

**Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет  
Исторический факультет  
Кафедра истории древней Греции и Рима  
Центр антиковедения**

# **МНЕМОН**

**Исследования и публикации по истории  
античного мира  
Под редакцией профессора Э.Д. Фролова**

**Выпуск 7**

**Санкт-Петербург  
2008**



**K. Nawotka**

## **Demodamas of Miletus, Seleucus I and Apollo**

The position of Apollo as the dynastic god of the Seleucids is a long-established fact. To it testify innumerable coins produced by royal mints from Antiochus I until well into the second c. uniformly bearing an image of the god seated on omphalos, as well as inscriptions referring to Apollo as the ancestor of the royal family (ἀρχηγότης /or pointing directly or indirectly to their kinship (συγγένεια) with the god<sup>1</sup>. This is no exception among Hellenistic royalty who habitually claimed divine ancestry in this, as in many other ways, following in the footsteps of Alexander the Great.<sup>2</sup> Much less obvious is why Apollo was selected as patron of the royal family and when and how this dynastic cult came into existence. Discussion in the modern scholarship tends to concentrate on either of the two first Seleucid kings, purporting political expediency or personal belief as the motive in this case. Among frequently given answers is the propaganda allegedly exercised by Seleucus I to win the hearts and minds of Greeks in Ionia and especially in Miletus, the supervisor of the great temple of Apollo at Didyma.<sup>3</sup> Others point to Seleucus' piety, to put it in words of S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt arguing that it was Antiochus I who made Apollo patron of the Seleucid family: "It was easy to build on Seleucus' own well-known and widely advertised personal devotion to Apollo and upon Apollo's reciprocal care for Seleucus, already implicit in the royal patronage of Didyma".<sup>4</sup> Some even go that far as to maintain that Apollon's temple and oracle at Didyma was as important for Seleucus as Siwah was for Alexander the Great.<sup>5</sup> Even if the primary focus on

---

<sup>1</sup> Ancestry: OGIS 212, 237, 219 with Robert, BEp 1955, 122. Kinship: Musti 1963, 230-231. All dates in this paper are B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Nilsson 1974, 154; Hölbl 2001, 92-98.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Orth 1977, 18; Parke 1985, 47, 53; Grainger 1990, 103-104, 164-165.

<sup>4</sup> Sherwin-White, Kuhrt 1993, 27; also Burstein 1980, 76-77.

<sup>5</sup> Holt 1999, 27.

monarchy in study of the Hellenistic epoch seems obvious, a question needs always to be asked to what extent this attitude reflects modern preconceptions rather than ancient sources. This paper will investigate the source tradition attempting to measure validity of some of these modern ideas on Seleucus' motives and personal involvement in cult of Apollo. It will then verge away from kings to polis and its citizens, trying to discover who else besides Seleucus himself could promote Apollo as the tutelary god of the royal family. Inevitably it will then focus on the role played by a prominent citizen of Miletus Demodamas in promoting the cult of Apollo in the inner circle of power in the Seleucid empire trying to gauge the extant of power wielded by the individual in the early Seleucid empire.

Seleucus' alleged preoccupation with Apollo is very well covered by ancient sources, or at least it may seem so. There are three major accounts in the authors of the early empire: Diodorus, Pompeius Trogus (known through Justin's epitome), and Appian, two short remarks in Pausanias, and to that a much later passage in Libanius' oration in praise of Antioch. There are also four inscriptions and some numismatic evidence.

Diodorus, relating events of 312 which lead to the reconquest of Babylon by Seleucus, states: "In Asia, after the defeat of Demetrius at Gaza in Syria, Seleucus, receiving from Ptolemy no more than 800 foot soldiers and about 200 horse, set out for Babylon. He was so puffed up with great expectations that, even if he had had no army whatever, he would have made the expedition into the interior with his friends and his own slaves; for he assumed that the Babylonians, on account of the goodwill that had previously existed, would promptly join him, and that Antigonus, by withdrawing to a great distance with his army, had given him a suitable opportunity for his own enterprises. While such was his own enthusiasm, those of his friends who accompanied him were no little disheartened when they saw that the men who were making the campaign with them were very few and that the enemy against whom they were going possessed large armies ready for service, magnificent resources, and a host of allies. When Seleucus saw that they were terror-stricken, he encouraged them, saying that men who had campaigned with Alexander and had been advanced by him because of their prowess, ought not to rely solely on armed force and wealth when confronting difficult situations, but upon experience and skill, the means whereby Alexander himself had accomplished his great and universally admired deeds. He added that they ought also to believe the

oracles of the gods which had foretold that the end of his campaign would be worthy of his purpose; for, when he had consulted the oracle in Branchidae, the god had greeted him as King Seleucus, and Alexander standing beside him in a dream had given him a clear sign of the future leadership that was destined to fall to him in the course of time. Moreover, he pointed out that everything that is good and admired among men is gained through toil and danger. But he also sought the favor of his fellow soldiers and put himself on an equality with them all in such a way that each man respected him and willingly accepted the risk of the daring venture.”<sup>6</sup>

Appian relates signs and prophecies foretelling Seleucus’ great future: “It is said that while he was still serving under Alexander and following him in the war against the Persians he consulted the Didymaeon oracle to inquire about his return to Macedonia and that he received for answer: “Do not hurry back to Europe; Asia will be much better for you.” It was said also that in Macedonia a great fire burst forth on his ancestral hearth without anybody lighting it; also that his mother saw in a dream that whatever ring she found she should give him to carry, and that he should be king at the place where he should lose the ring. She did find an iron ring with an anchor engraved on it, and he lost it near the Euphrates. It is said that at a later period, when he was returning to recover Babylon, he stumbled against a stone and that when he caused this stone to be dug up an anchor was found under it. When the soothsayers were alarmed at this prodigy, thinking that it portended delay, Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, who accompanied the expedition, said that an anchor was a sign of safety, not of delay. For this reason Seleucus, when he became king, used an engraved anchor for his signet-ring.”<sup>7</sup>

The same story in Justin’s account is as follows: “The merit of Seleucus was well known, and his birth had been attended with extraordinary circumstances. His mother Laodice, being married to Antiochus, a man of eminence among Philip’s generals, seemed to herself, in a dream, to have conceived from a union with Apollo, and, after becoming pregnant, to have received from him, as a reward for her compliance, a ring, on the stone of which was engraved an anchor and which she was desired to give to the child that she should bring forth. A ring similarly engraved, which was found the next day in the bed, and the figure of an anchor, which was visible on the thigh of

<sup>6</sup> D.S., 19.90.1-4 (translation by R. M. Geer).

<sup>7</sup> App., Syr., 283-287 (translation by H. White).

Seleucus when he was born, made this dream extremely remarkable. This ring Laodice gave to Seleucus, when he was going with Alexander to the Persian war, informing him, at the same time, of his paternity. After the death of Alexander, having secured dominion in the east, he built a city, where he established a memorial of his two-fold origin; for he called the city Antioch from the name of his father Antiochus, and consecrated the plains near the city to Apollo. This mark of his paternity continued also among his descendants; for his sons and grandsons had an anchor on their thigh, as a natural proof of their extraction.”<sup>8</sup>

Pausanias states that Seleucus returned to Milesian Didyma a statue of Apollo removed by Xerxes to Ecbatana<sup>9</sup>. Pausanias refers here to a famous late archaic sculpture of Kanachos taken away by the Persians upon destruction on Didyma in 479<sup>10</sup>. The date of this Seleucus’ benefaction is unknown.

Libanius gives an elaborate description of the foundation of Antioch on the Orontes by Seleucus and of naming it after the king’s (mortal) father.<sup>11</sup> Then he goes on to describe the foundation of the precinct of Apollo in the suburb of Antioch called Daphne: “And this suburb, Daphne, much famed in song, Seleucus elevated to the dignity of a shrine, dedicating this place to the god, since he found that the myth was true. For Apollo, when he was enamored of Daphne but could not win her, and as she was changed by her prayer into a tree, he transformed his loved one into a crown. Thus was the tale sung; and the chase revealed to Seleucus the truth of the tale. For he once rode out to hunt, taking his dogs with him, and when he came to the tree which had once been a maiden, the horse stopped and smote the ground with his hoof, and the earth sent up a golden arrowhead. This revealed its owner by means of an inscription; for it was engraved ‘of Phoebus’. I suppose that in his grief over the transformation of the maiden he shot all his arrows, and the tip of one, broken off, was hidden by the earth and was preserved for Seleucus, as a warning to adorn the spot and to consider it as what it actually was, a shrine of Apollo... Seleucus however lifted the tip of the arrow and saw a serpent coming straight upon him, hissing with its head in the air. But as the serpent came on, it look at him mildly, and

<sup>8</sup> Just., 15.4 (translation by J. S. Watson).

<sup>9</sup> Paus., 1.16.3, 8.46.3.

<sup>10</sup> Paus.,

9.10.2; Plin., Nat., 34.75. Günther 1971, 40-41.

<sup>11</sup> Lib., 11.84-93, large the same story is in The Chronicle of John Malalas, 199-202.

vanished. When this serpent was added to the omens that appeared from the earth, his conviction grew that the god walked abroad in this place. And at once a sacred closure was laid out and trees and a temple were provided, and the grove speedily flourished and was guarded by strong prayers. And Daphne was everything to Seleucus. For in addition to these signs from heaven which met his eyes, there also impelled him an oracle which he had received from Miletus, as support against his adversity, from which he had drawn courage. This oracle promised him good fortune, and commanded him, when he won the rule over Syria, to make Daphne sacred to god.”<sup>12</sup>

Then there is an epigraphic dossier of three quite securely dated (through Milesian eponymous *stephanephoroi*) inscriptions from Didyma:

*OGIS* 213 = *Didyma* 479 = Burstein 2 of 300/299, perhaps in the beginning of 299:

“Resolved by the People; motion of the synedroi; Demodamas, son of Aristeides, put the motion. Since Antiochus, the eldest <son> of King Seleucus (I), previously displayed great good will and zeal continuously for the Milesian people and now, seeing his own father exerting every effort on behalf of the sanctuary at Didyma, (and) judging that it would be good to follow his father’s [policy], promises to construct a stoa [one stadion (in length) for the] god in the city from which there shall be (derived) every [year income, which] he thinks ought to be spent for works undertaken in the sanctuary at Didyma, and the structures built with [these (revenues)] shall be his own dedications; it has been resolved by the Milesians that they praise [Antiochus] for his reverence for the god and his good will [toward the] Greeks; and that there shall be given to him [for the stoa] whichever spot the architect, who is chosen, and the men appointed by Antiochus may designate ...”<sup>13</sup>

*SEG* 4.442=*Didyma* 480 of 299/298, most likely at the end of 299:

“The council and people resolved, Lycus son of Apollodotus put the motion: about what Demodamas son of Aristeides had submitted to the council, that Apame the wife of King Seleucus (I) be honoured; the council and people decided; since Apame, the queen, before showed much goodwill and support to the Milesians campaigning with King Seleucus, and now on the arrival in her presence of the ambassadors whom Seleucus sent for from us, she had been especially zealous about

<sup>12</sup> Lib., 11.94-99 (translation by G. Downey).

<sup>13</sup> Translation by S. M. Burstein with minor improvements. Date: Seibert 1974, 199-200.

the building of the temple ad Didyma, and Antiochus her son has announced, honouring the policy of his father Seleucus [about the sanctuary of Didyma], that would build [as quickly as possible in the city a stoa] ... to the god, in order that the revenues [from it might regularly accrue] and the sanctuary to be established ...”<sup>14</sup>

*CIG 2852=Didyma 424=RC 5 of 288/7:*

“When Poseidippos was stephanephoros ... Kings Seleucus (I) and Antiochus (I) referred these matters written in their letter:

King Seleucus to the council and the people of Miletus, greeting. We have sent to the sanctuary of Didymaeon Apollo, as offerings to the Savior Gods, the great lamp-stand and cups of gold and silver bearing inscriptions; they are under the escort of Polianthes. When he comes, then, do you take them, with good fortune, and deposit them in the sanctuary, so that you may use them for libations and other uses in behalf of your health and fortune and the safety of the city, for which I wish and you pray. Carry out the written instructions of Polianthes and dedicate the objects sent you and perform the sacrifice which we have enjoined on him. Aid him in seeing that things are done properly. I have written the list of the gold and silver vessels sent to the sanctuary so that you may know the type and the weight of each one. Farewell.” [A list of 13 gold and silver objects of 3248 drachmae 3 obols of gold and 9380 drachmae of silver, fragrances, spices, bronze lamp] “He (i.e. Polianthes) brought also for the god, 1000 sheep and 12 steers.”<sup>15</sup>

There is also an inscription on the base of a bronze statue, certainly of Seleucus, in form of dedication which cannot be precisely dated:

“The people of the Milesians (dedicates the statue of) King Seleucus to Apollo”.<sup>16</sup>

And finally an inscription of 281 from Erythrae:

“Do celebrate on occasion of drink offerings the child of dark-haired Apollo, Seleucus whom he, (the lord of) lyre of gold, begot [- -].”<sup>17</sup>

For all discrepancies in these accounts, ancient authors give this sequence of events: Laodice married Antiochus, the mortal father of

<sup>14</sup> Translation in Sherwin-White, Kuhrt 1993, 26. Date: Rehm, Didyma, p. 281; Seibert 1974, 200.

<sup>15</sup> Translation by C. B. Welles, with a minor addition.

<sup>16</sup> Milet, 1.3.158.

<sup>17</sup> Powell 1925, p. 140 = IErythrai 205. The date is after Powell 1925 who remarks that these verses were inscribed in Seleucus’s lifetime but after Kurupedion when Erythrae along with all of Ionia passed to him from Lysimachus.

Seleucus I, she conceived Seleucus with Apollo, next morning she discovered in her bed an iron ring with an anchor engraved on it, a child was born (Seleucus) with an anchor sign on his thigh, at an unspecified date there was an unexplainable outburst of fire on the heart in Seleucus' (or his parents') home, in 334 Laodice handed over the iron ring to her son, Seleucus received a prophecy of kingship at Didyma, Alexander predicted to Seleucus the great future in a dream, Seleucus lost the iron ring on the Euphrates (the preceding three events happened between the beginning of Alexander's Persian expedition and Seleucus' expedition to Babylon in 312), in 312 Seleucus stumbled upon a stone anchor in Babylon, Seleucus made anchor his signet-ring, Seleucus honoured his two fathers by founding Antioch on the Orontes and consecrating the adjacent plain (Daphne) to Apollo, the place to be consecrated to Apollo was revealed to the king by Apollo through signs of his arrow and by that of a snake, Seleucus received also an oracle from Miletus (i.e. Didyma) concerning Daphne, Seleucus' descendants bore the remarkable anchor sign on their thighs, at one point Seleucus returned the Apollo statue to Didyma.

Sources used by these authors are largely unknown to us and historicity of their accounts is sometimes debatable. Two extremes are the factual report of Pausanias and the story told by Libanius. There is nothing in Pausanias' account which might disprove its veracity, the only unclear point being the date of Seleucus' act. It is usually assigned to ca. 300-299 and placed in the context of other, epigraphically attested, Seleucid benefactions for Didyma and sometimes attributed to initiative of Demodamas.<sup>18</sup> Both these conjectures are plausible if far from proven as they lack a clear support in Pausanias' very brief account. Royal gifts, especially to a major panhellenic shrine, like Didyma, had not to be associated with a propitious political situation, let alone with this king's control of this temple.<sup>19</sup> Suffices to say that this euergesia of Seleucus took place some time after he gained control of Ecbatana where the statue of Apollo was kept, i.e. no earlier than 311.

The case is different of a foundation legend of Daphne related by Libanius, one of many inserted in the *Antiochikos* to extol glory of his native town.<sup>20</sup> Its late date (ca. 660 years after the actual foundation) and aetiological character, not to mention miraculous components of

---

<sup>18</sup> Haussoullier 1902, 43-44; Hiller von Gaertingen 1932, 1603; Günther 1971, 39-43; Orth 1977, 18; Boffo 1985, 177; Mehl 1986, 217.

<sup>19</sup> Seibert 1974, 188-191; Boffo 1985, 183; Lund 1992, 136-137.

<sup>20</sup> Downey 1963, 22-25.

the story, make it extremely unbelievable as a historical source. Libanius either transmits in the *Antiochikos* a legend already circulating in Antioch or invents this story having transmitted to the Syrian setting the well known myth of love pursuits of Apollo originally associated with Thessaly as Daphne was a daughter of the god of the Thessalian river Peneus. The sheer fact of establishing of Apollo's temple at Daphne by Seleucus I is attested also by Sozomenus although without other elements of Libanius' foundation story. The myth with colourful transformation of Daphne into a laurel tree was common enough to disregard its attestation in mosaics of Antioch as the evidence of a wider circulation of the foundation legend of Daphne as related by Libanius. What passes scrutiny therefore is the very foundation of Apollo's temple by Seleucus I, not earlier, of course, that the foundation of Antioch, i.e. 300 or later.<sup>21</sup> In the last sentences of this story Libanius may, however, refer to an actual oracular response from Didyma given (by letter) to Seleucus prior to foundation of Antioch on the Orontes.<sup>22</sup> He conflates it with the better known Diodorus' story of the oracle received from Didyma.

There are serious doubts as well as to the core story of the divine ancestry of Seleucus transmitted by Diodorus and Pompeius Trogus (through Justin) not only because ancient accounts about miraculous signs and prophecies regularly associated with important historical figures are generally greeted with skepticism by modern scholars. Again, surviving accounts are by three hundred years and more later than the events and nothing is known about sources. The once influential hypothesis of Hieronymus of Cardia as the original source cannot be positively verified and in due course it was assailed too.<sup>23</sup> One skeptical scholar noticed even an outward similarity between the stories about the divine conceptions of Augustus and Seleucus and thought that later had been made up by Pompeius Trogus in pattern of the former one.<sup>24</sup> This hypothesis goes too far since the inscription from Erythrae quoted above directly and a number of other sources indirectly show that the narrative of Seleucus' divine parentage is early Hellenistic, in fact no later than 281. Hence the opposite is possible: story of the divine conception of Augustus may have its archetype in that of Seleucus.

---

<sup>21</sup> Sozomenus, 5.19.9. Downey 1961, 34-36; Downey 1963, 41-42.

<sup>22</sup> Seibert 1974, 203-204; Parke 1985, 46.

<sup>23</sup> Hadley 1969, criticised by Marasco 1982, 69-72.

<sup>24</sup> Apollo as Augustus' father: Suet., Aug., 94.4; Mehl 1986, 5-6.

Paradoxically, in the account of Diodorus it was Seleucus who did most to demolish the credibility of the story of the oracle given to him for he was the original source of it. Seleucus, Diodorus says, used it to fortify his companion's morale during the daring expedition from Egypt to Babylonia through Syria brimming with forces of Demetrius (later Poliorcetes) defeated at Gaza but still many times stronger than Seleucus' detachment. The author's purely utilitarian rationale for disseminating the story makes a modern reader ask whether it was perhaps invented in 312 by Seleucus, if not later by some unknown to us early Hellenistic source.<sup>25</sup> A further dent in the credibility is afforded by circumstances in which the oracle was allegedly issued to Seleucus. It is not clearly stated by Diodorus, yet in Appian's account it was: στρατιώτη τοῦ βασιλεως [scil. Ἀλεξάνδρου] ἔτι ὄντι καὶ ἐπὶ Πέρσας ἐπομένῳ, χρησιμὸν ἐν Διδυμέῳ γενέσθαι, i.e. in 334. At that time Didyma was still silent after the destruction afflicted by Xerxes in 479 while the first oracle after the sacred spring had (miraculously) sprung up was issued for Alexander the Great in the beginning of 331.<sup>26</sup> Some try to save the case pointing up that Seleucus could ask Didyma a question at a later date, either by letter or in person when he was operating in the Aegean as Ptolemy's nauarchos.<sup>27</sup> But this is reading into our sources what was never written: Appian describes circumstances of this oracle clearly enough to dispense with these unnecessary hypotheses.

This leaves us with the only verifiable detail in the literary tradition on prophecies preceding the reign of Seleucus, the sign of anchor, according to Appian and Justin engraved on a ring which Laodice found in her bed. Anchor is attested in Seleucus' coinage of 312-305 and again in 300-298.<sup>28</sup> It was Seleucus' personal sign, whose significance has never been convincingly explained. Among more common interpretations of this anchor sign are that it was a Babylonian symbol or a reference to Seleucus' position as Ptolemy's nauarch.<sup>29</sup> Anchor is not among attested symbols or attributes associated with Apollo and our sources do not give a hint why Apollo selected it for Seleucus' ring.

<sup>25</sup> Grainger 1990, 3-4, 163-164.

<sup>26</sup> Callisth., FGrH, 124 F14. Parke 1985, 62; Grainger 1990, 3; Nawotka 2004, 296-297.

<sup>27</sup> Haussouillier 1902, 33-34; Seibert 1974, 201-203; Mehl 1986, 97.

<sup>28</sup> Houghton, Lorber, Kritz 2002, 5-6.

<sup>29</sup> Reflection of it also in Clem. Al., Paed., 3.11.59.2. Haussouillier 1902, 126-127; Svoronos 1904, 100-101; Marasco 1982, 73.

In Justin's account an anchor-shaped mark could be seen on the thighs of Seleucus and his male descendants. Assuming that this information comes originally from Hieronymus of Cardia or from some other early Hellenistic source, this may be the reason why this odd trait appears in the Seleucus' story at all. In the epoch when male nudity displayed publicly, if only in gymnasium, was a commonplace, too many readers must have had a precise knowledge of the appearance of Seleucus' thigh to allow for a blatant falsehood to appear in a serious historical book. It looks, therefore, that Seleucus had in fact an anchor-shaped birthmark on his thigh and that he selected it for his personal sign in connection with his Ptolemaic narchy or not. What seems certain, there was no original connection between the well attested Seleucus' anchor sign and Apollo. At some later date, when the ideological picture of Seleucus was defined, divergent elements became amalgamated to create the story as we have it today.

The review of literary and epigraphic sources does not show any trace of Seleucus' particular devotion to Apollo prior to 300, which one would expect to have been manifest should the stories of Apollo's parentage have been a constituent part of the ideological portrait of Seleucus from 312 on. The shape of his coinage is even more telling if only because of its massive quantity and the significant number of attested series, certainly not markedly lower than originally put into circulation. For the whole rule of Seleucus I Apollo is not among deities most often represented in coinage imagery. Counting both reverse and obverse images on ca. 300 series of Seleucus' coins Apollo with 13 attested cases is no match to Nike (40), Athena (61), not to mention Heracles (144) or Zeus (165).<sup>30</sup> Apollo is absent from numismatic iconography of Seleucid coins prior to 300, to appear first soon after 300 beginning with bronze coinage of Antioch on the Orontes.<sup>31</sup>

This picture is not surprising, as it much reflects the coinage of Alexander the Great, so often imitated by Seleucus.<sup>32</sup> Of course we still do not know and probably never will much about Seleucus' views and his personal devotion yet his coinage tells us at least what he wanted the others to think about his religiosity. And in this there is no visible preference for Apollo. If numismatic iconography were representative

<sup>30</sup> Apollo: Houghton, Lorber, *Kritt* 2002, nos 15-20, 112, 113, 148-150, 163, 257. See also Jenkins 1972, 223-224.

<sup>31</sup> Houghton, Lorber, *Kritt* 2002, nos 15-17, 18-19.

<sup>32</sup> Jenkins 1972, 223-224; Mehl 1986, 101-102; Houghton, Lorber, *Kritt* 2002, 5-8.

of Seleucus' personal devotion, it would be for Zeus. Some epigraphic, iconographic, and literary evidence as well may suggest that he saw in Zeus the patron of his dynasty. After all his conspicuous foundations in Syria, as related by Libanius and Malalas, were carried under auspices of Zeus whose sacred bird disturbed sacrifices performed by Seleucus in Antigoneia thus indicating the god's will to have a new city established.<sup>33</sup> There are as well much later traces of Seleucus' dynastic cult of Zeus established in Dura Europos or, even more telling, that of Zeus Seleukios in Seleucia Pieria and in Lycia.<sup>34</sup>

There is therefore very little, and nothing at all securely dated, in our sources on Seleucus' devotion to Apollo or his patronage of Apollo's shrines prior to 300. Then we have a concentration of epigraphic and numismatic evidence beginning in 300 and lasting to the end of his reign. The first Seleucid coins on which the head Apollo appears are municipal coins of Antioch on the Orontes which incidentally represent the first serious break with the tradition of Alexander the Great in Seleucus' coinage.<sup>35</sup> At the beginning of this period are two major inscriptions of Didyma (see above) which testify to exchange of embassies between Miletus and Seleucus, assistance afforded to the Milesians on Seleucid military service and in Milesian diplomacy by Apame, unnamed benefactions of Seleucus towards Didyma and finally of Antiochus' foundation aimed at providing a steady income for construction works at Didyma. Many believe, perhaps rightfully, that among these good deeds of Seleucus was returning of Apollo's statue carried away by Xerxes.<sup>36</sup> The stadion-long stoa promised by Antiochus was indeed built and probably very fast, if we are to follow the restored inscription on its architrave in which Antiochus appears as the son of Seleucus and not yet as king which means that at least a large portion of the building must have been ready by 294.<sup>37</sup> It is attested epigraphically as Ἐπιτύχαιος στοά and archaeological traces of it have been identified as the eastern portico in the southern agora of Miletus.<sup>38</sup> Seleucid generosity for Didyma lasting past the construction of Antiochus' stoa

<sup>33</sup> Lib., 11.86-88; Ioh. Malalas, 200. Downey 1961, 85; Musti 1966, 95.

<sup>34</sup> TAM 5.1-2.426; OGIS 245. Nock 1928; Bikerman 1938, 242-245; Rostovtzeff 1939, 283-284; Tondriau 1948, 173-174.

<sup>35</sup> Houghton, Lorber, Krit 2002, nos 15-19 and p. 5-8.

<sup>36</sup> Note 18 above.

<sup>37</sup> Milet 1.7.193a with Hermann 1997, 13-14: [Ἐπιτύχαιος βασιλέως Σελεύκου ὁ πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς] / [Ἐπιτύχαιος] τῶν ἐν [Διδύμοις].

<sup>38</sup> Milet 1.3.145, l. 29; Milet 1.7.270, l. 7. Knackfuss 1924, 31-47.

is witnessed by Seleucus' gifts of 288/7 to the shrine of Apollo and Artemis, called by him Saviour Gods, the most generous ever recorded in Miletus.<sup>39</sup> These deeds are not incongruous with attested Seleucus' acts of euergesia towards important shrines in his realm: Olba-Diocaesarea, Nysa, Stratonicea, Delos, Esagila in Babylon, Daphne.<sup>40</sup> Except, however, temples in or at the outskirts of capital cities of his kingdom, Babylon and Daphne by Antioch on the Orontes, there is no other example of generosity matching that for Didyma. To the special relations between this Apollo's shrine and the king testify oracle asked for by him on a few occasions and a later tradition which invented his sister Didymeia.<sup>41</sup>

This brings us back to Miletus with which are associated the earliest securely dated important sources on Seleucus' devotion to Apollo. *Didyma* 479 and 480 convey decrees of the Milesians passed either on motion presented by Demodamas son of Aristeides on behalf of the probouleutic board of *synedroi* or tabled in the boule on instigation of Demodamas who wrote a letter to the council. He is also attested as a member of the commission of *epistatai* selected by the assembly to supervise erecting a statue of Apame the wife of Seleucus I and possibly of another commission entrusted with putting up the queen's second statue.<sup>42</sup> Demodamas is one the best known Milesians of his times, a citizen of Miletus and Halicarnassus, author of now lost books on history and ethnography, identified as one of the seven known *philoï* of Seleucus I.<sup>43</sup> His book was a source for Pliny the Elder who wrote „transcendit eum amnem [scil. Tanain] Demo<dam>as, Seleuci et Antiochi regum dux, quem maxime sequimur in his, arasque Apollini Didymaeo statuit”.<sup>44</sup> The date and circumstances of this expedition beyond the Jaxartes

<sup>39</sup> CIG 2852=Didyma 424=RC 5. Rehm, in *Didyma*, p. 256; Boffo 1985, 179; Günther 1988, 217-218.

<sup>40</sup> Magie 1950, 269, 1143; Marasco 1984, 334; Sherwin-White, Kuhrt 1993, 30-31.

<sup>41</sup> Oracle: Lib., 11.99 with Günther 1971, 70 and Seibert 1974, 203-204. Didymeia: Ioh. Malalas 198.

<sup>42</sup> *Didyma* 481 with Rehm's commentary and Günther 1971, 28. On Demodamas's role in the legislative procedure see Nawotka 1999, 99-100.

<sup>43</sup> Ath., 15.30; Hdn., *De prosodia catholica*, 3.1, p. 268; St. Byz., s.v. Ἀντισσα; Iulius Solinus, *Collect. Rerum memorabilium*, 49.5-6. Haussouiller 1902, 49; Jacoby 1954, 252-253; Mehl 1986, 259; Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 4-5.

<sup>44</sup> Plin., *Nat.*, 6.49; the same information appear, certainly after Pliny, in: Iulius Solinus, *Collect. Rerum memorabilium*, 49.5-6. Also Martianus Capella 692.

(Pliny's Tanais) have been long debated. Wilcken and Tarn dated it to the period of the joined rule of Seleucus I and Antiochus I, i.e. to 294/3-280.<sup>45</sup> Yet, as L. Robert noticed, Pliny indicates only that Demodamas served both kings, but not necessarily at the same time. If this is the case, it would be odd not to link Demodamas' led expedition in the native land of Apame with Apame's services to Milesian soldiers mentioned in the Milesian decree (*Didyma* 480) drafted by Demodamas. The precise date of this expedition cannot be established and modern attempts to place either before or after Seleucus' Indian war are pure speculations.<sup>46</sup> Taking into consideration a book on India written by Demodamas, one may only guess that he took part in the Indian campaign of Seleucus as well.<sup>47</sup>

*Didyma* 480 furnishes quite rare information about the ethnic origin of Seleucid soldiers, naming Milesians among them. Since this piece of information was included in the body of the decree drafted by Demodamas, one may infer that these Milesians, more likely mercenaries than allied soldiers, enlisted on the instigation of their countryman so prominent at the Seleucid court and served under his command.<sup>48</sup> They fought in the native land of the Queen Apame, most probably experiencing her protection and support on this occasion. Altars erected at that time by Demodamas marked the northern limit, if not border in the modern sense, of the realm of Seleucus. In this, they are reminiscent of altars erected by Alexander in the extreme points reached by his expedition to Asia, thus reminding us again of how closely Seleucus followed Alexander in creating his ideological image.<sup>49</sup> The idea to sacrifice on the altars mentioned by Pliny (after Demodamas) to Didymaeon Apollo must have been Demodamas' since this cult nickname of Apollo was exclusively Milesian and therefore in this respect Demodamas, the highest ranking Milesian at the court of Seleucus I, was certainly the person who took the initiative and not just followed Seleucus' orders. This is therefore the first recorded step in the way of giving prominence to the cult of Apollo within the inner circle of power

---

<sup>45</sup> Wilcken 1894, 2451; Tarn 1940, 90-94; Marasco 1984, 325; Grainger 1997, 86.

<sup>46</sup> Robert 1984; Rehm in Milet 1.3, p. 262; Henning 1936, 173; Sherwin-White, Kuhrt 1993, 19, 26.

<sup>47</sup> Hdn., De prosodia catholica, 3.1, p. 268.

<sup>48</sup> Rehm, Milet, 1.3, p. 262; Bikerman 1938, 72-73; Robert 1984, 471-472; Mehl 1986, 218.

of the kingdom of Seleucus I. It was followed by acts of the Seleucid generosity to the Didymaion.

The legislative initiative of Demodamas in honouring by Miletus Apame and Antiochus may suggest, with a very high degree of certainty, that he was also behind the earlier steps taken by Seleucus and members of his family: initiating the diplomatic exchange with Miletus and drafting the foundation of Antiochus' stoa. By that time the sanctuary and oracle at Didyma was already in operation for some thirty years following almost 150 years of silence after the destruction inflicted on it by Xerxes. Before 479 it had been an independent cult place ruled by Branchidae widely inculpated for betrayal of the Greek cause during the Persian wars, then evacuated by the retreating Persians to Sogdiana and eventually slaughtered on orders of Alexander the Great.<sup>50</sup> Didyma reopened in 331 under a new management, in the hands of the people of the Milesians who, for the next seven hundred years, elected officials responsible for running the sanctuary and oracle. Reopening was most probably marked by an unique series of hemidrachm coins with the inscription ΕΓ ΔΙΔΥΜΕΩΝ ΙΕΡΗ.<sup>51</sup> But the truly serious concern of the new management of Didyma was rebuilding the temple, designed on a truly grandiose scale.<sup>52</sup> The expenditure for this investment was clearly beyond the means of Miletus who already in 331 made an effort to find a patron willing to underwrite this enterprise. Alexander the Great, to whom the approach was made with the first oracular response of reopened Didyma proclaiming him son of Zeus, did not oblige and the matter had to be solved by other means.<sup>53</sup> Reopening the oracle meant that some works had to be done by 331, if only cleaning the sacred source clogged in 479. It seems certain that some construction works was done there between 331 and 300. The evidence of Didyma treasury accounts of the late fourth century testify to the existence of a temple building. So does the activity of the oracle. The archaeological traces of construction works prior to 300 are, however, ambiguous and the real building program for adyton and other parts of the temple complex laid ahead of the Milesians in the year 300.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Mehl 1986, 101-102; Holt 1988, 99-100; Sherwin-White, Kuhrt 1993, 19; Nawotka 2004, 382, 436-437, 449.

<sup>50</sup> Parke 1985a; Kulesza 1994; Nawotka 2004, 377-379.

<sup>51</sup> Deppert-Lieppitz 1984, 17; Kinns 1986, 237.

<sup>52</sup> Vittr., 7, pr. 16.

<sup>53</sup> Callisth., FGrH 124 F14 (= Str., 17.1.43). Parke 1985, 62; Fontenrose 1988, 15-16; Nawotka 2004, 297.

<sup>54</sup> Günther 1971, 37-39; Voigtländer 1975, 20-21; Haselberger 1983, 104.

There is no evidence that Demodamas in his promoting at the Seleucid court of cult of Apollo and of the temple at Didyma was implementing a preconceived Milesian political design. As a leading Milesian politician of his age, he was, however, certainly aware of what was the pressing concern of his polis. Miletus, it is often stressed, owed much of his position in the Hellenistic age to the prestige of Didyma.<sup>55</sup> Restoring it to its former glory, too costly for Miletus, was done to some degree thanks to services of Demodamas, willing to employ his position as Seleucus' friend to his polis' benefit. This, at the same time, initiated a pattern of Seleucid euergetiai for Miletus which was often prompted by prominent Milesians at the Seleucid court and which outlived the Seleucid political supremacy in Asia Minor.

Already in Seleucus' lifetime a new ideological image of Apollo's special protection of the dynasty was forming, if not without hesitation, as there are evidence associating Seleucus with Zeus and his son Antiochus with Apollo.<sup>56</sup> Eventually, a story of Apollo fathering Seleucus was born, first attested in Erythrae in 281, and therefore this god was officially proclaimed in an inscription of Illion the founder of the Seleucid dynasty (ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ γένους).<sup>57</sup> There is an interesting hypothesis that it was the oracle at Didyma who proclaimed Seleucus son of Apollo, as it earlier had announced Alexander son of Zeus. This cannot be proved in the light of our sources but the weight of evidence tilts nevertheless towards the Milesian origin of the Seleucid dynastic cult of Apollo. Evidence, patchy as it is, suggests Demodamas' substantial contribution to promoting this cult and therefore to creating the ideological identity of the Seleucid dynasty and empire enjoying a special protection of Apollo, the newly discovered ancestor of Seleucus I.

### Bibliography

- Bikerman E. *Institutions des Séleucides*. P., 1938.  
 Boffo L. *I re ellenistici e i centri religiosi dell' Asia Minore*. Firenze, 1985.  
 Burstein S. M. *Lysimachus and the Greek Cities of Asia Minor. The Case of Miletus* // *AncW* 3, 1980, 73–79.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Franco 1993, 110.

<sup>56</sup> OGIS 245 and a parchemnt quoted by Rostovtzeff 1935. Rostovtzeff 1939, 283-284; Tondriau 1948, 193-194.

<sup>57</sup> Powell, 1925, 140; OGIS 212 with Robert, BEp 1955, 122.

- Downey G. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton, 1961.
- Downey G. *Ancient Antioch*. Princeton, 1963.
- Fontenrose J. *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*, Berkeley, 1988.
- Franco C. *Il regno di Lisimaco: strutture amministrative e rapporti con le città*. Pisa, 1993.
- Grainger J. D. *Seleukos Nikator: Constructing a Hellenistic Kingdom*. L.; N. Y., 1990.
- Grainger J. D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*. Leiden; N. Y., 1997.
- Günther W. *Das Orakel von Didyma in hellenistischer Zeit. Eine Interpretation von Stein-Urkunden*. Tübingen, 1971.
- Günther W. "Vieux et inutilisable" dans un inventaire inédit de Milet // *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux / Recueillis & éd. par D. Knoepfler; avec la collab. pour l'index de N. Quellet*. Genève, 1988, 215–237.
- Hadley R. A. *Hieronymos of Cardia and Early Seleucid Mythology* // *Historia* 18. 1969, 142–152.
- Haselberger L. *Bericht über die Arbeit am Jüngerem Apollontempel von Didyma* // *MDAI(I)* 33, 1983, 90–123.
- Haussoullier B. *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didymeion*. P., 1902.
- Hermann P. *Inschriften von Milet (Milet VI. 1)*. B., 1997.
- Hiller von Gaertringen F. *Miletos* // *RE* XV, 1586–1622.
- Holt F. L. *Alexander the Great and Bactria: The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Central Asia*. Leiden, 1988.
- Holt F. L. *Thundering Zeus: The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. Berkeley, 1999.
- Hölbl G. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire / Engl. trans. by T. Saavedra*. L.; N.Y., 2001.
- Houghton A., Lorber C., Kritt B. *Seleucid Coins*. N. Y., Lancaster, 2002.
- Jenkins G. K. *Ancient Greek Coins*. L., 1972.
- Knackfuss H. *Das Rathaus von Milet (Milet I. 2)*, B., 1908.
- Kulesza R. *Persian Deportations: Greeks in Persia* // *Eos* 82, 1994, 221–250.
- Lund H. S. *Lysimchos: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. L., 1992.

Magie D. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*. Vol. I–II. Princeton, 1950.

Marasco G. *Appiano e la storia dei Seleucidi fino all'ascesa al trono di Antioco III*. Firenze, 1982.

Marasco G. La fondazione dell'impero di Seleuco I. Espansione territoriale e indirizzi politici // *RSI* 96, 1984, 301–336.

Mehl A. *Seleukos Nikator und Sein Reich*. Louvanii, 1986.

Musti D. Sull'idea di *syggeneia* in iscrizioni greche // *ASNP* 32, 1963, 225–239.

Musti D. Lo stato dei Seleucidi. Dinastia, popoli, città da Seleuco I ad Antioco III // *SCO* 15, 1966, 61–197.

Nawotka K. *Boule and Demos in Miletus and Its Pontic Colonies from Classical Age until Third Century A. D.* Wrocław, 1999.

Nawotka K. *Aleksander Wielki*. Wrocław, 2004.

Nock A. D. Notes on Ruler-Cult I–IV // *JHS* 48, 1928, 21–43.

Orth W. *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit*. München, 1977.

Parke H. W. *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London, 1985.

Parke H. W. (a) The Massacre of the Branchidae // *JHS* 105, 1985, 59–68.

Robert L. Documents d'Asie Mineure // *BCH* 108, 1984, 457–532.

Rostovtzeff M. Progonoi // *JHS* 55, 1935, 56–66.

Rostovtzeff M. Some Remarks on the Monetary and Commercial Policy of the Seleucids and Attalids // *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler*. Manchester, 1939, 277–298.

Savalli-Lestrade I. *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*. Genève, 1998.

Seibert J. *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen*. Darmstadt, 1983.

Sherwin-White S., Kuhrt A. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley, 1993.

Svoronos J. N. *Ta nomismata tou kratous ton Ptolemaion*. Athens, 1904.

Tarn W. W. Two Notes on Seleucid History // *JHS* 60, 1940, 84–94.

К. Навотка

### **Демодам Милетский, Селевк I и Аполлон**

В настоящей статье рассматриваются обстоятельства появления широко распространенного в эллинистическую, а затем и в более позднюю античную эпоху представления о том, что

Аполлон – бог-покровитель династии Селевкидов. На основании имеющихся источников – литературных, эпиграфических и нумизматических – автор приходит к выводу, что представление об особом покровительстве данной династии со стороны Аполлона начало формироваться уже при жизни Селевка I, где-то начиная с 300 г. до н.э. В конце концов родилась история о том, что Аполлон был отцом Селевка. По мнению автора, вполне вероятно, что селевкидский династический культ Аполлона имел милетское происхождение: не исключено, что именно оракул в Дидимах провозгласил Селевка сыном Аполлона. При этом свидетельства источников предполагают, что существенное содействие распространению и утверждению данного культа было оказано Демодамом, одним из наиболее известных милетских политиков своего времени и приближенных Селевка I.

