

"Persian" objects in classical and early hellenistic inventory lists

Autor(en): **Kosmetatou, Elizabeth**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica**

Band (Jahr): **61 (2004)**

Heft 3

PDF erstellt am: **26.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-47115>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

“Persian” Objects in Classical and Early Hellenistic Inventory Lists¹

By Elizabeth Kosmetatou, Leuven

The question of how to identify “Persian” or, more accurately, objects of eastern origin among offerings that are mentioned in surviving inscribed temple inventories, has occupied scholars for some time, and important studies debating this issue have been published to date. Most of these have focused on metrology, where the evidence allows it, but the reception of resulting theories has been mixed². A different approach involves a careful analysis of the nomenclature and description associated with certain objects, mainly drinking vessels, which are then compared to actual surviving finds in gold and silver from areas that were influenced by or came directly under the control of the Persian Empire³. Prosopographical studies of dedicants may also contribute to the classification of certain votives as foreign. This paper will review and evaluate the criteria that allow us to determine the eastern provenance of offerings in inventories from Athens, Delos, Didyma, and Samos dating from the fifth to the third centuries BC.

Even though a number of sanctuaries in Greece enjoyed a widespread reputation that exceeded the limits of the Greek world, the dedication of votives by foreigners, though epigraphically and archaeologically attested, remained an exceptional occasion⁴. In a famous passage Herodotos mentions lavish gifts offered by king Kroisos of Lydia (560–546) to various Greek precincts, focusing

1 Thanks are due to Professor Christian Habicht of the Institute for Advanced Study for granting me access to squeezes of the Athenian inventory lists during a visit to Princeton. Dr. Roberta Fabiani graciously provided me with the proofs of her forthcoming groundbreaking study on inscriptions in Herodotos. I should also like to express my gratitude to Professors Anna-Maria Biraschi, Gloria Ferrari-Pinney, Erich Gruen, Albert Henrichs, Dr. Philip Huyse, Professor Denis Knoepfler, Dr. Perikles Kondos, Professor Guido Schepens, and Dr. Christopher Smith for discussing with me various problems related to this article. Earlier versions of this paper have been presented to audiences at the Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies (Washington, D.C.) and at the Department of Classics of Harvard University whose input is much appreciated. In the end, I alone remain responsible for all errors and flaws.

All dates are BC unless otherwise noted. The author is a Fellow of the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research.

2 For cautionary notes see Harris 1995, 276–278; Harris 1997, 30–36; Miller 1997, 60–61.

3 Not all oriental votives are identified as such. A case at point is Cat. D 24 which lists two typically Persian phialai that are sometimes identified as βατιάκη καὶ φιάλη, while other inventories state that they were both βατιάκαι. Cf. also Cat. D 31 which is both described as a phiale with relief decoration of Persians and as simply embossed (καρυστή).

4 For a review of foreign-made objects that have been excavated in Greek sanctuaries see Buxton 2002, 35–40.

in particular on the votives he sent to Delphi in the tradition followed by his predecessors, Gyges and Alyattes. These dedications appear to have achieved the status of historical relics through the centuries⁵. Although scholars have mainly stressed the central role that oral sources played in Herodotos' reconstruction of the history of the Delphic sanctuary following his visit there during the 440's, his text nevertheless bears indications that some of his information may have come from written accounts⁶. To begin with, the Halikarnassean's report reads at times very much like surviving inventories listing the same types of dedications that were reportedly kept in Greek sanctuaries⁷. It certainly follows the format we know from elsewhere and displays the same inconsistencies, while its vocabulary is surprisingly familiar, especially in the recording of weights and of the exact location of a given dedication within a treasure. We hear for example of two large, apparently unweighed, gold and silver craters that were located in the cella of the Delphic temple, immediately to the right and left of the entrance respectively: τῶν ὁ μὲν χρύσεος ἔκειτο ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ εἰσιόντι ἐς τὸν νηόν, ὁ δὲ ἀργύρεος ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ⁸. The same clauses (δεξιᾷ εἰσιόντι – ἀριστερᾷ εἰσιόντι) is found in Herodotos' contemporary and later Attic inventories and is also echoed more than a hundred years later in the inventories of the Delian Artemision and Temple of Apollo. In the latter case, these clauses are associated with large vessels that were permanently mounted on bases, rested on the floor of the Temple of Apollo, and were counted annually but not weighed. Thus four cauldrons (λέβητες) were reportedly placed along the left side of the Temple of Delian Apollo in ca. 200, while ten silver phialai are listed as occupying the opposite side about two years later⁹. The vocabulary changed

5 Hdt. 1,46–55.92; Diod. 9,10,6; 16,56,6; Paus. 10,8,7.

6 On the oral sources of Herodotos' section on the Delphic treasures see H. W. Parke, "Croesus and Delphi", *GRBS* 25 (1984) 209–232; H. I. Flower, "Herodotus and Delphic Traditions about Croesus", in: M. A. Flower/M. Toher (eds), *Georgica. Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell*, BICS Supplement 58 (London 1999) 57–77, both of whom list previous bibliography. For a valuable survey of the use of inscriptions by Herodotos see Fabiani 2003, 161–185 which reviews earlier literature.

7 For a discussion of some inscriptions that were associated with Kroisos' dedications see Fabiani 2003, 167–168, although the author does not connect in her survey Herodotos's report on the Lydian votives with inventory lists.

8 Hdt. 1,51. In his discussion of a Lydian bronze crater at the museum of Vix-sur-Seine, Griffith has questioned the accuracy of Herodotos' report that a large crater such as Kroisos' could have been made of solid gold. He therefore proposed that the artefact was made of gild bronze. His theory has been convincingly refuted by engineers Blackman and Sawyer and lately by Buxton (who does not take into account Blackman and Sawyer). See J. G. Griffith, "Two Passages in Herodotus and the Bronze Crater from the Royal Tomb at Vix-sur-Seine (Chatillonnais)", *Festinat Senex* (Oxford 1988) 5–23; D. R. Blackman/J. Sawyer, "Croesus' Craters at Delphi", *OJA* 19 (2000) 319–321; Buxton 2002, 40–53, 61–82; D. R. Blackman/J. Sawyer, "Finite Analysis of Herodotus' Gold and Silver Craters" (forthcoming).

9 Cf. IG I³ 1455, l. 26 (ca. 430–404); IG II² 1456, b, A, l. 26 (after 341); IG II² 1486, l. 17 (late 4th c.); ID 372, B, l. 28 (200); ID 380, l. 67 (198?).

slightly after twenty years to describe a series of twelve and eighteen phialai that were lined-up on the right and left sides of the Artemision respectively (δεξιᾶς εἰσπορευομένων – ἀριστερᾶς εἰσπορευομένων). Another forty-four phialai were similarly placed near the ceiling of the temple (ἐν τῇ ὀροφῇ)¹⁰.

Of course, Herodotos may have purposefully imitated the structure of the recently produced Akropolis stone inventories in order to achieve optimal response of his Athenian readers and/or listeners who had presumably just become familiarized with them. However, further indications for the historian’s use of such texts are found in his record of the fate of Kroisos’ ex votos following a reorganization of the Delphic treasures after the fire which devastated the temple in 548/7¹¹. The sanctuary’s administrators, we hear, transferred Kroisos’ craters to the Treasure of the Klazomenians and to the Proneos of the Temple of Apollo. This move reportedly occasioned their weighing before they were installed in their new home, something that had not been previously attempted¹². As was the habit in other Greek sanctuaries, Kroisos’ dedications were not kept together; his four silver pithoi were stored in the Treasure of the Corinthians. His extraordinary gift also included, among other things, two lustral basins (περιορραντήρια) made of gold and silver respectively, a gold lion weighing 10 talents, a gold statue of a woman that was slightly under life-size, miscellaneous votives including electrum “bricks”, vessels, and jewellery¹³. Direct and indirect references are made to inscriptions; the weight of the gold and silver lustral basins was inscribed (τῶν τῷ χρυσέῳ ἐπιγέγραται), a detail which is reported in later inventory lists from Athens and, especially, Delos¹⁴. We also hear that a

- 10 ID 442, B, l. 212 (179); ID 443, B, l. 136 (178); ID 444, B, l. 56 (177). For a discussion of clauses indicating the precise location of specific objects in the Delian Temple of Apollo see J. Tréheux, “Une nouvelle lecture des inventaires”, in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel en l’honneur de Jacques Tréheux* (Neuchâtel 1988) 31–35.
- 11 For an overview of the phases of the Delphic temple and a review of the literature see J.-F. Bommelaer and D. Laroche, *Guide de Delphes. Le site* (Paris 1991) 176–184. As Lewis has convincingly argued based on epigraphic evidence, Kroisos’ silver lustral basin and crater were repaired again in the fourth century by a team of Athenian and Corinthian craftsmen, including none other than Nikokrates of Kolonos, a metal-worker who is mentioned in the Athenian inventory lists. See *FdD* III/5 48, l. 23–41; Lewis 1986, 78. On Nikokrates’ career through the Athenian inventories see D. Harris, “Nikokrates of Kolonos, Metalworker to the Parthenon Treasures”, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 329–337, who does not discuss the Delphic inscription and Nikokrates’ activities in that sanctuary.
- 12 The treasure’s administrators had apparently relied on the inscribed reference to the lustral basin’s weight, as was the habit later on Delos as well. Their change of policy was probably due to the fact that a number of votives were damaged by the fire and had to be reweighed in order to assess the amount of metal they lost. By Herodotos’ account Kroisos’ gold lion lost 2.5 talents of gold during the same fire. Cf. *Hdt.* 1,50.
- 13 For an analysis of Kroisos’ dedications and their reconstruction see Buxton 2002, 71–145.
- 14 For two out of numerous examples of references to inscribed votives see repeated references in IG II² 1492, A (Athenian Akropolis 306/5) and ID 1544, Aa, l. 41–42 (Delos 145). Discrepancies between inscribed and actual weight of votives was noted on Delos. Cf. ID 104, l. 39–41 (364/3);

local Lakedaïmonian sympathizer, in all likelihood somehow connected to the temple administration¹⁵, even tried to give credit to the Spartans for Kroisos' gold lustral basin by forging its dedicatory inscription¹⁶.

Yet, a more tangible piece of evidence points to the existence of inventories that may have been made available to Herodotos during his visit to Delphi. In his discussion and reconstruction of Kroisos' silver crater on the basis of surviving finds, Griffith convincingly argued that the artefact in question could not have had the capacity of 600 amphoras that Herodotos transmits. If such were the case Griffith calculated the vessel's weight at about 160 kg, its height at 3.5 m, its overall size and dimensions making it impossible to fit through the door of the temple. He therefore suggested that Herodotos' text had been corrupted there due to a scribe's, and that the vessel in question had the capacity of 60 amphoras. Blackman and Sawyer agreed that there was probably an error in the Halikarnassean historian's text but questioned whether a scribe could have mistakenly copied ἑξακοσίους instead of ἑξήκοντα, offering instead a more plausible explanation. According to their theory the weight amounts were originally written in numerals rather than in full, and the scribe probably confused ϞΔ for ϞΗ¹⁷. Confusion with numerals may indeed explain the problem, but it is unclear whether the mistake occurred while a scribe copied Herodotos' report or long before, when the historian himself consulted the sanctuary's archives. We do not know whether Herodotos and his copyists wrote amounts in full or in the form of numerals, but there is evidence that weight amounts in inventory lists were mostly expressed in numerals, and mistakes sometimes occurred due to copyist or letter-cutter's error¹⁸.

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 109 (278). On the weight of votives in the late inventories of Athena see D. M. Lewis, "The Last Inventories of Athena", in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux* (Neuchâtel 1988) 301.

15 Herodotos refrains from mentioning the name of this individual although he clearly states that his identity was known to him. A possible motive may lie in a presumed agreement that he made with the temple administration in exchange for their granting him privileged access to their archives and treasure holdings for his research. Besides that, it is hard to imagine that anyone would have had access to the precious dedications kept in the Delphic treasury and consequently the opportunity to meddle with them to such an extent.

16 Hdt. 1,52,21; cf. 8,122; F. Prontera, "Gli Alcmeonidi a Delfi: un' ipotesi su Erodoto I, 51, 3–4", *RA* n.s. (1981) 253–258; Fabiani 2003, 168.

17 Cf. n. 6. Buxton, whose valuable discussion of Kroisos' dedications is not informed by Blackman and Sawyer, independently accepts Herodotos' transmission of the enormous silver amphora of a capacity of 600 amphoras. She cites, among other examples, Kallixenos' later report of a similar vessel, as well as an even larger *askos*, that were both paraded in the early third century by Ptolemy II Philadelphos. Cf. Athen. 5,199b–c; E. E. Rice, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford 1983) 13, 71, 71; Buxton 2002, 100–101, 180–183. There is little doubt that the construction of such large vessels was technologically possible, but this still does not explain how Kroisos' krater could have entered the temple.

18 For one of numerous examples see ID 314, B, l. 115–119 (233 or 233 BC).

The fact that Herodotos took pains to reconstruct such a detailed history of Kroisos' votives suggests that, besides collecting oral reports from Delphi, he may also have taken the time to consult the sanctuary's records¹⁹. It is unclear whether these were inscribed on stone, or whether he was allowed to research the Delphic archives where annual temple inventories were presumably kept, in order to trace the Lydian royal *ex votos* through time. An inscribed version of the inventory commemorating Kroisos' lavish dedication may have existed for all to see, as it is unlikely that everyone had access to the Delphic treasures. Herodotos' text certainly bears many similarities with surviving inscribed inventories from Athens and Delos, even though his sources may not necessarily date from the time of Kroisos. His reconstruction of the life of the Lydian king's votives in various Delphic treasures may largely derive from annual inventories that resembled closely their Athenian and Delian counterparts. However, the Halikarnassean's ultimate source, against which all Kroisos' *ex votos* were checked, may have resembled in form the Hellenistic offering lists from Didyma (ca. 320–70). Rather than recording the annual inventorying of the property of Apollo Didymaios, these lists were incidental and almost certainly provided incomplete information on the sanctuary's holdings in precious votives²⁰. My proposed reconstruction of a similar offering list commemorating Kroisos' piety is based on two considerations: First, part of Herodotos' transmitted statement reportedly made by Kroisos' representatives to Delphi seeking to consult the oracle on behalf of the Lydian ruler, may reflect the preamble of an inscribed inventory listing his *ex votos* for posterity: Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βασιλεύς, νομίσας τάδε μαντήια εἶναι μούνα ἐν ἀνθρώποισι, ὑμῖν τε ἄξια δῶρα ἔδωκε τῶν ἐξευρημάτων. This clause may be reflected centuries later in the letter of Seleukos I that was inscribed on the inventory listing his luxurious dedication to Apollo Didymaios. Like Kroisos, Seleukos I sent his gifts, including a sacrifice, to the sanctuary in 288/7, explaining the occa-

19 His text suggests that he also reported information from guides, but the fact that he discusses problems of attribution and even decides against oral tradition may be indicative of his research in inventories. On Herodotos' use of inscriptions see R. Fabiani, "Epigrafi greche", in: A. M. Biraschi/P. Desideri (eds), *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica*, Incontri perugini di storia della storiografia antica e sul mondo antico 12 (Perugia 2003) (forthcoming).

20 Dignas 2002, 237. On the purpose of inventories see studies by T. Linders, "The Purpose of Inventories: A Close Reading of the Delian Inventories of the Independence", in: T. Linders/G. Nordquist (eds), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985*, Boreas 15, (Uppsala 1987) 37–47; T. Linders, "The Purpose of Inventories: A Close Reading of the Delian Inventories of the Independence", in: D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux* (Neuchâtel 1988) 37–47; D. Harris, "Freedom of Information and Accountability: The Inventory Lists of the Parthenon", in: R. Osborne/S. Hornblower (eds), *Ritual, Finance, Politics, Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 213–225; Dignas 2002, 234–244.

sion for his dedication in a letter²¹. Last, but not least, by his own statement, Herodotos hints at some research on Kroisos' dedications which, though still vividly present in the collective memory, could not be easily traced due to the passage of decades and their perils in the Delphic sanctuary. The image of a scrupulous historian then sitting in an archive and reading carefully through the original offering list, before shifting through masses of dedications in later inventories, in order to trace each offering, is very attractive indeed²².

The identification of foreign objects in sacred treasures of the Classical and early Hellenistic periods, when distinctly Persian objects still carried Achaemenid associations, presents historians with a considerable challenge. Most votives are separated from their original context within a larger dedication lot, while their often vague descriptions do not allow us to draw conclusions as to their typology. Dedicants' names are not always given. Indeed, even Herodotos' text on Kroisos' Delphic *ex votos* does not provide descriptions, except in terms of size and metal, which may generate at best a mental slide-show among scholars that are familiar with Lydian style. Even so, the visualisation of these objects can occur in general terms only, since no reference to typology or any other detail of their appearance is given, and the only indication of their origin is their association with the specific dedicant, i.e. Kroisos.

Or at least this should be the case with most of the king's votives. A possible clue to the style of the silver lustral basin is offered by Herodotos' attribution of it to the craftsmanship of the famous Samian sculptor and metal worker Theodoros (mid-6th century). Herodotos' information does not seem to come from inventories, but rather from local hearsay (φασὶ δὲ μὴν Δεῖλοι). The historian evaluates and accepts this outside information, presumably based on the Samian's reputation as a great innovator in metal-working, and most likely given his own appreciation of Greek and oriental artistic production, the result of his familiarity with various styles, including Theodoros' own²³. Even though modern scholars do not have the benefit of viewing this magnificent lustral basin, its sheer size and the dates for both Theodoros and Kroisos certainly corroborate the Delphians' association of the artefact with the Samian's early production. We also know that Theodoros was a particular favorite among the non-Greek aristocracy and royalty: Athenaios mentions a magnificent gold crater that he made for one of the Persian kings, a relic that Dareios III cherished well enough to place in his bedroom a few centuries later²⁴. In the end of course, no conclusions may be drawn as to the style of Kroisos' lustral basin. Theodoros

21 IvDidyma 480 (= SEG 4, no. 442); IvDidyma 479 (= SEG 4, no. 470); Welles 1934, 33–40, no. 5.

22 Even though he may have obtained this information from a guide, one cannot exclude the possibility that Herodotos' report, according to which Kroisos' gold lion lost part of its gold during the fire, may have derived from his study of the Delphic inventories.

23 See also Buxton 2002, 146–165, especially 103–105, 152.

24 Athen. 12,514f.

was certainly Greek, but we cannot exclude the possibility that his work may have been influenced by oriental style and by such considerations as his client's taste and background²⁵.

The above analysis of Herodotos' text is indicative of some of the questions that historians strive to answer when studying inventory lists: How is it possible to identify objects of eastern origin, and what is the significance of their presence in Greek sanctuaries? What constitutes a "foreign" object? In truth, it is unlikely that we will ever answer these questions satisfactorily owing to the lack of physical evidence, but it may be possible to advance the discussion of this problem by placing it in its right context. In this respect, it is important to return to basics and attempt some definitions taking into account different parameters.

Eastern votives may indeed have been foreign-made, in which case they would have been presumably immediately recognizable as such because of their style and typology. Of course, one may wonder at the accuracy of classification, especially given the lack of art-historical discourse on the development of regional styles based on sophisticated methodology²⁶. Moreover, terms such as Persian and Mede were used interchangeably even though they represent two different ethnics²⁷. In this respect, it is equally unlikely that distinction was always made between what was Persian, Lycian, Phrygian, or indeed Lydian, especially after the conquest of the latter kingdom²⁸. In a discussion of the distinction between "Greek" and "Persian" votives one should also take into account the possible diffusion and influence of various styles during the acculturation process that was taking place in Western Anatolia. The recent publication of the Archaic painted tomb chamber at Kızılbél in Northern Lycia, to give only one out of numerous examples, shows how Greek and oriental artistic traditions, styles and iconography could coexist, blend, and adapt in that crossroads

- 25 Hdt. 1,51; Pliny *NH* 35,153; Pausanias 10,38,6–7. On Theodoros see C. C. Mattusch, *Classical Bronzes. The Art and Craft of Greek and Roman Statuary* (Ithaca 1996) 71–72; Buxton 2002, 103–105; E. Kosmetatou, "Vision and Visibility. Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiika*", in: *Labored in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus*, ed. by B. Acosta-Hughes/E. Kosmetatou/M. Baumbach (Cambridge, Mass. 2003) 204–206. All three review previous bibliography.
- 26 See for example Thucydides' discussion of presumed "Carian" finds associated with the Delian graves that the Athenians moved during their purification of the island in 426/5. Cf. Thuc. 1,8; 3,104. Modern excavations that have been conducted both on Delos and Rheneia suggest that the finds Thucydides refers to may have actually dated to the Geometric period. Cf. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1945) 106–108; R. M. Cook, "Thucydides as Archaeologist", *BSA* 50 (1955) 267; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1991) I, 30.
- 27 Herodotos uses the term "Medes" to refer both to the homonymous people that were conquered by Cyrus and to the Persians. Cf. Hdt. 1,130; 5,77.
- 28 Cf. Athenaios 11,784a–b, where a *κόρυς* is described as both Persian and typically Lycian, while modern scholars believe that the term is of Hittite origin. Cf. Huyse 2002, 223, n. 62. It is noteworthy that different ethnic groups are carefully distinguished in Persian art.

of cultures from very early on²⁹. Greek and oriental elements were also continuously bilaterally interpreted and reinvented by artists of various origins and backgrounds to reappear in media such as pottery and silver plate³⁰. Last, but not least, both the Greeks and their eastern neighbours could acquire objects foreign to their culture through trade and war³¹. Some of these were certainly dedicated at various sanctuaries and may have found their way to the treasuries of the Athenian Acropolis or Delos. However, the lack of information on style, typology, and dedicants allows only conjecture.

Nevertheless, a case can be made for the identification of a number of votives as oriental. The catalogue presented in the Appendix at the end of this article lists votives that have been conservatively selected out of inventories from Athens (Acropolis and Asclepieion), Delos, Didyma, and Samos³². It comprises items that are distinctly oriental, or which were presented to sanctuaries by dedicants of presumed oriental origin. References to types whose ultimate source of inspiration may have been oriental plate have not been included as many foreign elements had been adapted by that period, and it is impossible to determine whether the style of specific votives was Greek or oriental³³. Even though the evidence does not always allow us to draw conclusions as to the origins and occasion for the dedication of these listed objects, a study of the wording of all entries may lead us to classify them into possible war spoils and regular (non-war related) dedications.

War Spoils

Both Herodotos and especially Thucydides mention booty from the Persian Wars that made up a significant part of the Athenian budget throughout the fifth century and financed the reconstruction of Athens after 479, as well as a number of the city's military operations during the Peloponnesian War³⁴.

29 M. J. Mellink, *Kızılbél: An Archaic Painted Tomb Chamber in Northern Lycia* (Philadelphia 1998) 55–64.

30 Miller 1997, 65–72, 135–152. For a case study of the re-interpretation of Greek and oriental elements in Late Classical metalwork from Thrace see Archibald 1989, 12–25. Cf. also P. Th. Themelis/G. P. Touratsoglou 1997, 68–69, B 14, pl. 10, 71.

31 Cf. Menander *Shield* 34–39 (from Lycia); Miller 1997, 63–88.

32 Entries in the catalogue provide the best preserved or composite Greek text on the votives, a translation, and references to all annual inventories listing it. An asterisc next to a numeral suggests that the weight of a given votive fluctuates from stone to stone. In the case of votives listed in the Athenian inventories references are given to catalogue entries in Harris 1995 (H); Hamilton 1999 (RH); J. R. Melville-Jones, *Testimonia Numaria: Greek and Latin Texts Concerning Ancient Greek Coinage*. Vol. I: *Texts and Translations* (London 1993) [TM]; and Kosmetatou 2001 (K).

33 This group includes phialai with relief decoration that are described as ῥαβδωτή, ἐκτυπωτή, and καρπωτή.

34 Hdt. 6,113; 117,1; 7,61,1; 62,1; 64,1; 9,41; 80,2; Thuc. 2,13,3–5. Herodotos does not give specifics on booty but often underlines the splendor of Xerxes' army and the enormous wealth of the Per-

Various authors give accounts of Athenian financing of building projects in sanctuaries outside Athens and of victory monuments, all from Persian spoils³⁵. Given the Greek fascination with Persian silver plate and Herodotos’ reports on abandoned Persian silver cups, we would expect that a large number of Persian vessels were kept on the Acropolis alongside Persian bullion, furniture, jewellery and other luxury items³⁶. Yet, none of these objects can be traced with certainty in surviving inventories from the Athenian Acropolis which are notorious for their brevity. However, a case can be made for several items that seem to be peculiarly Persian, and which are listed in the earliest inventory lists dating to the second half of the fifth century.

Tracing the origins of the eight typically Persian straight short swords (ἀκινάκαι: Cat. AAc 1–3) which were stored in the Parthenon at least as early as 434, can only be an exercise in speculation³⁷. Cat. AAc 3 had an iron blade, which suggests that it had a utilitarian use. Cat. AAc 1 and AAc 2 were “gilded”, and the luxury that all eight swords represented brings to mind Herodotos’ descriptions of Persian noblemen that appeared to be covered in gold even when marching to the battlefield, and who reportedly also carried gilded swords³⁸. Miller has convincingly associated the ἀκινάκαι of the Parthenon with booty from the Persian Wars, and Harris is right to caution against linking them specifically to the Persian invasions of 490 and 480–479. The Greek-Persian conflict continued well into the century, sometimes culminating to important battles like the one that took place at Eurymedon (460’s)³⁹. It should also be noted that Greeks could get hold of such weaponry during their tenure as mercenaries in the Persian army⁴⁰. The fragmentary state of our evidence may not allow us to trace the adventures in time of these votives through the inventory lists, but their fate may be reflected in literature. Miller’s suggested identification of Cat. AAc 2 with the so-called Mardonios’ ἀκινάκης that Demosthenes reported stolen in the second part of the fourth century is

sians. See also the surveys by Thompson 1956, 281–291; W. K. Pritchett, *Ancient Greek Military Practices* (Berkeley 1971) 61–69; A. Giovannini, “Le Parthénon, le Trésor d’Athéna et le tribut des alliés”, *Historia* 39 (1990) 129–148; and Miller 1997, 29–62 reviewing previous bibliography.

35 For an excellent, comprehensive discussion of reports from literary sources see Miller 1997, 30–32.

36 Hdt. 6,41; 7,190; 9,83,1; Xen. *Kyrop.* 4,2,28. Cf. Miller 1997, 33–41.

37 The term Parthenon refers to the western chamber of the temple of Athena that is commonly known today as the Parthenon.

38 Hdt. 7,61,1; 62,1; 64,1; 9,80,11; cf. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 20,8,10; Miller 1997, 33. On this type of weapon see P. R. S. Moorey, “The Iranian Contribution to Achaemenid Material Culture”, *Iran* 23 (1985) 21–37; and S. Bittner, *Tracht und Bewaffnung des persischen Heeres zur Zeit der Achaimeniden* (München 1985) 199–207. See also *7000 jaar perzische kunst* 2000, 196–197, no. 110, listing a relief of a Mede with an ἀκινάκης from Persepolis and dated to the late sixth-early fifth century.

39 Miller 1997, 12–13, 30, 46–48; Harris 1995, 82.

40 Miller 1997, 100–101 reviewing earlier literature.

very attractive⁴¹. However, if his testimony is correct, we cannot accept Thompson's suggestion that the same object was moved at a later date to the Erechtheion, where tourists, among them a doubting Pausanias (ca. AD 160), could admire it as a relic linked to the same Persian general⁴². Assuming that the ἀκινάκαι attested on the Acropolis in the fourth century and then in Pausanias' time were actual Persian relics from the early fifth century, they could have belonged to any group of relevant attested or unattested objects in the inventories.

Fascination with Persian luxurious military equipment, including armour and weapons, survived in the Hellenistic Lindian *Anagraphe* which lists former, largely fictitious, dedications by mythological and historical figures and imitates the form of actual inventories. An ἀκινάκης set in precious stones was reportedly part of a lavish dedication by Artaxerxes (mid-fifth century) to the local sanctuary of Athena. His lot was supposed to have included his royal robes, tiara, and jewellery. Another, presumably gold ἀκινάκης is listed in the same inscription as a similar votive presented to the goddess by Artaphernes, Dareios I's general⁴³.

The presence of gold Darics and silver sigloi (Cat. AAc 5–10) in various Athenian sanctuaries is also difficult to assess, and we cannot associate them with certainty with Persian spoils. The term Daric could be vague, and it seems to have been used together with *croeseid* staters to indicate different varieties of oriental gold coins. Until recently it was generally accepted that the coins referred to in inventory lists and the ancient literature belonged to the royal-archer obverse type coins minted by the Persian Empire. Lately theories have been introduced associating the term with the old lion-and-bull types, as well as early Lydian electrum coins⁴⁴.

In our quest for oriental war spoils, Cat. AAc 11 and A 12, listing thirteen silver-plated feet for dining couches and one silver-footed stool, look more promising. Even though no other indication exists to link them to war spoils, their material argues in favor of such an association. Furniture, including stools and dining couches are included in the Acropolis inventories, but most of these seem to be utilitarian since they are not described in great detail. Made of wood,

41 Dem. 24,129; Harris 1995, 33; Miller 1997, 47. Demosthenes, perhaps exaggeratedly, states that this votive weighed 300 darics or about 2.5 modern kilograms!

42 Paus. 1,27,1; Thompson 1956, 285.

43 Lindos II, 2, col. C, l. 64a, 79a; cf. Dignas 2002, 240–241 which reviews earlier literature. For the latest study of the Lindian Chronicle see C. Higbie, *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past* (Oxford 2003).

44 On Darics see Hdt. 7,28; I. Carradice, "The 'Regal' Coinage of the Persian Empire", in: *The Athenian and Persian Empires. The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, ed. by I. Carradice (London 1967) 73–95; J. R. Melville-Jones, "Darics at Delphi", *RBN* 126 (1979) 25–36; Kosmetatou 2001, 32.

they could be easily used during the Panathenaia festivities⁴⁵. However, the use of precious metal for the feet of the specific objects, that had apparently been rendered useless by 434, points to Persian spoils that were presumably dedicated to Athena after the Salamis, Plataiai, or Eurymedon action. Writers like Herodotos and Xenophon describe in detail lavish Persian tents that were set up in military camps, and which were filled with gold- and silver-plated dining couches and tables. Studies of the ancient literature and Near-Eastern iconography show that the treatment of the legs of dining couches and stools was famously associated with the extravagance of the Achaemenid court⁴⁶. There is little doubt that Cat. AAc 12, a silver-footed *diphros*, is also of Persian origin; this or a similar object belonging to this type was reported stolen, along with “Mardonios” short sword, by Demosthenes. On the other hand, Harpokration and the Suda identify it with the throne of Xerxes on which he sat while watching his navy’s defeat at Salamis. The latter is certainly an unlikely attribution of legend given the fact that *diphroi* were rather modest seats⁴⁷.

Cat. AAc 20 lists a number of Persian gilded animal-head vessels (προτομαί, σαννάκια in Persian) and jewellery (ἵππος· γρύψ· γρυπὸς προτομή· γρύψ μέγας· λέοντος κεφαλή· δράκων· ἐπίχρυσα ταῦτα) that may have ended up in the Parthenon treasury as war booty, at least judging from the fact that they appear in the earliest inventories⁴⁸. Of course, there is evidence to suggest that animal-head vessels, though linked to oriental context, had nevertheless been adapted in the years between the end of the Persian wars and the carving of the first inventories⁴⁹. Griffins and snakes certainly belonged to oriental iconography, but lions and horses were also favorite themes for figurines, as well as animal-head and shaped vessels of which numerous examples have been excavated at various sites in the Middle East. Cat. AAc 20, dated to the late fifth century, lists a *protome*, as these cups were called, of the winged horse Pegasus

45 Excepting Chian and Milesian dining couches which were probably somewhat luxurious by Greek standards. Cf. Athen. *Deipn.* 1,28b. See also Harris 1995, IV 25–27, 29–31. That most dining couches were plain is only an assumption based on the fact that, despite the brevity of the Athenian inventories, their silver-plated feet deserve a special mention, while similar care was not taken in the case of other furniture.

46 Hdt. 9,80,1; 82,1–2; Xenophon, *Kyrop.* 4,3,1–2; *Anab.* 4,4,21; Athen. *Deipn.* 2,48d; Miller 1997, 53–55. On Persian-type furniture, its forms, and influence on Macedonia see S. A. Paspalas, “On Persian-Type Furniture in Macedonia: The Recognition and Transmission of Forms”, *AJA* 104 (2000) 531–560.

47 Demosthenes 24,129; Harpokration and Suda, s.v. On the typology of *diphroi* see A. Shapiro, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens* (Mainz am Rhein 1989) 31, pls 10–11.

48 Miller 1997, 144; cf. Harris 1995, IV 22 (= V 103) who interpretes most of these items as figurines. On σαννάκια see Athen. 11,497f; cf. Miller 1997, 144.

49 Miller 1997, 143, fig. 49, illustrating examples from Attic pottery, the earliest of which is dated to ca. 470 and attributed to the Stieglitz Painter. The vessel in question features a donkey’s head, and although it is held by an oriental figure, to judge from his attire, it has Dionysian associations.

which figured in the myth of Bellerophontes, a Greek hero with Lycian associations⁵⁰. Even so, fantastic winged animals were particular favorites of oriental artists, and at least one artefact such as the one described in Cat. AAc 20 has survived⁵¹. Following Alexander's conquests the Macedonians appear to have acquired a taste for these luxurious items which they used in symposia, as they are often illustrated in funerary painting, including the magnificent dining scene from Tomb III of Hagios Athanasios in Macedonia. Significantly, one of the participants, who may be identified as the tomb's owner, an apparent lover of luxurious Persian vessels, holds up a winged-horse cup⁵².

A possible indication for the association of certain dedications with war spoils may be the use of the epithet βαρβαρικός in their description. Indeed, the term usually referred to anything non-Greek and became synonymous with "Persian". Yet, none of the foreign, non war-related votives are described as such: Seleukos I's Persian wine-cooler (Cat. DI 5) was almost certainly part of Alexander's war spoils, a possibility that is further corroborated by the fact that it was damaged when the king offered it to Apollo Didymaios. Similarly, the otherwise unidentified Kleon may have been a mercenary soldier who offered Athena a phiale of bronze alloy, probably bronze mixed with tin, that he acquired during his adventures in the East (Cat. AAc 22). The same may be said about the Persian horse bridle bits (χαλινοὶ Μηδικοί; Cat. AAc 4) that had found their way to the Athenian Chalkotheke by 371/0⁵³. It seems that this type of dedication was not uncommon; Herodotos mentions a gold bit belonging to the wounded horse of the Persian officer Masistios that was dedicated on the Acropolis along with the dead warrior's corslet. On the other hand, Greek-Persian interaction in the late fifth and early fourth century and the Persian royal gifts that flooded Greece at the time may account for the presence of presumably bronze bits in the Chalkotheke⁵⁴. Cat. S 7 lists Persian curtains (παρά-

50 Harris erroneously interpretes this entry as reference to two separate entities, as she does with other ἐκπώματα, but Miller rightly observes that there is no grammatical reason to consider them separately. See Miller 1997, 144–145; Harris 1995, V 241; cf. V 240.

51 Cf. Boardman 2000, 184–187, figs 5.66 (a griffin *protome*) and 5.68a–d; *7000 jaar perzische kunst* 2000, 175–176, no. 101 (horse-shaped vessel); 181–182, no. 108 (gold bracelet decorated with lions), 184–185, no. 109 (*protome* of a griffin), 200–201, no. 113 (gold winged-lion cup). For an animal-head cup featuring a winged horse see Vickers and Gill 1994, 42, fig. 2.3.

52 Tsimbidou-Avloniti 1994, 235; M. Tsimbidou-Avloniti, "Ag. Athanassios 1994: Revealing a Painted Macedonian Tomb", in: *La pittura parietale in Macedonia e Magna Grecia. Proceedings of the International Symposium in Memory of Mario Napoli, Salerno 21–23 novembre 1996* (Paestum 2002).

53 Cf. J. Tréheux, "L'aménagement intérieur de la Chalkothèque d'Athènes: Études d'archéologie classique", in: *Annales de l'Est* (publiées par la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Nancy, mémoire n° 19; Paris 1958) 133–146.

54 Hdt. 9,20; 22,2–25,1. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* 1,2,27 on gold bits as Persian royal gifts; Miller 1997, 49.

πετάσματα βαρβαρικά) that were in all likelihood part of a military tent⁵⁵. On the other hand, Cat. S 1–6 list Lydian chitons that were presented to Samian Hera by private persons and are not described as βαρβαρικοί; at least one of these (Cat. S 1) was dedicated by someone bearing the very Greek name of Diogenes⁵⁶.

Seleukos I's Persian (βαρβαρικός) wine-cooler (DI 5) is also described as λιθόκολλος (set in precious stones), an element which excited Greek imagination in the late Classical and early Hellenistic periods⁵⁷. Indeed, gold and silver plate that was set in gemstones was especially in vogue in the Achaemenid court and the technique seems to have remained in use in the Hellenistic East⁵⁸. Plutarch (c. AD 50–120), drawing from an earlier source, mentions a περιτραχήλιον, Alexander the Great's gorget, and we hear that this was ὁμοίως σιδηροῦν λιθοκόλλητον (also made of iron, set in precious stones). In her study of necklaces from the Archaic and Classical period, Blanck argued that the term was transmitted correctly from Plutarch's fourth century BC source, and her theory is corroborated by information from the Athenian inventories listing a number of dedications by Rhoxane, Alexander the Great's ill-fated wife (Cat. AAc 15, 17–18, also AAc 24?). The Bactrian royal consort dedicated two (?) elaborate gold necklaces set in precious stones (περι[τρα]χήλια [χρυσᾶ λιθοκόλλητα |]), a gold rhyton, also set in precious stones (ῥυτόν χρυσοῦν λιθοκόλλητον)], and a second gold vessel that may have been an oinochoe⁵⁹. The date for the dedication is debated, but these precious votives were sent in a single dedication lot sometime in 323, just before Alexander's death. It is equally likely that some, if not all of these, made part of Persian spoils; according to our sources, Alexander sent such gifts to Greek sanctuaries, including Athens, on a number of occasions⁶⁰.

55 Cf. Hdt. 9,82 who uses the exact same phrase to refer to Mardonios' tent. Fascination for Persian military tents may have persisted into the early Imperial period judging from a relevant scene from the fragmentary frieze of the NE "Heroon" at Sagalassos (first c. AD). See E. Kosmetatou/L. Vandeput/M. Waelkens, "The NE 'Heroon' at Sagalassos", in: *Sagalassos IV. Report on the Survey and Excavation Campaigns of 1994 and 1995*, ed. by M. Waelkens/J. Poblome (Leuven 1997) 360–361.

56 On the Samos ἐξετασμός inscription see Dignas 2002, 239–240 listing previous bibliography.

57 Theophr. *On Stones* 35,2; idem, *Characters* 23,3,2. Cf. Athen. *Deipn.* 11,782a (quoting from Alexander's letters); Strabo 15,1,69. The most recent work on gemstones in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods is Kosmetatou 2003, 35–42 which lists previous bibliography.

58 For an example dating to the late Hellenistic period see M. Pfrommer, *Metalwork from the Hellenized East. Catalogue from the Collections of the Jean-Paul Getty Museum* (Malibu 1993) 188, no. 72. The phiale in question is made of gilded silver and bears a decoration of pentagonal or net pattern, each individual pentagonal framing a rosette-like flower with a garnet in the center.

59 Plut. *Alex.* 32,10; I. Blanck, *Studien zum griechischen Halsschmuck der archaischen und klassischen Zeit* (Stuttgart 1974) 15; E. Kosmetatou, "Rhoxane's Dedications to Athena Polias", *ZPE* 146 (2004) (forthcoming). For a plain bronze military περιτραχήλιον dated to the late fourth century see Themelis-Touratsoglou 1997, 84–85, B 46, pl. 19,95.

60 Arr. *Anab.* 1,16,7; Plut. *Alex.* 16,17–18; Plut. *Alex.* 25,2; Hyp. *Eux.* 24–26.

Non War-Related Dedications

Cat. AAc 13–14, 19, 21–23 can be associated with Achaemenid Persia for a variety of reasons. Some, like the Persian flute-case (Cat. AAc 17) are specifically described as Persian (Μηδική) in the inventories. Similarly, Cat. AAc 13 represents a peculiarly oriental luxurious robe made of soft material (ξυστίς) which was dedicated by the satrap Pharnabazos of Hellespontine Phrygia (ca. 413–370), whose interests led him time and again to a policy of rapprochement with Athens, especially after the Peloponnesian War. It involved, among other things, the bribing of Athenian generals and the setting of Greek petty politicians against each other, a standard practice of Persian foreign policy at the time⁶¹. Harris reviews Pharnabazos' involvement with the Greeks, especially his financing the Athenian admiral Konon's campaigns against the Spartans, and dates his dedication of the ξυστίς before 382/1, when the satrap became involved in the Persian reconquest of Egypt⁶². Even though the satrap's dealings with the Athenians continued after Konon, dating his dedication between 397 and 394, the years of the Athenian admiral's war against the Spartans is also plausible, and the lack of evidence from the inventories in support of this date may indeed be due to the chance of preservation.

The remaining dedications in the catalogue were presumably presented by private individuals and are interpreted as foreign because they are identified as such in the inventories. There is some undeniably oriental jewellery: two cylinder seals from the Athenian Asklepion and the Delian Artemision (Cat. AAs 1 and D 6), the former bearing an incised goat-stag. Next, two στρεπτά from the Athenian Acropolis and Delos (Cat. AAc 14 and D 1) are probably references to typically Persian twisted necklaces that were worn by noblemen and came below the neck, examples of which have been discovered during excavations and are also illustrated on reliefs dating to the Achaemenid period⁶³. Both were made of gilded silver, and at least one (Cat. D 1) was offered to the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos by Batesis, son of Babis, undoubtedly of oriental descent. Bracelets presumably belonging to the στρεπτόν type, to judge from descriptions of Cat. D 4, were identified as ψίλια or ψέλια (Cat. D 2–5). They seem to have been peculiarly Persian, twisted artefacts and appear frequently together with στρεπτά necklaces in literature, at least in the Classical period, especially in descriptions of the characteristic jewellery of Persian nobles. Ψέλια

61 Thuc. 2,67,2; 8,6,1; Xen. *Hell.* 1,1–2; 1,3,8; 4,3,10–12; 4,8,6; Plut. *Alc.* 31,1; Diod. 14,79,4–8; 14,81,4–6; 14,83,4–7; 14,84,3–5; 14,85,2–4.

62 Harris 1995, 230.

63 Xen. *Kyrop.* 1,3,2; 8,5,28; *Oikon.* 4,23; *Anab.* 1,2,27; 5,8. Cf. Miller 1997, 57, figs 34, 65; E. Kosmetatou, "Peritrachelion/Peritrachelidion in the Athenian Inventory Lists" (forthcoming). An example is illustrated in *7000 jaar perzische kunst 2000*, 207–212, no. 123. A στρεπτόν is not always reference to a necklace; it could also be a ring or a bracelet, as it becomes obvious in the various versions of the description of Cat. D 4.

disappear from the epigraphical record after the third century, and the term had acquired the meaning of generic bracelet (ἀμφιδέαι) by Late Antiquity⁶⁴. The term did not lose its “barbaric” associations through the centuries, however: due to its twisted form, an apparent particular favorite among non-Greek populations, we encounter it in sources from Polybios to Diodoros as part of the attire of Gallic soldiers⁶⁵.

Miller has interpreted Cat. AAc 16 as an onyx bead depicting an ithyphallic goat-stag and associated its iconography with Achaemenid art, or at least Achaemenid influence, citing Athenian use of the term to refer to Near Eastern iconography of fantastic animals⁶⁶. In attempting to visualize this object she identified it as an incised goat-stag on a large onyx, taking note of the difficulties presented by the votive’s description in the surviving inventory, and her interpretation remains tentative. A few decades earlier Woodward had suggested an unlikely new reading of IG II² 1388, B, l. 62–63 which is not supported by the text on the squeeze of the inscription that I have consulted. According to that scholar, the entry in question represents two items which formed perhaps one dedication lot: a gold goat-stag *protome* weighing 32 drs (ca. 135 gr.) and a large onyx. *Protomai* are mentioned in greater detail in the inventories of Didyma (Cat. DI 2–3) and are compatible with actual finds from Persian contexts, but in all known cases they are five or six times heavier than the goat-stag head from the Athenian inventories⁶⁷.

The large size of the onyx (μέγας) makes it a peculiar medium for an incised representation that usually belonged to small-sized seals⁶⁸. Reconstructing this artifact, however, proves difficult because its description does not constitute sufficient guide for its reconstruction. The term μέγας used in the inventories certainly referred to the size of its surface, and its weight, set at 32 drs, suggests that this was a very large gem, certainly not a bead: 32 drs are equivalent to 135 modern grams or 675 carats! A comparison with actual gems suggests that its

64 Hdt. 3,20.22; 4,168; 9,80; Xen. *Kyrop.* 1,3,2; 8,5,28; *Oikon.* 4,23; *Anab.* 1,2,27; 5,8; Plut. *Them.* 18,2; *Kim.* 9,3–6; Hesych. s.v.; cf. Miller 1997, 57. The Lindian *Anagraphe* lists ψέλια and dates the type from the Bronze Age to the fifth century. Lindos II, 2, col. B 70 (XI); col. C 66, 87; col. D 37.

65 Gallic women also wore it. See Polyb. 2,31; 5,3; Strabo 4,4; 5,4; Diod. 1,20; 3,4; 5,27.45; 6,6.

66 Ar. *Frogs* 937; Athen. 11,500d–e; Miller 1997, 56–57, cf. 143. On Persian influences on Greek style see also Boardman 2000, 170–174.

67 A. M. Woodward, “Two Attic Treasure Records”, *Athenian Studies Presented to W. S. Ferguson*, HSCP Suppl. 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1940) 387, n. 1; also discussed by Miller 1997, 56–57. See also Harris 1995, V 145 who does not take into account Woodward’s new reading. For a *protome* of a goat-stag which used to be part of an animal-head *rhyton* see *7000 jaar perzische kunst* 2000, 206, no. 118. The item in question comes from a fifth-early fourth century archaeological context, is therefore contemporary to the *protome* from the Hekatompedon, and is made of gilded bronze.

68 Cf. P. d’Amore, “Glittica a cilindro achemenide: linee di uno sviluppo tematico-cronologico”, *Contributi e Materiali di Archeologia Orientale* 4 (1992) 187–267; Boardman 2000, 152–174.

largest dimension could have easily reached 10 cm⁶⁹. Its decoration has certain oriental associations, and, taking into account the vocabulary used in its description, one may wonder whether the artefact in question was not an early cameo, even though there is no evidence for their manufacture at so early a date. Nevertheless, the technique of cutting a relief on stone certainly existed, and the lack of evidence for the production of cameos in the early fourth century, at least in the Achaemenid empire, may be due to the chance of survival. Cameos, along with other oriental products, certainly became in vogue after Alexander's conquests when the market was flooded with gemstones and artefacts from the East⁷⁰. However, given the lack of concrete evidence and the great uncertainty regarding the date for the earliest production of cameos this suggestion is only put forward tentatively⁷¹.

There are three criteria for the identification of gold and silver plate as oriental: first, we may consider that we are on safe ground when analyzing objects whose names are typically Persian. These include the βατιάκη or βατιάκιον (Cat. D 8–23; DI 1), a typically Persian or Lycian drinking vessel (phiale) which also occurs in an inventory, presumably of war spoils, reportedly found in Parmenion's letter to Alexander the Great that is preserved by Athenaios⁷². The two terms seem to have been used interchangeably; although the second one is in diminutive form it does not follow that it refers necessarily to a vessel that was small in size, as is obvious in Cat. D 18⁷³. The absence of βατιάκαι in inventories after the third century suggests that its Achaemenid style may have gone out of fashion in the early Hellenistic period.

Another peculiarly Asiatic vessel is the so-called κόνδυ, which occurs in the Delian inventories (Cat. D 25–28). It became a particular favorite with the Persians, but its etymology suggests that it may have been originally Hittite, and scholars have associated it with the wine vessel *kankur*⁷⁴. Its non-Iranian links were probably known to the Greeks: Menander describes it as a drinking cup that could be made of gold and was popular in Kappadokia, while Hesychius calls it βαρβαρικόν without specifying its origins any further, nor linking it specifically to the Persians. The historian Nikomachos reports that it had a globular body which gave it its name, and according to the astrologer Hermip-

69 My calculations are based on international conventions, according to which 1 carat equals 200 Milligrams, and 142 carats equal 1 ounce.

70 See Kosmetatou 2003, 35–42 where it is argued that cameos were produced in the Ptolemaic court at least as early as the first half of the third century.

71 See E. Kosmetatou, "On Large Gemstones", *ZPE* 146 (2004) [forthcoming].

72 Ath. *Deipn.* 11,784a; 393c.

73 This usage of diminutive is observed in other cases as well. See Cl. Prêtre, "Imitation et miniature. Étude de quelques suffixes dans le vocabulaire délien de la parure", *BCH* 121 (1997) 673–680.

74 Athenaios, *Deipn.* 11,55; Hesychius K 3497; Georgios Synkellos I,206,9f. (gest. 810/811); Frisk 1960, I, 911; Neumann 1961, 29; Frisk 1972, III, 134; Tischler 1983, I, 485; Huyse 2002, 223, n. 62.

pos, the term originally described a magic ball, a kind of proto-crystal ball of sorts used in divination, from which libations were poured⁷⁵. However, the archaeological record suggests that despite its associations with divination and astrology, its shape was common in Persian art already in the Iron Age⁷⁶. Athenaios’ text and the archaeological evidence suggest that a κόνδῦ was a deep globular drinking vessel without handles or base which could sometimes be confused with a type of κύμβιον bowl (cf. D 26–28). Such shapes were introduced in Macedonia after Alexander the Great’s death, as is obvious from MΘ 18169, a miniature globular beaker with a snake-shaped handle that was used as perfume container and clearly draws its inspiration from Persian vessels. The object in question was discovered in a secure late fourth century context in one of the tombs at Hagios Athanasios (outside Thessaloniki) in 1994⁷⁷.

Another group of vessels are not described as specifically Persian, but their typology suggests that they were of Asiatic origin. These include the much-admired animal-head cups and drinking horns (ῥυτά) which were the Persian vessels *par excellence* for the Greeks (Cat. AAc 19–22; Cat. D 24, D 31; Cat. DI 2–4)⁷⁸. The latter could be very elaborate, made of gold and silver, featuring one or more animal-heads at the bottom, and sometimes be set in precious stones (Cat. AAc 18). King Seleukos I dedicated a number of *protomai* to Apollo Didymaios which are referred to as παλίμποτα (DI 2–4). As Welles has suggested these were probably rhyta with no base on which to rest that could only lie on all sides, and from which one had to drink without laying them down. They were probably passed from hand to hand in banquets⁷⁹. The remaining vessels in the catalogue can be associated with the production of eastern workshops only on the basis of their reported decoration, assuming that they were not Greek adaptations of Persian products: Cat. AAc 23 represents a lot of six heavy phialai with feather pattern decoration. Cat. D 30 is described as an embossed phiale decorated with Persian faces in relief, examples of which have been discovered in Skythia and are obviously inspired by Persian examples⁸⁰. Last but not least, Cat. D 31 is reported to have a scale pattern decora-

75 Menander, Nikomachos, Hermippos, and Pakrates’ fragments are all found in Athen. *Deipn.* 11, 477f–478a.

76 7000 jaar perzische kunst 2000, 163, 168, no. 94.

77 Tsimbidou-Avloniti 1994, 233, fig. 4. Gulick translates κόνδῦα as beakers, but there are no indications in ancient literature that it had a pouring lip. Cf. Athen. *Deipn.* 11, 784a, translated by C. B. Gulick (LOEB).

78 On rhyta see Athen. 11, 497a–e; A. Zournatzi, “Inscribed Silver Vessels of the Odrysian Kings: Gifts, Tribute, and the Diffusion of the Forms of ‘Achaemenid’ Metalware in Thrace”, *AJA* 104 (2000) 686.

79 Welles 1934, 39, 350–351.

80 Cf. gold phiale from a mid-4th century archaeological context from Kurgan Kul’-Oba, near Kerç in the Crimaea, in: *Das Gold der Skythen und Griechen aus der archäologischen Schatzkammer der Eremitage in St. Petersburg* (Hamburg/Bonn/Köln/Stuttgart 1997) 163–165.

tion, and these patterns appear to have been particular favorites of oriental artists⁸¹.

One of the more intriguing objects listed in the Delian inventories is a golden vine, that was kept at the Artemision for at least 126 years and was never weighed, presumably because of its location or large size (Cat. D 7). It first appears in an inventory dated to 367, and its last mention is on a list of 241, but may have been much older. Nothing is known about its dedicant. Of course, the manufacture of floral ornaments, fruit, and, mostly miniature trees out of precious metals is known from inventory lists from Athens, Delos, and Didyma, as well as from the ancient sources. Actual examples of such ornaments have luckily survived, and these are pivotal in our attempts to visualize the magnificent objects that we only get to read about, but are lost to us today⁸². However, none of these objects comes close to the size and presumed splendor of the Delian vine.

The votive vine from Delos is the only known dedication of its kind mentioned in inventory lists, and it consequently raises questions as to its origins, date, and the occasion for its dedication. It does not appear to be associated with the cult of Dionysos and may have been part of a long oriental tradition, of which is indicative the fact that it features in mythology as a bribe of heros associated with the Trojan cycle. The genealogist Akousilaos from Argos (late 6th century) wrote of a legend, according to which king Priam of Troy bribed the hero Eurypylos's mother Astyoche with a golden vine, in order to lure her into sending her son as an ally of Troy in the war effort against the Achaians⁸³. This precious object was further associated with the myth of the abduction of Ganymed by Zeus and allegedly served as repayment to the youth's (and Priam's) father, king Laomedon⁸⁴.

The Persian kings seem to have been especially fond of such extravagances which they took over from the Assyrians. In particular, Herodotos mentions that a Lydian of immense wealth by the name of Pythios, son of Atys, gave a gift of a golden plane-tree and vine to king Dareios I and even funded Xerxes's war effort against Greece⁸⁵. It is unclear whether the golden vine that belonged to Artaxerxes, one of Xerxes's successors, was the same one, handed down the

81 See for example a deep bowl from the Rogozen treasure in Archibald 1989, 12–25, pl. 1.

82 H. Hoffmann/P. F. Davidson, *Greek Gold Jewellery from the Age of Alexander* (Mainz 1965) 288–294, nos 137–138.

83 Akousilaos apud Apollodoros, *Bibl.* 3,133 = FGrHist 2 F40. This myth is also mentioned by authors of the Roman period: cf. Apollonios (ca. 100 AD), *Lexicon Homericum*, p. 55, l. 32; Diktys from Knossos in FGrHist 49 F7a; Scholia In Homerum, *Odysseam* (scholia vetera), Book 11, hypothesis-verse 520.

84 Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, Vol. 1, p. 431; Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 190, Bekker, p. 152b; Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera), *Vita-argumentum-scholion schOr*, section 1391; Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera), *Vita-argumentum-scholion schTr*, section 822; Scholia in Homerum, *Odysseam* (scholia vetera), Book 11, hypothesis-verse 521.

85 Hdt. 7,27. Cf. Diod. 19,48,7.

generations of Achaemenid kings⁸⁶. It is equally difficult to determine the accuracy of later reports, according to which the Persian kings owned multiple plane-trees alongside what seems to have remained a unique golden vine, that may or may not have been relics from Persia’s glorious past. The geographer Agatharchides from Knidos (2nd century) furnishes additional information on this type of artefact in his description of the Persian throne room that featured a gold vine under which the Great Kings held court. He describes it as a large plant, whose clusters were made of emerald, Indian rubies, and various other precious stones, but his description may be related to the extravagant ornamental vine that Alexander the Great encountered in Dareios III’s private bedroom in 331, when he captured Persepolis. Whether this article can be identified with the one that Pythios gave to Dareios I more than a hundred years before, is only a matter of speculation, and if reports about the presence of such a piece in the throne room are correct, it is likely that there existed at least two⁸⁷. One should also bear in mind that vines functioned as favorite fertility symbols of the Assyrian and Persian kings for a long time, and, at least in the case of the Achaemenid kings, they may have been associated with tree-cults⁸⁸.

Various Alexander historians of the late Classical and Hellenistic period described a unique magnificent golden vine that was one of the most intimate belongings of Dareios III. Athenaios, citing two Alexander historians of the 4th century, Amyntas and Chares from Mitylene, describes it in some detail as indicative of the luxury of the Persian royal bedroom, which also served as treasure⁸⁹. It was jewel-studded (λιθοκόλλητος) and extended over the Great King’s bed. Amyntas adds that its clusters were made of precious stones (ψήφοι), a description with which Agatharchides also agrees⁹⁰. In referring to this artefact as well, the historian Phylarchos (3rd century) observed that extravagant though the vine was, its intrinsic value was insignificant when compared to the daily lavish expenses of Alexander’s court⁹¹. Nevertheless, this object became the stuff legends are made of; it later figures in Pseudo-Kallisthenes, as standing on an emerald table and was mounted on a gold base, its

86 Himerius, *Declamationes et orationes*, Oration 31,58; Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Codex 243, Bekker, p. 375b.

87 Agatharchides apud Athen., *Deipn.* 12,539d = FGrHist, 86 F3. Cf. also Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, Vol. 1, p. 148, l. 40. For a discussion of the texts relating to the golden vine of the Persian king see: P. Jacobsthal, *Ornamente griechischer Vasen* (Berlin 1927) 102–110; R. Vallois, *L’architecture hellénique et hellénistique à Delos. I. Les Monuments* (Paris 1944) 290–298, 427.

88 I would mention the famous Assyrian banquet relief, as well as the relief decoration of Indian king Maurya at Pataliputra, which may have been modelled after the Achaemenid tradition. Cf. Curtius Rufus 8,8,25; Hdt. 1,108. A tree-cult is probably represented on the so-called “seal of Xerxes”. Cf. Briant 1996, 246–249, figs 24a, 25.

89 Athen. *Deipn.* 12,514f.

90 Chares Mitylenaios FGrHist 125; Amyntas FGrHist 122.

91 Phylarchos FGrHist 81 F41 apud Athen. *Deipn.*, 12,539d.

branches reportedly covering both the table and its base, its clusters made of pearls, emeralds, sapphires, and rubbies. The description is further elaborated by the addition of birds of all kinds, including partridge, nightingales, and doves, that stood on each brunch and even sang!⁹² Water supposedly ran from the vine, and, when night fell, its clusters generated a star-rain and glittered, making it unnecessary to light the room with lamps. An odd choice of decorative object for a bedroom indeed⁹³.

The vine motif functioned as a Jewish symbol as well. Josephus mentions a gold vine in connection with the Sanctuary portal of the Second Temple in Jerusalem. Based on numismatic evidence Patrich plausibly suggested that it was supported by the portal's four columns, and that it was entwined on poles above the capitals. Its presence in Jerusalem is consistent with its eastern origins, but it held a special significance in that it symbolized the Jewish people. According to Strabo, when Pompey the Great arrived in Damaskos in 63, the Jewish king Aristoboulos sent him a large golden vine which weighed 500 talents and was known as *τερπωλόν* (delightful). Pompey dedicated it to the sanctuary of Jupiter Capitolinus, where Strabo saw it, inscription and all⁹⁴.

Patrich's reconstruction of the vine in the Temple of Jerusalem may help us to visualize its earlier Delian counterpart, even though any discussion must remain speculative. The Delian vine was kept at the Archaic Artemision which did not feature internal columns, but it may have been entwined around a wooden structure that rested on the floor or around one of the beams of the ceiling. This should also account for the fact that it was never weighed. Even though information on its dedicant is not available, one may argue that he or she must have come from a region of the Persian Empire, where there seems to have been a long tradition for such luxury objects. It is equally possible that this unknown worshipper may have been a Persian official of high standing, judging from the fact that these reportedly sent lavish gifts to Greek sanctuaries. The Persian Peukestas is mentioned in the Delian inventory lists from 279 to 234 BC, as the dedicant of a gold laurel wreath that was kept in the Artemision⁹⁵.

However, one should not exclude the possibility that the Delian gold vine may not have been dedicated by a pious worshipper. The votive in question belongs to a group of old relics, including the notorious Eriphyle's necklace, a

92 Pseudo-Kallisthenes possibly blends various traditions on Achaemenid and Persian-inspired precious objects. Curtius mentions a golden vine from the palace of king Maurya at Pataliputra bearing silver figurines of birds. Cf. Quintus Curtius 8,8,25.

93 *Historia Alexandri Magni*, Recensio L (lib. 3), p. 61, l. 6–15; p. 63, l. 9–14; p. 64, l. 20–25.

94 Josephus *Ant. Jud.* 15,395; idem, *Bell. Jud.* 5,210. J. Patrich, "The Golden Vine, the Sanctuary Portal, and its Depiction on the Bar-Kochva Coins", *Jewish Art* 19/20 (1993/94) 56–61. Cf. Strabo 14,34.

95 Not to be confused with the satrap Peukestas, general of Dareios III; cf. IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 53; Briant 1996, 258–259.

mythological piece that was associated with bribery and was kept at the Artemision until the second half of the second century⁹⁶. Various Apollonian sanctuaries lay claim on this artefact, including Delphi, and it is not inconceivable that, like fictitious Eriphyle's necklace, the Delian gold vine also had mythological associations: locals may have claimed that it was the actual vine given to treacherous Astyoche by Priam.

A number of scholars, headed by Lewis, attempted to identify Persian vessels among otherwise typologically unclassified votives of uneven weight that are listed in inventories. In a series of important articles, to which this paper cannot do justice, being different in scope, Vickers carefully analysed weights of vessels that are mentioned in inventories, as well as of surviving specimens⁹⁷. His principle was that metalware was made according to certain standards, and he therefore identified vessels of uneven weight as belonging to a foreign standard and hence as being of foreign origin. Persian gold pots are therefore ascribed to the daric standard, while their silver counterparts presumably followed the Persian siglos standard. Harris and Miller have rightly cautioned against pitfalls in Vickers' theory: first, it was not only the Persians who minted on a standard other than the Athenian; Greek cities of Asia Minor like Phokaia adopted a standard similar to the Achaemenid, as did Macedonia⁹⁸. An additional problem facing scholars is related to the range of the Persian and Athenian standards; sigloi are set at 5.20–5.49 gr. and later from 5.40–5.67 gr., and Vickers seems to choose the weight of the sigloi used arbitrarily within the available range in order to explain "awkward" weights as Persian every time⁹⁹. As Miller has shown, given the approximation of both the Persian and the Athenian standards, certain vessels from the Acropolis inventories, and Cat.

96 The earliest mention of it is in ID 101, l. 26 (367), the latest in ID 444, B, l. 43 (177).

97 Lewis 1986, 77; M. Vickers, "Panagyurishte, Dalboki, Loukovit and Rogozen: Questions of Metrology and Status", *The Rogozen Treasure. Papers of the Anglo-Bulgarian Conference, 12 March 1987*, ed. by B. F. Cook (London 1989) 101–111; M. Vickers, "Persian Gold in Parthenon Inventories", *Actes du Colloque sur l'or dans l'empire achéménide, Bordeaux, March 1989*, *REA* 91 (1989) 249–257; M. Vickers, "Golden Greece: Relative Values, Minae and Temple Inventories", *AJA* 94 (1990) 613–625; M. Vickers, "Persian, Thracian and Greek Gold and Silver: Questions of Metrology", in: *Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire. Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop*, ed. by H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg/A. Kuhrt, Achaemenid History VI (Leiden 1991) 31–39; M. Vickers, "The Metrology of Gold and Silver Plate in Classical Greece", *Boreas* 21 (1992) 53–72; Vickers/Gill 1994, esp. 33–54; M. Vickers, "Metrological Reflections: Attic, Hellenistic, Parthian and Sasanian Gold and Silver Plate", *Studia Iranica* 24 (1995) 163–185; M. Vickers, "Fifth Century Chronology and the Coinage Decree", *JHS* 116 (1996) 171–174.

98 Miller 1997, 60–61.

99 Harris 1997, 31. It is important to note that even the Attic standard could fluctuate, sometimes significantly, as can be seen for example in Attic weight coins from Pisidian Selge, Phoinikian Arados, and Ionian Ephesos in the second century, especially when compared with their Athenian counterparts.

AAc 22 in particular, can be interpreted as belonging to both systems¹⁰⁰. One should also bear in mind that weights and measures in antiquity were not set so absolutely as in our modern era of prototypes, and ancient scales were certainly not as accurate as our own. A study of the dedications in the Delian inventories suggests that weights could fluctuate from year to year, and this is why the sacred administrators of the sanctuary found it necessary to control all votives at the end of their term (cf. Cat. D 29)¹⁰¹.

Harris is correct then, at least in the case of the Acropolis hydriai whose approximate weight was 1000 drs, in supposing them to have been made according to the Athenian standard¹⁰². However, uneven weights associated with many vessels, including the ones that are associated with the Didyma offering lists (Cat. DI 1–5), cannot be convincingly explained as the result of approximation or damage. Despite the above-expressed reservations then, Vickers, Gill, and, more recently, Bresson's research on ancient standards on the basis of surviving inscribed inventories has merit, certainly shows promise, and consequently their theories deserve to be further developed¹⁰³. Alternatively, research may focus on the analysis of discrepancies in reported weights: objects may bear a certain inscribed weight, that presumably reflects a certain "foreign" standard, while temple administrators in Athens and Delos, using their own Attic weights and measures, may record substantially different numbers¹⁰⁴. Even though we may never be able to identify Persian votives with certainty, perseverance with the material and a careful analysis of the yearly descriptions and of fluctuations in the weight of votives may render important results. Questions on typology and provenance should also be addressed, and comparisons between recorded ex votos and actual finds are also of particular value in metrological research.

100 Miller 1997, 60, n. 152. Cf. also M. B. Wallace, "Texts, Amphoras, Coins, Standards and Trade", *Ancient World* 11 (1984) 11–13.

101 The only objects that can be studied in this manner are those which could not lose weight easily due to damage or theft. Pendant necklaces and wreaths for example could lose parts, but such destruction was unlikely in the case of phialai. Cf. IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 23 (249 BC).

102 Harris 1995, 276–277; Harris 1997, 36. Cf. also E. Kosmetatou, "The Athenian Inventory Lists. A Review Article", *Ant. Class.* 71 (2002) 196–197.

103 Cf. A. Bresson, "Unités de pesée et poids des offrandes dans les sanctuaires grecs", in: *La cité marchande* (Bordeaux 2000) 211–242.

104 See for example IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 108–109. Not every such reference suggests the presence of a "foreign" object, however, especially when discrepancies are insignificant. Additionally, the Attic standard, while dominant, was never the only one used in the Greek world. Many parameters should be therefore taken into account for a study of ancient standards and for determining which objects are not "Greek".

Appendix: Catalogue
Athens Acropolis (AAc)

Armour and Weapons

AAc 1. H IV 1; RH PA 8

ἀκινάκαι περίχρυσοι ΓΙ

Six gilded *akinakai* swords

Parthenon Treasure A (434/3–412/1)¹⁰⁵

IG I³ 343, l. 8; IG I³ 344, l. 24 (433/2); IG I³ 346, l. 59; IG I³ 350, l. 70; IG I³ 351, l. 9; IG I³ 352, l. 33–34; IG I³ 353, l. 56–57; IG I³ 354, l. 76; IG I³ 355, l. 9–10; IG I³ 356, l. 36; IG I³ 357, l. 62

AAc 2. H IV 2 (= V 1); RH PA 37

ἀκινάκης ἐπίχρυσος ἁσταθμός

One gilded *akinakes*; unweighed

Parthenon Treasure A (428/7–412/1)

IG I³ 349, l. 58–59; IG I³ 350, l. 79; IG I³ 351, l. 17; IG I³ 353, l. 64; IG I³ 354, l. 81; IG I³ 355, l. 18; IG I³ 356, l. 44–45; IG I³ 357, l. 70–71

Parthenon Treasure B (403/2–399/8)

IG II² 1373, l. 15; IG II² 1376, l. 16; IG II² 1377, add. P. 797, l. 26

Hekatompedon Treasure C (397/6–ca. 385)

IG II² 1394, l. 11; IG II² 1395, l. 27; Agora I 5363, l. 3

Athena Treasure B (371/1–367/6)¹⁰⁶

IG II² 1424a, col. III, l. 336; IG II² 1425, A, col. III, l. 268–269; IG II² 1428, col. II, l. 222

AAc 3. H V 2; RH AA 84 (AB 36)

ἀκινάκης σιδηροῦς τὴν λαβὴν χρυσὴν ἔχων τὸ δὲ κολεὸν ἐλεφάντινον περίχρυσον τὸ δὲ πυγλίον χρυσοῦν

An iron *akinakes* with a gold handle, a sheath of gilded ivory, and a gold pommel

Athena Treasure A (after 385/4)

IG II² 1413, l. 28

Athena Treasure B (374/3–after 330/29)

IG II² 1421, col. II, l. 27–30; IG II² 1424a, col. I, l. 77–80; IG II² 1425, A, col. I, l. 75–78; IG II² 1460, l. 12–15

AAc 4. RH AB 70

χαλινοὶ Μηδικοί

Persian horse bridle bits

Chalkotheke (371/0)

IG II² 1424a, col. I, l. 135

Coins

AAc 5. H V 60a; TM 136, 157; K 6

σίγλοι Μηδικοὶ ἀργυροὶ Δ

Ten silver Persian shekels

¹⁰⁵ On the organization of the Acropolis Treasures see Hamilton 1999, 247–277.

¹⁰⁶ Harris 1995, 82–83, lists this item under the heading *Hekatompedon*, although its last three occurrences are in an inventory of the Treasurers of Athena who do not specify the location of the votives that were under their supervision. Cf. R. Hamilton, “Review of D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion* (Oxford 1995)”, *BMCR* (1996) <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/1996/96.09.27.html>.

*Hekatompedon Treasure A (405/4?)*IG I³ 342, l. 11–12**AAc 6.** H V 60b; TM 159–165; RH HC 80; K 7

σίγλοι Μηδικοὶ ἄργυροὶ ΔΙ

Eleven silver Persian shekels

*Hekatompedon Treasure B (403/2)*IG II² 1384, l. 7*Hekatompedon Treasure C (ca. 400–390/89)*IG II² 1386, l. 15; IG II² 1387, l. 5–6; IG II² 1388, A, l. 43; IG II² 1390, l. 3–4; IG II² 1393, l. 23–24; IG II² 1389, l. 4; IG II² 1400, l. 19–20**AAc 7.** H V 57; TM 165–166; K 13

χρυσίου δαρεικοὶ τοῖν θεοῖν ΔΔΔΔΣΣΣ

43 gold Darics dedicated to the Two Goddesses

*Hekatompedon Treasure C (394/3–390/89)*IG II² 1401, l. 27; IG II² 1400, l. 43**AAc 8.** K 29ΗΠ⁹ Δαρεικὸ χρυσίο στατῆρες

105 staters of gold Darics

*Other Gods Treasure-Various sanctuaries (429/8)*IG I³ 383, l. 17–18**AAc 9.** K 37

στατῆρες χρυσίο Δαρεικὸ

Gold Daric staters

*Other Gods Treasure-Various sanctuaries (429/8)*IG I³ 383, l. 43–44**AAc 10.** K 61

<Ποσειδῶνος ἀπὸ Σουνίου> Σ Δαρεικὸ χρυσίο στατῆρ

From the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion: one gold Daric stater

*Other Gods Treasure-Various sanctuaries (429/8)*IG I³ 383, l. 110–111**Furniture****AAc 11.** H IV 28; RH PA 33

κλινῶν πόδες ἐπ'ἀργυροὶ ΔΙΙΙ

Thirteen silver-plated feet for dining couches

*Parthenon Treasure A (434/3–412/1)*IG I³ 343, l. 15–16; IG I³ 344, l. 31; IG I³ 345, l. 48; IG I³ 346, l. 66; IG I³ 349, l. 56–57; IG I³ 350, l. 77;IG I³ 351, l. 15–16; IG I³ 353, l. 63; IG I³ 354, l. 80; IG I³ 355, l. 16; IG I³ 356, l. 43; IG I³ 357, l. 69**AAc 12.** H V 118

δίφροι στρογγυλόποδες Γ ἄργυρόπος ἕξ

Five stools with turned legs, one with silver feet

*Hekatompedon C (397/6)*IG II² 1394, l. 11–14**Garment****AAc 13.** H V 51; RH AA 160 (= AB 282)

ξυστις ἦν Φαρνάβαζος ἀνέθηκεν

A *xystis* dedicated by Pharnabazos

Athena Treasure B (382/1–367/6)

IG II² 1412, l. 11; IG II² 1421, col. IV, l. 118; IG II² 1424a, col. III, l. 303–304; IG II² 1428, col. II, l. 143

Jewellery

AAc 14. H V 135; RH *HB* 38 (= *HC* 9)

στρεπτὸν περιχρυσὸν ὑπάργυρον σταθμὸν ϞΓΗΗΗΗ

A twisted (necklace?) of gilded silver; weight: 58 drs 4 obols.

Hekatompedon B (401/0)

IG II² 1386, l. 1–2

Hekatompedon C (398/7–385/4)

IG II² 1388, A, l. 28–29; IG II² 1393, l. 14; IG II² 1400, l. 14; IG II² 1407, l. 39

AAc 15. H V 141

[πε]ρι[τρα]χήλια [χρυσᾶ λιθοκόλλητα ἡ ἀν]έθηκεν βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου γυνὴ Ῥωξάνη Ἀθην[αῖ Πολιάδι· στα...⁷....]

[Two gold] *peritrachelia* [set in precious stones] dedicated by [the wife of] king [Alexander] Rhoxane to Athena [Polias; weight...⁷....]

Athena and Other Gods Treasure (305/4)

IG II² 1492, A, l. 54–57

Miscellaneous

AAc 16. H V 145; RH *HC* 104

ὄνυξ μέγας τραγέλαφο πριαπίζοντος σταθμὸν ΔΔΔΗ

A large onyx with an ithyphallic goat-stag; weight: 32 drs

Hekatompedon C (398/7–394/3)

IG II² 1388, B, l. 62–63; IG II² 1401, fr. d, l. 45

Musical Instrument

AAc 17. H V 190; RH *AB* 331

συβήνη Μηδική

A Persian flute case

Athena Treasure B (371/0–367/6)

IG II² 1424a, col. III, l. 337 (371/0); IG II² 1425, A, col. III, l. 270; IG II² 1428, l. 225

Vessels

AAc 18. [οἶνοχόην? χρυσ]ῆν ἀν[έθηκεν βασιλέως Ἀλεξ]άνδρου γυνὴ Ῥ[ωξάνη Ἀθην]αῖ Πολιάδι· στα: ΗΗϞΔΔΔΔ[...³.]

[A gold oinochoe?] dedicated by Rh[oxane], wife of [king] Alexander [to Athena Polias]; weight 290+ drachms

Athena and Other Gods Treasure (305/4)

IG II² 1492, A, l. 45–48

AAc 19. H V 358

ῥυτὸν χρυσο[ῦν λιθοκόλλητον δ? ἀν]έθηκεν βασιλ[έως Ἀλεξ]άνδρου γυνὴ Ῥωξάνη Ἀθηνᾶ [Πολιάδι· στα....⁸....]

A gold rhyton [set in precious stones, dedicated by the wife of] king [Alexander] Rhoxane to Athena [Polias; weight....⁸....]

*Athena and Other Gods Treasure (305/4)*IG II² 1492, A, l. 52–54**AAc 20.** H V 241

ἔκπωμα ἀργυροῦν Πηγᾶσου προτομή· τοῦτο Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέθεσαν Πολιάδι· σταθμὸν ΗΔΓΓΗΗ

A silver Pegasus-head cup; this was dedicated by the Athenians to Athena Polias; weight: 118 drs

*Parthenon Treasure A (405/4–ca. 400)*IG I³ 342, l. 14–16; IG II² 1382, l. 13–15**AAc 21.** H IV 22 (= V 103); RH PA 15

ἵππος· γρύψ· γρυπὸς προτομή· γρύψ μέγας· λέοντος κεφαλή· ὄρμος ἀνθέμων· δράκων· ἐπίχρυσα ταῦτα

horse, griffin, griffin-head vessel, large griffin, lion-head vessel, necklace with flower-pendants, snake bracelet, these gilded

*Parthenon Treasure A (434/3–412/1)*IG I³ 343, l. 11–12; IG I³ 344, l. 26–27; IG I³ 346, l. 61–62; IG I³ 349, l. 52–53; IG I³ 350, l. 73–74; IG I³ 351, l. 11–12; IG I³ 352, l. 36–37; IG I³ 353, l. 59–60; IG I³ 354, l. 77–78; IG I³ 355, l. 12–13; IG I³ 356, l. 39; IG I³ 357, l. 64–65*Parthenon Treasure B (after 390?)*IG II² 1380, l. 6–7*Athena Treasure A (385/4)*IG II² 1414, l. 22*Athena Treasure B (375/4–367/6)*IG II² 1426, l. 25–26; IG II² 1424a, col. III, l. 324–326; IG II² 1425, l. 252–254; IG II² 1428, l. 199–202**AAc 22.** H V 315; RH AB 44

φιᾶλη χαλκοκράς βαρβαρική ἣν Κλέων ἀνέθηκεν σταθμὸν ΗΓΓΔΓΓΗΗΗΗ

A “barbaric” phiale of bronze alloy dedicated by Kleon; weight 167 drachms 5 obols

*Athena Treasure B (374/3–367/6)*IG II² 1421, col. II, l. 46–47; IG II² 1424a, col. I, l. 95–96; IG II² 1425, A, col. I, l. 91–92; IG II² 1428, col. II, l. 118–119**AAc 23.** H V 341; RH AB 11

φιᾶλαι πτιλωταὶ ἕξ σταθμὸν ΧΔΔΔΓΓ

Six feather pattern phialai; weight 1036 drs

*Athena Treasure B (371/0–344/3)*IG II² 1424a, col. I, l. 29; IG II² 1425, A, col. I, l. 24; IG II² 1443, col. II, l. 135–136**AAc 24.** [χρυσοῦν λι]θοκόλλητο[ν ἀνέθηκεν – – – – – βασιλε. σ] Ἀλεξανδρο[ο – – –]

Something [gold] set in precious stones [dedicated someone associated with king] Alexander

*Athena and Other Gods Treasure (ca. 312/1)*IG II² 1479, A, l. 1–4**Athens Asclepieion (AAs)****Jewellery****AAs 1.** κύλινδρος ἔνι τραγέλαφος

A cylinder on which is represented a goat-stag

Aleshire 1989, Inv. IV, l. 122–123 (= IG II² 1534A, a, l. 99) (274/3)

Delos (D)

Jewellery

Bracelets

D 1. στρεπτός χρυσοῦς ἀλύσιον ἔχων ἀργυροῦν, ὃν Βάτησις Βάβιδος ἀνέθηκεν, σταθμὸν ἄγει
 ΔΔΔ ΓΗ

A gold twisted (necklace?) with a silver chain, dedicated by Batesis, offspring of Babis; weight:
 36 drs 2 obols

Porinos Oikos (ca. 367/6–342/1)

ID I 103, l. 65–67; ID I 104, l. 116–117; ID I 104–12, l. 96–97; ID 104–27, l. 21–22

D 2. ψίλιον ἀργυροῦν σταθμὸν ΗΗΗΗ

A twisted bracelet; weight; 2 drs 5 obols

Artemision Treasure A (367–353/2)

ID 101, l. 9; ID 103, l. 6; ID 104, l. 65–66; ID 104–3, B, l. 7; ID 104–12, l. 47

D 3. ψίλια ἀργυρᾶ δύο καὶ ἀμφιδῆ ἀποκεκλασμένη, ὅλην δραχμαὶ ϜΔΔΗΗΗ

Two silver twisted bracelet and a broken armlet; weight: 74 drs

Artemision Treasure B (ca. 300–275)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 19; IG XI (2) 162, B, l. 15; IG XI (2) 190, l. 9

D 4. ψίλιον χρυσοῦν στρεπτόν, ὅλην δραχμαὶ ΓΗΗΗΗΗΗ*

A twisted bracelet; weight 9 drs 5 obols*

Artemision Treasure B (279–242)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 26; IG XI (2) 164, A, l. 84; IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 57; IG XI (2) 203, B, l. 82; IG XI (2) 208, l. 17; IG XI (2) 219, l. 16; IG XI (2) 223, B, l. 16; ID 296, l. 39

Necklaces

D 5. Δημητρίου βασιλέως περιδέραια χρυσᾶ σὺν τοῖς φιαλίοις ΔΔΔΓΓ· ἄστατα· ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐκ τῆς
 σειρᾶς κρεμαμένων μειζόνων ΔΔΗΗ· τῶν ἐλασσόνων ϜΔΗ καὶ ψέλιον
 (Dedicated) by king Demetrios: 36 gold necklaces with phialai pendants; unweighed; number of
 larger pendants: 23; of smaller ones: 62; and a twisted bracelet

Artemision Treasure B (ca. 265–177)

IG XI (2) 261, l. 7; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 21; ID 296, l. 37; ID 298, A, l. 141–142; ID 313, A, l. 109; ID 399, B, l. 140; ID 439, c, l. 5; ID 442, B, l. 201; ID 443, B, l. 125; ID 444, B, l. 44

Signet Rings

D 6. κυλινδρῖσκος χρυσένδετος, ὅλην, ΗΗ

A little gild cylinder; weight: 2 drs 1 obol

Artemision Treasure B (279–after 249)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 48–49; IG XI (2) 162, B, l. 38; IG XI (2) 164, A, l. 70; IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 48; IG XI (2) 203, B, l. 67; IG XI (2) 208, l. 32; IG XI (2) 223, B, l. 26; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 26; ID 338, l. 17

Miscellaneous

D 7. ἄμπελος χρυσῇ ἄστατος

A gold vine; unweighed

Artemision Treasure A (367–353/2)

ID 101, l. 26; ID 103, l. 31–32; ID 104, l. 89–90; ID 104–112, B, l. 8; ID 104–112, l. 63–64

Artemision Treasure B (279–241)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 44; IG XI (2) 162, B, l. 23; IG XI (2) 162, B, l. 35; IG XI (2) 164, A, l. 87; IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 58; IG XI (2) 203, B, l. 83; IG XI (2) 208, l. 19; IG XI (2) 219, l. 17; IG XI (2) 223, B, l. 17; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 15; ID 295, l. 11; ID 298, A, l. 148

Vessels

- D 8.** βατιάκη Νικίδος ανάθημα ὅλη ἐκατόν
a *batiake* dedicated by Nikis; weight: 100 drs

Hieropoion (ca. 313–296)

IG XI (2) 137, l. 10; IG XI (2) 154, B, l. 17

- D 9.** βατιάκη Ἐπαρχίδου ανάθημα, ὅλη ἐβδομήντα ὀκτώ
a *batiake* dedicated by Eparchides, weight: 78 drs

Hieropoion (ca. 313–296)

IG XI (2) 137, l. 19; IG XI (2) 145, l. 55; IG XI (2) 154, B, l. 14

- D 10.** βατιάκη Δαδάμου ανάθημα, ὅλη ἐξήκοντα ἕξ
a *batiake* dedicated by Dadamos

Hieropoion (302–287)

IG XI (2) 145, l. 51; IG XI (2) 154, B, l. 34; IG XI (2) 155, fr. A, l. 13

- D 11.** βατιάκην ἀνέθηκεν Ἱπποκράτης, ὅλη τετταράκοντα τρεῖς
a *batiake* dedicated by Hippokrates

Hieropoion (302–296)

IG XI (2) 145, l. 56; IG XI (2) 154, B, l. 45

- D 12.** βατιάκη Ἱπποκλέους ανάθημα, ὅλη εἴκοσι δύο
a *batiake* dedicated by Hippokles, weight: twenty-two drs

Hieropoion (296)

IG XI (2) 154, B, l. 47

- D 13.** βατιάκη ἐν πλινθείῳ ἦν ἀνέθηκε Κλεαρχίς
a *batiake* on a base, dedicated by Klearchis

Eileithyiaion (278)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 114

- D 14.** βατιάκιον, ανάθημα (βασιλέως) Σελεύκου
a little *batiake* dedicated by (king) Seleukos

Prodomos of Apollo Temple Treasure B (273)

IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 8

- D 14.** βατιάκην
a *batiake*

Hieropoion (273–ca. 265)

IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 91; IG XI (2) 219, B, l. 66

- D 15.** ἐπὶ Κώκωνος βατιάκη, ὅλη ϞΓΠ (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)
a *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Kokon, weight: 55 drs 2 obols

Aphrodision (257–ca. 230)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 13; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 133; ID 298, A, l. 99; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 80; ID 314, B, l. 87; ID 319, B, l. 46

- D 16.** ἐπὶ Γλαυκιάδου βατιάκη, ὅλη [– –] (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)
A *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Glaukiades, weight: [– –]

Aphrodision (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 16; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 135; ID 298, A, l. 100–101; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 82; ID 320, B, l. 48

- D 17.** ἐπὶ Γλαυκιάδου ἄλλη βατιάκη, ὅλη [– –] (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)
Another *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Glaukiades; weight – – –

Aphrodision (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 16; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 135–136; ID 298, A, l. 100–101; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 82; ID 320, B, l. 48

D 18. ἐπὶ Χάρμου βατιάκιον, ὀλκή [– – –] (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

A little *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Charmos, [weight – – –]

Stesileian phialai (257–234)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 16; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 136; ID 298, A, l. 101; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 82

D 19. ἐπὶ Φίλλιος βατιάκη, ὀλκή ΔΔΔΓΗΗ (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

A *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Phillis; weight: 38 drs

Stesileian phialai (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 18; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 136; ID 298, A, l. 101; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 83; ID 314, B, l. 90; ID 320, B, l. 48

D 20. ἐπ' Ἀντιγόνου βατιάκη ὀλκή ΔΔΔΔΓ[.] (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

A *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) under the archonship of Antigonos; weight: 45+ drs

Stesileian phialai (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 18; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 136–137; ID 298, A, l. 101; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 83; ID 320, B, l. 49

D 21. ἐπ' Ἀρχεδάμα βατιάκη ὀλκή [– – –] (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

a *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Archedamas; weight: [– – –]

Stesileian phialai (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 21; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 139; ID 298, A, l. 103; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 85; ID 320, B, l. 51

D 22. ἐπ' Ἀρχεδάμα ἄλλη βατιάκη, ὀλκή ΔΔΔΔΓΗΗ (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

Another *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Archedamas

Stesileian phialai (257–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 21; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 139; ID 298, A, l. 103; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 85; ID 320, B, l. 51

D 23. ἐπὶ Θαρσύνοντος βατιάκαι δύο (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

A *batiake* and *phiale* (dedicated Stesileos) during the archonship of Tharsynon¹⁰⁷

Stesileian phialai (250–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 140; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 86; ID 320, B, l. 51–52

D 24. ἐπὶ Ξενοκράτους βατιάκιον (ἀνέθηκεν Στησίλεως)

A little *batiake* (dedicated by Stesileos) during the archonship of Xenokrates

Aphrodision (after 244–ca. 229)

IG XI (2) 296, B, l. 4; ID 298, A, l. 103; ID 313, fr. Ab, l. 88; ID 314, B, l. 96; ID 320, B, l. 54

D 25. κέρας ἐλάφιον σταθμὸν ΗΔΔΔΔΓΙ

A drinking deer-horn; weight: 145 drs 1 obol

Artemision Treasure A (364/3–353/2)

ID 104, l. 21; ID 104–12, l. 14

D 26. κόν[δυ]

A *kнду*

Unknown location (300–275 BC)

IG XI (2) 198, l. 4–5

D 27. ἐπὶ Τιμοθέμδος (...) καὶ κόνδυ, ὀλκή ^Γ

A *kнду* dedicated under the archonship of Timothemis; weight: 50 drs

107 The wording of this entry differs from stone to stone, the dedications being sometimes referred to as βατιάκαι δύο or as βατιάκη καὶ φιάλη.

Aphrodision (257/6–229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 14; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 134; ID 298, A, l. 99; ID 313, fr. ab, l. 81; ID 320, B, l. 46¹⁰⁸

D 28. ἐπὶ Φάνου (...) Ἴπποδάμα ἀνάθημα κόνδου, ὀλκή ΔΔΔ††

A *kondou* dedicated by Hippodamas under the archonship of Phanos; weight: 33 drs

Aphrodision (257/6–229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 24; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 142; ID 298, A, l. 106–107; ID 313, fr. ab, l. 89; ID 320, B, l. 55

D 29. ἐπὶ Φάνου (...) καὶ ἄλλο κόνδου Ἴπποδάμα ἀνάθημα

Another *kondou* dedicated by Hippodamas under the archonship of Phanos

Aphrodision (257/6–229)

IG XI (2) 226, B, l. 24; IG XI (2) 287, B, l. 142; ID 298, A, l. 106–107; ID 313, fr. ab, l. 89; ID 320, B, l. 55

D 30. φιάλη ἀργυρᾷ ἔκτυπα ἔχουσα Περσῶν πρόσωπα, Κτησυλίδος ἀνάθημα, ὀλκήν F ΔΔ††*

A phiale with relief decoration of Persian faces, dedicated by Ktesylis; weight: 72 drs

Eileithyiaion (278–ca. 170)

IG XI (2) 161, B, l. 115; IG XI (2) 164, A, l. 96; IG XI (2) 189, l. 5; IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 64–65; IG XI (2) 203, B, l. 88; IG XI (2) 205, B, fr. A, l. 3; IG XI (2) 219, B, l. 20; IG XI (2) 223, B, l. 35; IG XI (2) 274, l. 5; IG XI (2) 380, l. 83; IG XI (2) 385, fr. a–e, l. 85; IG XI (2) 424, l. 7; IG XI (2) 439, fr. a, l. 47; IG XI (2) 442, B, l. 50; IG XI (2) 461, B, fr. a, l. 56; IG XI (2) 465, fr. f, l. 3

D 31. φιάλαι ἀργυραῖ III· τούτων φιλοδοτῇ I

3 silver phialai, of which one scale pattern

Artemision Treasure A (367)

ID 101, l. 27–28

D 32. ὁ δωδέκατος ῥυμός, σταθμός μναῖ τριάκοντα· εἰσὶ δὲ προτομαὶ III, οἶνοχόαι IIII, λεοντόποδα III, λεοντίου κεφαλῇ·

Twelfth weighing lot; weight: 30 mnai; there are 3 animal-head vessels, 4 wine jugs, 3 lion-foot vessel stand, a lion-head vessel

Artemision Treasure B (278–274)

IG XI (2) 162, B, l. 2–8; IG XI (2) 164, A, l. 45–54; IG XI (2) 199, B, l. 32–38

Didyma (DI)

DI 1. βατιάκια τρία ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς προσόδου, ἃ παρέδωκαν Ἀθήναιος καὶ Αἰσχυλίδης, ὀλκήν ἄγοντα Ἀλεξανδρείου ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα μίαν

Three little *batiakai* from the sacred income, handed over by Athenaios and Aischylides; their weight: 151 Alexander drachms

IvDidyma 433, l. 16–18 (288/7)

DI 2. παλμπότων τραγελάφων προτομῶν ἐπιγεγραμμένων “Ἀπόλλωνος” ζεῦγος ἓν, ὀλκή δραχμαὶ τριακόσαι δεκαοκτὼ τρεῖς ὀβολοὶ

A pair of goat-stag-head vessels lying on all sides (without base), inscribed “of Apollo”; weight 318 drs 3 obols

IvDidyma 480, l. 37–40 (288/7)

DI 3. ἄλλο παλίμποτον ἐλάφου προτομή ἐπιγεγραμμέν<ο>ν “Ἀρτέμιδος” ἓν, ὀλκή δραχμαὶ ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα μίαν

108 The wording of this entry differs from stone to stone, the dedications being sometimes referred to as κόνδου and as κυμβίον.

Another deer-head vessel lying on all sides (without base), inscribed “of Artemis”; weight 161 drs

IvDidyma 480, l. 40–43 (288/7)

- DI 4.** κέρας ἐπιγεγραμμένον “Διὶ Σωτῆρι” ἓν, ὅλκῃ δραχμαὶ ἑκατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα τρεῖς τρεῖς ὀβολοί
One drinking horn, inscribed “to Zeus Savior”; weight 173 drs 3 obols

IvDidyma 480, l. 43–45 (288/7)

- DI 5.** ψυκτήρ βαρβαρικὸς λιθόκολλος ἐπιγεγραμμένος “Σωτείρας” εἷς, ἔχων ἀποπεπωκότα κάρυα ἑπτὰ, ὅλκῃ δραχμαὶ τριακόσιαι ἑβδομήκοντα δύο

A “barbaric” wine-cooler set in precious stones, inscribed “of Soteira”, missing seven “dates”; weight 372 drs

IvDidyma 480, l. 47–50 (288/7)

Samos Heraion (S)

Linen

- S 1.** κιθὼν Λύδιος ἔξαστιν ἔχων ἰσάτιδος, Διογένης ἀνέθηκε
A Lydian chiton with a blue fringe, dedicated by Diogenes
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 12–13 (346/5)

- S 2.** κιθὼν Λύδιος ἔξαστιν ὑακινθίνην ἔχων
A Lydian chiton with a light-blue fringe
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 13–14 (346/5)

- S 3.** κιθὼν Λύδιος ἔξαστιν ὑακινθίνην ἔχων
A Lydian chiton with a light-blue fringe
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 14–15 (346/5)

- S 4.** κιθὼν Λύδιος ἔξαστιν ὑακινθίνην ἔχων
A Lydian chiton with a purple fringe
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 15 (346/5)

- S 5.** κιθὼν Λύδιος ἔξαστιν λευκὴν ἔχων
A Lydian chiton with a white fringe
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 16–17 (346/5)

- S 6.** κιθῶνες Λύδιοι ἐξάστεις ἀλοργὰς ἔχοντες
Lydian chitons with purple fringes
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 27–28 (346/5)

- S 7.** παραπετάσματα δύο βαρβαρικὰ ποικίλα
Two multi-colored Persian curtains
IG XII.6.1 261, l. 26 (346/5)

Abbreviated References

- S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories* (Amsterdam 1989).
Z. H. Archibald, “Thracian Interpretations of Greek and Oriental Elements in Fourth-Century Metalwork”, in: B. F. Cook (ed.), *The Rogozen Treasure. Papers of the Anglo-Bulgarian Conference, 12 March 1987* (London 1989) 12–25.
J. Boardman, *Persia and the West* (London 2000).
P. Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1996).

- A. H. Buxton, *Lydian Royal Dedications in Greek Sanctuaries*, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, UMI 3082125 (Ann Arbor 2002).
- B. Dignas, "'Inventories' or 'Offering Lists'? Assessing the Wealth of Apollo Didymaeus", *ZPE* 138 (2002) 234–244.
- R. Fabiani, "Iscrizioni in Erodoto", in: A.-M. Biraschi/P. Desideri (eds), *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica* (Firenze 2003) 161–185.
- H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1960–1972).
- R. Hamilton, *Treasure Map. A Guide to the Delian Inventories* (Ann Arbor 1999).
- D. Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion* (Oxford 1995).
- D. Harris, "A Question of Standards. Metrology and the Parthenon Treasures", *Ancient History Bulletin* 11 (1997) 30–36.
- Ph. Huyse, "Sprachkontakte und Entlehnungen zwischen dem Griechisch/Lateinischen und dem Mitteliranischen", in M. Schuol/U. Hartmann/A. Luther (eds), *Grenzüberschreitungen. Formen des Kontakts zwischen Orient und Okzident im Altertum*, Oriens et occident 3 (Stuttgart 2002) 197–234.
- E. Kosmetatou, "A Numismatic Commentary of the Athenian Inventory Lists", *RBN* 147 (2001) 11–37.
- E. Kosmetatou, "Poseidippos, *Epigr.* 8 AB and Early Ptolemaic Cameos", *ZPE* 142 (2003) 35–42.
- D. Lewis, "Temple Inventories in Ancient Greece", in: *Pots and Pans. A Colloquium on Precious Metals and Ceramics in the Muslim, Chinese and Graeco-Roman Worlds*, Oxford 1985, ed. by M. Vickers, Oxford Studies in Islamic Art 3 (Oxford 1986) 71–81.
- M. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century. A Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge 1997).
- G. Neumann, *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1961).
- P. Th. Themelis/G. P. Touratsoglou, *Οι τάφοι του Δεσβερίου* (Athens 1997).
- J. Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar I*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 2 (Innsbruck 1983).
- M. Tsimbidou-Avloniti, "Αγ. Αθανάσιος 1994. Το χρονικό μιας αποκάλυψης", *Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και τη Θράκη* 8 (1994) 231–240.
- M. Vickers/D. Gill, *Artful Crafts* (Oxford 1994).
- C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (London 1934).
- 7000 jaar perzische kunst. Meesterwerken uit het Nationaal Museum van Iran in Teheran* (Milano/Wien 2000) [also available in French and German with the same pagination].

Correspondence:

Dr. Elizabeth Kosmetatou

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Afdeling Oude Geschiedenis

Erasmushuis

Blijde Inkomststraat 21

B-3000 Leuven

E-Mail: elizabeth.kosmetatou@arts.kuleuven.ac.be