto married Clarus, an eponymous hero of the region, or Rhacius, the leader of the Colophonians.[50] Theopompus seems to have narrated this version of the mythical foundation of Clarus in the fourth century BCE. The foundation myth of this neighboring rival oracular sanctuary, which seems to have spread already in the classical period, presumably influenced the Milesians in the Hellenistic period, who were creating the previously mentioned system of oracle and seeking to increase the authority and sanctity of the reestablished oracular sanctuary in Didyma.

5. Minoan Didyma?[51]

Leandrius, a local historian in Hellenistic Miletus, also referred to a story concerning Didyma. Although his work is now lost, Clement of Alexandria, an early

[48] Parke, *Oracles* (n.2), 41–42; Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 45–56. On the modern arguments about the traditions concerning the Branchidae, see *e.g.*, H. W. Parke, The Massacre of the Branchidae, *JHS* 105 (1985), 59–68; N. G. L. Hammond, The Branchidae at Didyma and in Sogdiana, *CQ* 48 (1998), 339–44; Ehrhardt, archaischer Zeit (n.3), 13–16; A. Herda, AD-AD (n.7), 21, nn.66–67. In any case, the reform of the mantic process after the 150-year interval must have been important for the contemporary Milesians.

[49] A. Busine, Oracles and Civic Identity in Roman Asia Minor, in R. Alston, O. van Nijf and C. G. Williamson (eds.), *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven and Paris 2013, 175–196.

[50] Theopom. *FGrH* 115 F346. On Manto and the foundation myths of Clarus, see M. B. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie,* Athens 1958 (*La migration*), 164–166; Parke, *Oracle* (n.2), 112–113; N. MacSweeney, *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*, Cambridge 2013, 104–122.

[51] I have partly discussed this section in my previous paper, N. Sato, Milesian Foundation Myths and Didyma, *Journal of Classical Studies* 61 (2013) 12–23 [in Japanese with English summary]. To avoid confusion, I use “Miletus” as the name of the city and “Miletos” as the name of the hero.

Christian philosopher, cited a passage from his book, in which he stated, "Cleochus was buried in the Didymaeum, in Miletus." Cleochus is the grandfather of Miletos, one of the major founding heroes of Miletus. According to Pausanias, well before "the Ionian migration" led by Neileus,[52] the city of Miletus was founded by Miletos, who had fled from Crete.[53] Other classical or Hellenistic authors, as we will discuss, also name Miletos as an ancient Milesian founding hero. Thus, Leandrius tells that the grandfather of the founding hero was buried in the most important suburban sanctuary of the city.

The traditions concerning Miletos and Cleochus possibly date back to at least the classical period. The scholion on Apollonius of Rhodes relates that Miletos was abandoned by his mother as a baby but was saved by his grandfather, Cleochus, and later fled from Minos to Samos and then to Caria, where he founded Miletus.[54] This information is from Aristocritus, possibly a Milesian, who wrote *Milesiaca* during the Hellenistic period.[55] Moreover, the scholiast says that this story of Cleochus and Miletos is also "testified" by Herodorus, a mythographer in Heraclea at Pontus in the fifth century BCE.[56]

However, no sources before Leandrius even suggest the burial of the founding hero's family in this most important sanctuary, although the sanctuary itself was already well known in the Archaic period. In the ancient Greek world, the burial of a

[52] Hdt. 1.146, 9.97; Paus. 7.2.6. On Ionian migration myths, see *e.g.*, Sakellariou, *La migration* (n.50), *passim*, esp. 39–76, 331–336; G. L. Huxley, *The Early Ionians*, London 1966, 25–30; F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie*, München 1979 (*Gründungsmythen*), 314–376; Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 31–43; A. Herda, Panionion-Melia, Mykalessos-Mykale, Perseus und Medusa, *IstMitt* 56 (2006), 43–102; J. Cobet, Das alte Ionien in der Geschichtsschreibung (Das alte Ionien), in J. Cobet, W.-D. Niemeier und V. von Graeve (Hrsg.), *Frühes Ionien*, Mainz 2007 (*Frühes Ionien*), 729–743. On the debate concerning the reality of Ionian migration, see *e.g.,* J. Vanschoonwinkel, Greek migrations to Aegean Anatolia in the Early Dark Age, in G. R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation*, vol.1, Leiden 2006, 115–142; Cobet, Das alte Ionien (n.52); I. S. Lemos, The Migrations to the West Coast of Asia Minor, in Cobet et al. (eds.), *Frühes Ionien* (n.52), 713–727. On intermarriage between ancient Greek colonists and indigenous people, see J. M. Hall, *Hellenicity,* Chicago 2002, 101–102; A. Herda, Karkiša-Karien und die sog. Ionische Migration, in F. Rumscheid (Hrsg.), *Die Karer und die Anderen*, Bonn 2009 (Karkiša), 76. Some show a cautious attitude toward intermarriage: *e.g.,* Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 42–43; Greaves, *Miletos* (n.2), 27.

[53] Ephorus *BNJ* (=*FGrH*) 70 F 127 tells that the Cretan founder of Miletus was not Miletos but Sarpedon. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen* (n.52), 97–111, esp. 109–110 views the myth of Miletos as a later invention. See also the refutation by C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and Others*, Stockholm 2005 (*Hylas*), 269–270, n.149.

[54] Schol. Apollon. Rh. I, 186.

[55] Aristocritus, *FGrH* 493 F 3; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas* (n.53), 270, n.150.

[56] Herodorus, *BNJ* 31 F 3 with F. Graf's comment; Prinz, *Gründungsmythen* (n.52), 109–110, n.25; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas* (n.53), 269–270, n.149, n.151. See also Thomas, *Polis Histories* (n.1)*,* 233–234.

founding hero or his family generally attracted intellectuals and many others, and cultic activities were often held at these burial places.[57] Nevertheless, no evidence before Leandrius even hints at Cleochus's burial in Didyma. The so-called Molpoi inscription lists a number of rituals and associated deities but—although it probably dates back to the Archaic period—no mention or suggestion of Cleochus's burial.[58] The notion of the burial of the grandfather of the founding hero in this renowned sacred precinct is likely, therefore, to have been invented in the early Hellenistic period or, if not created out of thin air, certainly given significantly more attention than before.

The episode of the burial of the grandfather of the city's founding hero allows for the assumption that the sanctuary might date back to the Cretan/Minoan age. In other words, for the Greeks in the Hellenistic period, the story could have suggested that the sanctuary of Didyma had been closely related to Miletus since the Cretan/Minoan period. On the one hand, archaeological studies certainly show that the sanctuary was continuously occupied, at least starting in the Bronze Age. On the other hand, no Greek or Minoan cultic activity in the Bronze Age has been explicitly verified in Didyma.[59] The tradition concerning Cleochus's burial in the Didymaeum does not seem to reflect the reality of the Bronze Age but, more likely, the contemporary Milesian attempts to enhance the authority of the sanctuary and to deepen their bond with their important extra-urban religious center by tracing it back

[57] On the tomb of Neileus, Paus. 7.2.6. On the recent research on the cults of the founders of the Greek colonies, see *e.g.*, I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden 1987.

[58] Gorman, *Miletos* (n.2), 176–186; Herda, *Neujahrsprozession* (n.6). Herda in his book (305–310) argues that ΕΝΚΕΛΑΔΟ in lines 29–30 means "at the sanctuary of Kelados" and identifies the deity as a son of Miletos mentioned at Schol. Dion. *Perieg.* 825. Even if the phrase in the Molpoi inscription refers to the god Kelados, as Herda argues, the god may originally have been a river god in the Archaic period and its association with Miletos may have been invented much later.

[59] Archaeological research has shown the prosperity of Miletus in the Bronze Age. See *e.g.*, Greaves, *Miletos* (n.2), 39–73; W.-D. Niemeier, Minoans, Mycenaeans, Hittites and Ionians in Western Asia Minor, in A. Villing (ed.), *The Greeks in the East*, London 2005, 1–36; Id., Milet von den Anfängen menschlicher Besiedlung bis zur Ionischen Wanderung, in Cobet et al. (eds.), *Frühes Ionien* (n.52), 3–19. Didyma was also prosperous in the Bronze Age, but no explicit cultic activity in Didyma in the Bronze Age has been confirmed. A late-Minoan shard was found in Didyma but was probably from a stratum of the middle of the seventh to the beginning of the sixth century BCE. See T. G. Schattner, Didyma, ein minoisch-mykenischer Fundplatz? *AA* 1992, 369–372; Greaves, *Miletos* (n.1), 109–111; A. Slawisch, Didyma: Untersuchungen zur sakralen Topographie und baulichen Entwicklung des Kernheiligtums vom 8.-4.Jh. v. Chr., in I. Gerlach und D. Raue (Hrgs.), *Sanktuar und Ritual: Heilige Plätze im archäologischen Befund,* Rahden-Westf 2013, 53–60. The origin of the sanctuary is possibly Carian (Herda, AD-AD (n.7), 20–22; Id., Karkiša (n.52), 87–88, 96–101).

to the Cretan/Minoan period, the very beginning of Milesian mythical foundation history.

Again, the emulation of or communication with other city-states, especially with Clarus, may have influenced the mythical narrative connecting the Didymaeum with the Cretan founding hero. The rival oracular sanctuary had also claimed a pre-Ionian Greek origin. According to Pausanias, the Colophonians believed that the first Greeks to arrive in the region around Clarus were the Cretan Rhacius and his colleagues (7.3.1–2), and that their leader married Manto, the daughter of Teiresias, who arrived there later, in accordance with a Delphic oracle (9.33.2). The Ionians later arrived at Colophon and inherited the state from their Cretan predecessors (7.3.2–3). An Archaic poet refers to Rhacius in the context of the foundation of Clarus, although he is described as Mycenaean rather than Cretan (*Epigonoi* F3). Although how these Clarian myths may have shaped the Didymaean myths remains unclear, the Milesians seem to have attempted to emulate Clarus by devising or by focusing on a pre-Ionian Greek origin for their oracular sanctuary, linking it to the remote past and emphasizing the strong, ancient ties between the holy place and the city.

6. The Didymea and the Divine Couple

Another example suggests that diplomatic affairs exerted an influence on the mythography surrounding Didyma and that assemblies of the people were important forums for spreading the mythical narratives developed in accordance with contemporary interests. Around 210 BCE, in keeping with the oracles, the Milesians decided to enlarge the Didymean festival into a quadrennial pan-Hellenic festival and then sent an emissary to many cities to invite them to the festival. The decree also states that not a few *ethnes* and kings, that is, Hellenistic rulers, already proclaimed the *asylia* of Miletus and its territory, obviously including Didyma, due to Apollo's oracles and to the intercourse of Zeus and Leto that occurred at Didyma (διὰ τὴν ἐν τῶιδε τῶι τόπωι Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς μεῖξιν).[60]

The origin of the myth of the divine *meixis* is uncertain.[61] Leto was presumably worshiped in connection with Apollo in Didyma, as well as his twin goddess,

[60] *Milet* VI, 3 1052 = *Syll.*[3] 590 = *IG* XII, 4 1, 153, 154. See also Günther, *Orakel* (n.21), 100–107; K. J. Rigsby, *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley 1996 (*Asylia*), 172–176; Id., Cos and the Milesian Didymeia, *ZPE* 175 (2010), 155–157.

[61] Park, *Oracle* (n.2), 59–60 assumes that the Hellenistic Milesians fabricated the myth of the *meixis* between Zeus and Leto at Didyma. This assumption seems possible, at least to me, but it remains

Artemis, from an earlier period. An Archaic oracular bone tablet from Olbia, a Milesian colony on the Black Sea coast, contains the goddess's name and the name Apollo Didymeus Milesius, which suggests that Leto was also worshiped in the mother city.[62] Although the presence of Zeus in Archaic Didyma is not clear,[63] the myth of the divine sexual relations that occurred in this sanctuary may also date back to the Archaic period, as some scholars have assumed. By contrast, however, nothing before this decree explicitly indicates that Zeus and Leto had sexual relations in Didyma. Thus, the Milesians in the Hellenistic period possibly paid much more attention to this mythical episode than they had previously, when they discussed it among themselves in the assembly[64] and negotiated with other cities, *ethnes*, and kings concerning the *asylia* of the Milesian territory and the festival of Didymea. The Milesians presumably sought to elevate the prestige and sanctity of the sanctuary of Didyma by referring to the *meixis* myth to persuade other cities and Hellenistic kings of the sacredness of this sanctuary. In addition, the recognition of *asylia* by these kings and other cities must have raised the Milesians' confidence in the myth of the divine sexual relations, which is suggested by the reference to the same episode again in the decree to invite Greek cities to the Didymean festival.

---

speculation. Günther argues that it may have originated in the Archaic period (*Orakel* (n.21), 104–107). See also Herda, *Neujahrsprozession* (n.6), 320. The evidence that Günther provided does suggest the presence of Leto and Zeus in the Archaic Didyma, but it does not necessarily prove the Archaic origin of the myth of their *meixis*.

[62] *SEG* 36.694; W. Burkert, Olbia and Apollo of Didyma, in J. Solomon (ed.), *Apollo: Origins and Influences*, Tucson and London 1994, 49–60; L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales d'Olbia du Pont,* Genf 1996, 146–154; Herda, *Neujahrsprozession* (n.6), 320–321, n.2290; id., AD-AD (n.7), 23–25, 34; B. Bravo, Una tavoletta d'osso da Olbia Pontica della seconda metà del VI secolo a. C. (*SEG* XXXVI, 694), *ZPE* 176 (2010), 99–119.

[63] Günther and Fontenrose discuss the presence of Leto and Zeus in Didyma beginning in the Archaic period based on archeological findings (Günther, *Orakel* (n.21), 106–107; Fontenrose, *Didyma* (n.9), 134). Günther argues that Callimachus fr. 229.1 (Δαίμονες εὐυμνότατοι, Φοῖβέ τε και Ζεῦ, Διδύμων γενάρχαι) suggests that the myth of the *meixis* between Zeus and Leto originated in the Archaic period (*Orakel* (n.21), 104). Herda, AD-AD (n.7), 241–215 assumes that the same fragment suggests that Zeus was worshiped in Archaic Didyma. However, the fragment of the Hellenistic poet does not necessarily prove the cult of Zeus in Archaic Didyma.

[64] The Milesian decree regarding the Didymea (*Milet* VI, 3 1052) was passed at the council and the assembly around 210 BCE. Miletus seems to have retained its democratic constitution in the latter half of the third century BCE after Antiochus II had liberated it from a short-lived tyranny under Timarchus, an Aetolian, and granted the city freedom and democracy in 259/8 BCE. *I.Didyma* 358; App. *Syr.* 65. See also Günther, *Orakel* (n.21), 54–55; Rigsby, *Asylia* (n.60), 173; Hölbl, *Ptolemaic Empire* (n.35), 44; V. Grieb, *Hellenistische Demokratie: Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen,* Stuttgart 2008, 238–251; S. Carlsson, *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedures in Some East Greek City-States,* Stuttgart 2010, 249–250.

Presumably, through diplomatic negotiations, the myth of the *meixis* of Zeus and Leto in Didyma was officially established in Miletus and spread among the people around the city.

A desire to emulate other cities may have also motivated the Milesians to heighten their consciousness of the union of the divine couple. The existence of other famous Apolline sanctuaries, such as that at Delos, may have inspired the Milesians to pay attention to the parents of Apollo. As Park speculates, their union at Didyma means that Apollo was conceived at Didyma, and this myth may have been a good one for promoting the sanctuary of Didyma because Delos had long reputed their legendary claim of being Apollo's birthplace.[65] Additionally, however, rival poleis in Asia Minor may have influenced the Milesians' claims. Ephesus, one of the most influential Ionian cities, claimed that Leto gave birth to Artemis, Apollo's twin sister, on the island of Ortygia, near Ephesus. The story must have been well known to the local people since the third quarter of the fourth century BCE at the latest, when Scopas was working on a group of statues, including Leto and Ortygia with a child in each arm.[66] Moreover, after an epiphany regarding Artemis in 221 BCE, the citizens of Magnesia on the Maeander, a competitive rival of Miletus, seem to have started a project to create a new crowned festival in honor of Artemis Leucophryene, in accordance with a Delphic oracle.[67] The Milesians probably emulated their rivals not only by making their festival one of "crowned" games but also by emphasizing the connection between their sactuary and the twin gods Artemis and Apollo, and their parents Zeus and Leto, which was probably an attempt to raise the status of their sacred precinct over that of their rivals.

7. Milesian Colonies and Apollo Didymeus

Milesian diplomacy with other Greek city-states in the Hellenistic period also made the Milesians and other related peoples conscious of their histories of

[65] Parke, *Oracle* (n.2), 59–60. However, see above nn.61 and 63. There is no need to assume that the Milesians fabricated the myth of the *meixis* in the Hellenistic period. They may have emphasized a mythical episode that had already been available to them.

[66] Strabo 14.1.20; G.M Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos*, New Haven and London 2012, 38.

[67] On the recent debate concerning the Leucophryena, see Rigsby, *Asylia* (n.60), 179–279; G. Sumi, Civic Self-Representation in the Hellenistic World: The Festival of Artemis Leukophryene, in Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, in S. Bell and G. Davies (eds.), *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity*, Oxford 2004, 79–92; W. J. Slater, D. Summa, Crowns at Magnesia, *GRBS* 46 (2006), 275–299; P. Thonemann, Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia (*I. Magnesia* 16.16), *GRBS* 47 (2007), 151–160; J. D. Sosin, Magnesian Inviolability, *TAPA* 139 (2009), 369–410.

colonization and of Apollo Didymeus.[68] In the 330s and 320s, Miletus concluded *isopoliteia* treaties with Cyzicus and Olbia, Milesian colonies. "Histories" of colonization plausibly played an important role in their negotiations and speeches at the Milesian council and assembly. The phrase "κατὰ τὰ πάτρια" mentioned in the inscriptions of these treaties suggests that they decided to follow their traditional or ancestral arrangements, which may date back to the period of their colonization.[69] These treaties may have encouraged the Milesians to think of Apollo Didymeus, whose involvement in Milesian colonization is suggested at least by an Archaic bone tablet from Olbia.[70]

Around 220 BCE, Miletus passed a decree concerning *isopoliteia* with Cius, another Milesian colony on Propontis in Mysia.[71] In the inscription, the relationship between "the founder (κτίστης)" and "its colonists (ἄποικοι)" is explicitly stated as a reason for the Milesians to treat the Cians with generosity; its mention must reflect the sentiments of the speeches delivered in the assembly. The Milesians in the assembly were presumably aware not only of their status as colonizers in the Archaic period but also of Apollo Didymeus as the most important deity related to it, for the Cians sought the benevolence of the Milesians because they failed to fulfill their obligation of dedicating a *phiale* as a first fruit to the deity.[72]

In 219/8 BCE, Miletus and Tralles/Seleucia-at-Maeander concluded a treaty to grant each other potential citizenship.[73] Although, according to a tradition, Tralles/Seleucia was founded by the Argives and a Thracian tribe named Tralles, the

[68] On Milesian diplomatic policies, see J. LaBuff, *Polis Expansion and Elite Power in Hellenistic Karia*, New York 2016, 47; S. Saba, Isopoliteia *in Hellenistic Times,* Leiden and Boston 2020 (Isopoliteia), esp. 35–83.

[69] Olbia: *Milet* I 3, 136; Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 37–44. On this inscription, see also V. Gorman, Milesian Decrees of Isopoliteia and the Refoundation of the City, ca. 479 BCE, in B. Gorman and E. Robinson (eds.), *Oikistes. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A. J. Graham*, Leiden 2002, 181–193. Cyzicus: *Milet* I 3, 137; Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 45–48. On recent discussion about *syngeneia*, see *e.g.*, O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*, Paris 1995 (*parentés*), esp. 224–241; Id., La parenté légendaire à l'époque hellénistique, *Kernos* 12 (1999), 167–194; Id., Un usage fort controversé: la parenté dans le langage diplomatique de l'époque hellénistique, *Anc.Soc.* 35 (2005), 101–107; S. Lücke, *Syngeneia*, Frankfurt 2000; A. Erskine, O brother where art thou? Tales of kinship and diplomacy, in D. Ogden (ed.), *The Hellenistic World*, London and Swansea 2002, 97–117.

[70] *SEG* 36.694. See above n.61.

[71] *Milet* I 3, 141; Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 52–58. On Milesian foundation of Cius, see Ehrhardt, *Kolonien* (n.39)*,* 47–48.

[72] On the interpretation of this decree, see A. Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 2005, 122; Ehrhardt, *Kolonien* (n.39), 235; Sabe, Isopoliteia (n.68), 52–58.

[73] *Milet* I 3, 143; Curty, *parentés* (n.69), 136–138; Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 9–15, 58–63.

representative of that city referred to their ancestral *syngeneia* relationship with the Milesians and to Apollo Didymeus's crucial role in the establishment of their relationship (l.4: [διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] συγγένε̣ι̣αν; ll.8–9: τὸν Ἀπόλλω τὸν Διδυμῆ, εἰς ὃν ἀναφέ[ρουσιν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴ]ν̣ τῆς πρὸς τὴμ πόλιν συγγενείας).[74] Whatever the *syngeneia* in this case meant exactly to the Milesians and the Tralleians/Seleucians, they clearly emphasized their past concerning their close relationship that originated from the deity, possibly a (fabricated) story of Milesian colonization, in the course of the negotiation at least at the assembly in Miletus. Notably, not only the Milesians but also the Tralleians/Seleucians resorted to the Milesian colonial past and Apollo Didymeus's crucial role, at least to some extent, to reach their mutual agreement. Certainly, as Saba points out, Apollo Didymeus is emphasized only in the Milesian decree. Therefore, the past concerning the *syngeneia* that originated from the deity was more important for the Milesians.[75] However, it was the representatives of the Tralleians/Seleucians who referred to their *syngeneia* and the importance of Apollo Didymeus at the Milesian assembly. The wording incised on the inscription reflect the Milesian intentions, but it is hard to believe that the Milesians made up the Tralleian/Selucian ambassadors' speech.

In the second century BCE, Apollonia-at-Rhyndacus sent envoys to Miletus to negotiate the renewal of their relationship, presumably on Apollonia's initiative.[76] The inscription of the Apollonian decree relates that when their representatives arrived at Miletus to renew their relationship that had originated from the Milesian colonization (περὶ τοῦ ἀνανεώσασθαι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶι δήμωι ἡμῶν διὰ τὴν ἀποικίαν συγγένειαν), the Milesians investigated histories and other documents (ἐπισκεψάμενοι τὰς περὶ τούτων ἱστορίας καὶ τἆλλα ἔγγραφα). As a result, the Milesians agreed to renew their relationship because their ancestors in the Archaic period, led by Apollo Didymeus, had founded various colonies, including Apollonia-at-Rhyndacus.[77]

[74] Strabo 14.1.42.
[75] Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 63.
[76] *Milet* I 3, 155; Curty, *parentés* (n.69), 143–145; Herda, AD-AD (n.7), 26–27; Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 81–82.
[77] καθ' οὓς καιροὺς ἐκπέμψαντες στράτευμα καὶ εἰς τοὺς [κ]ατὰ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ τὴν Προποντίδα τόπους κρατήσαντες δόρατ(ι) τῶν ἐνοικούντων βαρβάρων κατώ(ι)κισαν τάς τε ἄλλας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν καθηγησαμένου τῆς στρατείας Ἀπόλλωνος Διδυμέως·

Apollonia is generally agreed to have been a type of "Milesian" colony, possibly one founded by another Milesian colony, Cyzicus.[78] Therefore, the story of the Milesian colonization of Apollonia cannot be wholly fabricated. Nevertheless, before accepting the Apollonian ambassadors' explanation, the Milesians in the second century BCE found it necessary to make a careful examination of history. The Milesians presumably either rediscovered a forgotten historical episode or newly learned about an ancient event unknown to them through the Apollonian envoys' speeches. Having examined the historiography and other documents, the Milesians accepted the Apollonian version of the history of their colonization and officially added a "new" episode to their history at the council and assembly. Before they dispatched envoys, the Apollonians had also discussed their Milesian origin and the importance of Apollo Didymeus at the council and assembly at home. After the envoys returned, the Apollonian citizens debated again the same matter at their assembly and passed a decree in accordance with the Milesian response. The reference to the Milesian investigation of histories and other documents in the Apollonian decree may suggest that the Milesian answer encouraged the Apollonians to convince themselves of their ancestral connection with the Milesians. These last two examples in particular illustrate that the Hellenistic Milesians obviously thought of Apollo Didymeus as having been deeply involved in their Archaic colonizing activities and that not only the Milesians but also foreigners were conscious of Miletus's past and helped shape contemporary beliefs about it through their claims in diplomatic negotiations.

The ambassadors' speeches and the discussions that followed at the assembly must have increased the Milesian citizens' consciousness of their past concerning colonization and encouraged them to build an identity as a "mother city" responsible for numerous Greek colonies. In the Hellenistic period, the Milesian past that focused on colonization and Apollo Didymeus was repeatedly reconstructed through their interactions with other Greek city-states and circulated widely among the

[78] On the history of Apollonia-at-Rhyndacus, see Ehrhardt, *Kolonien* (n.39), 44–47; A. Abmeier, Zur Geschichte von Apollonia am Rhyndakos, in E. Schwertheim (Hrsg.), *Mysische Studien* (Asia Minor Studien 1), Bonn 1990, 1–16. While Apollonia is now generally agreed upon as a Milesian colony, scholars have debated in what sense Apollonia-at-Rhyndacus was a Milesian colony. Ehrhardt holds that it was founded by Cyzicus, another Milesian colony (47). Abmeier argues that Apollonia had been founded by the Attalids between 183 and 150 BCE and that its Milesian origin may have been based on another nearby Milesian site, such as Miletouteichus (Μιλητουτεῖχος). (6–16). P. Herrmann (ed.), *Inschriften von Milet*, VI, 1, Berlin 1997, 193–194 and Saba, Isopoliteia (n.68), 81–82, n.137 conveniently summarizes this debate.

citizens. These stories are probably the reason why Milesians in the second century CE used "the mother city of many large cities in the Euxine, Egypt and all over the *Oikoumene*" as well as "the first city of the Ionians" as the titles of their city.[79]

Conclusion

The restoration of the Didymaean oracle and the reconstruction of the Temple of Apollo Didymeus in the late classical and early Hellenistic periods increased the Milesian consciousness of the sanctuary's past. The mythical and historical narratives concerning Didyma that circulated in this period reflected contemporary Milesian interests: the myths served to validate the current oracular operation in Didyma by elected Milesian citizens and to enhance their pride and their facilitation of diplomatic action by tracing back its history to the mythical past or by connecting its origin with Delphi. While it is unlikely that these myths were all fabricated in this period, presumably, some episodes were changed or even created, and others gained more attention than before, enhancing the authority and sanctity of Didyma. Moreover, the mythical and historical past of the sanctuary functioned not only to distinguish the Milesians from others but also to link them with Hellenistic kings and other Greek city-states. Through diplomatic negotiation, the Milesians, as well as other cities and monarchs, shaped, sometimes concocted, and shared the past concerning Miletus and the Didymaeum. The Hellenistic Milesians and their contemporaries related to the city were actively committed to shaping and spreading the mythical/historical narratives on Didyma for the needs of the present.

Kobe University
nsato@lit.kobe-u.ac.jp

[79] *Milet* VI, 3 1111 (= *CIG* 2878, 195AD), 1140 (177–193AD), 1184–1202. On the competition over titles among Asiatic Greek cities in the Roman period, J. H. M. Strubbe, Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität, *Anc.Soc.* 15–17 (1984–86), 253–304; B. Puech, Des cités-mères aux métropoles, in S. Follet (ed.), *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine: nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches*, Paris 2004, 357–404.