

KENT J. RIGSBY

COS AND THE MILESIAN DIDYMEIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 175 (2010) 155–157

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

COS AND THE MILESIAN DIDYMEIA

The calendar of Cos – the sequence of months, their approximate place in the solar year, and the starting point of the year – has become progressively better understood thanks to the inscriptions. Segre, writing at the end of the 1930s, described his conclusions briefly; he relied on then-unpublished texts, especially *Iscr. Cos* ED 178 published posthumously in 1991 (now *IG* XII.4 301–302). Trümper gave thorough arguments in favor of Segre’s sequence. Bosnakis and Hallof have confirmed this and determined with great probability the beginning month of the year:¹

Θευδαίσιος	Nov/Dec
Πεταγείτιος	Dec/Jan
Καφίσιος	Jan/Feb
Βαδρόμιος	Feb/Mar
Γεράστιος	Mar/Apr
Ἄρταμίτιος	Apr/May
Ἄγριάντιος	May/June
Ἰακίνθιος	June/July
Πάναμος	July/Aug
Δάλιος	Aug/Sept
Ἄλσειος	Sept/Oct
Κάρνειος	Oct/Nov

One document has appeared problematic. An inscription of the late third century B.C., published by Herzog in 1905, contains on one side a decree of Miletus requesting panhellenic recognition of the Didymeia festival in honor of Apollo as “crowned”; on the back of the stone are the meager remains of the Coans’ decree in response to the Milesian θεωροί who brought the decree.² What has most often been cited is the edition at *Syll.*³ 590, where Hiller reprinted the Milesians’ decree but, understandably, not the thankless traces of the Coan decree on the back side. Taken together, however, the two decrees offer light on the calendar.

The Milesian decree has a heading: ἐπὶ Ἰποκράτους, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμυτίου. This since the first publication has been recognized as a Coan date, a docket indicating when the Milesian θεωροί delivered their decree to the Coan authorities. The simple dating formula is typical of Cos; and the name Hippocrates was, for obvious reasons, much favored there, including an eponymous μόναρχος attested in another inscription of the late third century B.C.³ Such dockets are found in other Coan inscriptions: a Coan year and month precede a decree of Halicarnassus (*IG* XII.4 142 [ἐπὶ μονάρχου] Μακαρέως, Βαδρ[ομίου]), and also the Roman Lex Fonteia (*IG* XII.4 266 μηνὸς Πανάμου δευτέ[ραι ἐξ ἰκάδος]). Different in form but more explicit in substance is a statement placed at the end of another foreign decree: ἐνηέχθη Ἄλσειου τριακάδι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν ἔχον ἐπίσημον ζῶδιον γυναικεῖον, (the decree) “was presented by the envoys on 30 Alseios, having as a seal a female figure” (*IG* XII.4 177).

But the docket creates two chronological problems. The Coan decree in response to the embassy (*IG* XII.4 154) is dated ἐπὶ Φιλίνου, νομηνιαί μηνὸς Ἰακινθίου. The implication is that between the Mile-

¹ M. Segre, *Tituli Calymnii* (Bergamo 1952) p. 170; K. Trümper, *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen* (Heidelberg 1997) 179–183; D. Bosnakis and K. Hallof, *Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos II*, *Chiron* 35, 2005, 233–240. Cf. Ph. Gauthier, *Les assemblées électorales et le calendrier de Samos*, *Chiron* 31, 2001, 220 n. 39 (Coan elections in Ἄλσειος, near year’s end as at many other cities); N. Robertson, *The Religious Criterion in Greek Ethnicity*, *AJAH* n.s. 1.2, 2002/3, 32–33, 39 (Πεταγείτιος probably a winter month as at Byzantium; Ἰακίνθιος perhaps early summer as at Rhodes, while Κάρνειος is everywhere late in the year). The one extant papyrus written on Cos, *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2771, of A.D. 323, places 8 June in Ἄγριάντιος.

² R. Herzog, *Das panhellenische Fest und die Kultlegende von Didyma*, *SBakBerlin* 1905, 979–993; now *IG* XII.4 153–154.

³ *T.Calymnii* 88.20, 57.

sians' arrival and the Coan response, one Coan year has ended and a new one begun.⁴ This would make the first month of the Coan year not Θεουδαίσιος but Ἀγριάνιος or Ὑακίνθιος. Furthermore, roughly two months have passed while the Milesian θεωροί waited for an answer (to be exact, more than one month but less than three).

But with the Coan year beginning in Θεουδαίσιος (or even Κάρνειος, as Trümpy tentatively thought), the change of μόνωρχοι indicated here is out of place. We might save the phenomena by supposing that Hippocrates died while in office and was replaced (if there was such a practice) by Philinus. But nothing can explain a delay between the Milesians' arrival and the Coans' response that spanned five to eight weeks and at least one meeting of the Coan assembly; θεωροί felt obliged to keep moving.⁵ These anomalies are troubling,⁶ and a great scholar has expressed doubt about our understanding of the Coan calendar.⁷ But the essentials of the calendric system at Cos are certain – as Segre evidently realized, there is no significantly different conclusion to be drawn from *IG XII.4* 301–302. The problem must be not with the calendar, but with our interpretation of the first line of the Milesians' decree, which is taken to have no date. I propose that it is not a docket at all but a Coan misrendering of a Milesian date.

The most common opening of Milesian public acts has the pattern ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου X μηνὸς Y (e.g. *Milet* I.3 102). Sometimes the word στεφανηφόρου is omitted (e.g. *Milet* 134, *I.Didyma* 226, 227), sometimes the word μηνὸς (*Milet* 150). In the Coan inscription, the mason misspelled two of the four words ἐπὶ Ἴποκράτους, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμιτίου. These can be seen as specifically Coan errors in copying a Milesian text.

First, the month: the Milesians had a month named Ἀρτεμισιών, the Coans one named Ἀρταμίτιος. The seeming docket offers neither Ἀρτεμισιώνος nor Ἀρταμιτίου but Ἀρτεμιτίου. That is a common enough spelling of this month in some other cities, but unparalleled in Coan texts. The explanation would be that the mason began to copy what he saw but then slipped into his own language, so as to produce the hybrid Ἀρτεμι-τίου.

Second, the year: we know the Milesian eponymous στεφανηφόροι of the late third century without interruption,⁸ and there is no room to insert a Hippocrates. The mason has misspelled that personal name that was most loved among Coans. What caused him to omit a letter? I suggest that the papyrus which he was copying contained not his Ἴποκράτους but rather Ἐπικράτους, an attested Milesian στεφανηφόρος: the mason, by eye or ear, has slurred this into the best-known of Coan names.

This is admittedly a heavy intervention in a received text: in effect, ἐπὶ (Ἐ)π(ι)κράτ(ε)υς, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμι(σι)ώνος. In attributing errors to the mason, I have sought a Coan explanation. In fact, as Herzog already noted (983), in line 45 this mason wrote Doric ἀρέθησαν, where the Milesian decree must have had ἠρέθησαν – an error found only here among Coan copies of foreign decrees. The gain from this emendation of line 1 is that it would solve the two chronological problems that the four words must present so long as they are taken as a Coan docket rather than a Milesian date.

The month: Milesian Ἀρτεμισιών when their request was voted was March/April; Coan Ὑακίνθιος was June/July. The Coan assembly met, as it regularly did in Hellenistic times,⁹ on the first of each month; so their decree of 1 Ὑακίνθιος was voted in the second half of June. Thus, between two months and three elapsed before the team of Milesian θεωροί appeared before a Coan assembly. After the Milesians had voted to seek panhellenic recognition of the Didymaia, θεωροί must be elected, itineraries planned, travel

⁴ Chr. Habicht, Zur Chronologie der hellenistischen Eponyme von Kos, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 309, accordingly listed Philinus as the immediate annual successor to Hippocrates.

⁵ See K. J. Rigsby, *Asyria. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1996) 136, for instances.

⁶ My anxiety about them was cited by Bosnakis–Hallos (n. 1) 239, and (rightly) discounted in favor of the stronger evidence of the other inscriptions.

⁷ Ph. Gauthier, *Bull. épigr.* 2006, 317.

⁸ *Milet* 124; bibliography at *SEG XXXVII* 984.

⁹ There is occasional evidence also of a second meeting, at mid-month: *IG XII.4* 206 μηνὸς Κα]ρνήου ἐκκα]ιδεκάται (Imperial date), 48 - - - ἐκκα]ιδεκάται (III B.C.). The problematic text is 101 (init. II B.C.), a deme decree voted on the first of Ἄλσειος, which ought to have conflicted with the national assembly.

with its various stops undertaken, and at Cos the next assembly meeting awaited. This interval between the two decrees, sixty to ninety days, seems reasonable.

The year: the Didymeia as a “crowned” festival is first seen at some date between 218 and 208 B.C., as delimited by our evidence about the games. Epikrates was στεφανηφόρος of Miletus in 217/6 (*Milet* 124.21).¹⁰

If this emendation is accepted, it gives us a fixed date for the elevation of the Didymeia. The Milesians’ request to the Greeks was voted in the spring of 216 and their θεωροί travelled during the following months; Coan Philinus was μόναρχος during 217/6; the first panhellenic celebration of the Didymeia was held in 215 – so year 2 of an Olympiad, which is consistent with other testimonies.¹¹ The cost is that at Cos we lose the immediate sequence Hippocrates/Philinus and thus the date of Hippocrates. But the order of events that emerges for the enlarged Didymeia is clear and coherent, and does not conflict with our evidence about the Coan calendar.

Kent J. Rigsby, 5840 S. Stony Island Ave. Apt. 3F, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
krigsby@duke.edu

¹⁰ These years reflect Michael Wörrle’s redating of Milesian στεφανηφόροι of this period, *Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos I*, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 428–448; followed by Rigsby (n. 5) 174–176; Habicht (n. 4) 309, 328.

¹¹ See J. Fontenrose, *Didyma* (Berkeley 1988) 69–70; Rigsby (n. 5) 175.