

'MANNERS MAKYTH MAN' and KEEPING UP WITH THE PERSIANS  
Some reflections on cultural links in the Persian Empire

Christopher Tuplin  
(University of Liverpool)

Revised version: 9 June 2008

The purpose of the meeting (according to the web site) is  
*to explore how ancient peoples expressed their identities by establishing, constructing, or inventing links with other societies that crossed traditional ethnic and geographic lines. These cross-cultural links complicates, undermine, or give nuance to conventional dichotomies such as self/other, Greek/barbarian, and Jew/gentile*

In the Achaemenid imperial context this offers a fairly wide remit. But it is a remit limited – or distorted – by the evidence. For in this, as in all aspects of Achaemenid history, we face a set of sources that spreads unevenly across the temporal, spatial and analytical space of the empire. For what might count as an unmediated means of access to a specifically Persian viewpoint we are pretty much confined to iconographically decorated monuments and associated royal inscriptions at Behistun, Persepolis and Susa (which are at least, on the face of it, intended to broach ideological topics) and the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury archives (which emphatically are not). This material is not formally or (to a large extent) chronologically commensurate with the voluminous, but unevenly distributed, Greek discourse that provides so much of the narrative of Achaemenid imperial history. Some of it may appear more commensurate with the substantial body of iconographically decorated monuments (most *not* associated with inscriptions) derived from western Anatolia that provides much of the material in the two papers under discussion. In fact, of course, the problems posed by this material turn out to include just how commensurate it *is* with heartland monuments. Meanwhile, huge patches of imperial landscape provide little that is directly comparable – or that might be thought to speak unequivocally in some other mode of the establishment, construction or invention of links with the ruling power. In possession of a data-set that is globally not inconsiderable, we are still reduced to reading between the lines, trying to adjust for prejudice without knowing independently how great or mischievous it is, and engaging in speculative imagination.

Cultural linkage can take many forms. Median grass (lucerne) and white doves supposedly reached Greece as a by-product of the Persian Wars. The arrival of pepper or the peach is less precisely located, but each was associated with Persia, even if the ultimate origin was further afield. It is also rarely neutral. The way personal names are heard is affected by one's own norms (for example, Haxamaniš becomes Achaemenes under the general influence of Greek names ending in -menes and the particular interest of names such as Pylaemenes or Talaemenes),<sup>1</sup> as is the way things are seen: the fashion in which Attic vase-painters represented the military arm of the empire is an amalgam of reality and fantasy, a perspective on the enemy in which his cultural identity is partly – but only partly – dictated by an existing stereotype for a different (if distantly related) sort of foreigner. The single word of a poet can forge a startling cultural link: when Timotheus calls the royal entourage at Salamis a *panegyris*,

he turns it into a festal religious gathering – assimilating the unfamiliar to the familiar, but also inviting all manner of further inferences of fact and judgement.

The same sort of thing happens on a larger scale as well. Consider, for example, the expatriate Athenian Xenophon's belief that a fictive history of Cyrus the Elder was a way of analysing leadership that was relevant to a Greek audience. From one point of view, this is a stunning exhibit in the museum of acculturation – both a reflection of the impact of personal experience on an individual who had been exposed to Achaemenid stimuli and a piquant reaction to the prevailing character of the Greek-Persian cultural relation. From another point of view it is simply a version of the project of asserting intellectual control of an alien and dangerous space: even creation of stereotypes is a form of acculturation or assimilation (when Attic pot-painters fashioned Persian soldiers who amalgamated observation of reality with an existing artistic model for Scythians, they were linking the Persians into a Greek template); creating actual bodies of knowledge and points of reference allows one to comprehend – and to apprehend. Where Egyptians – we are always told – dealt with the problem of Persia by wishing it out of existence (if also celebrating their provision of doctors), Greeks dealt with it, not only by providing experts, including doctors (and dancers and diviners), but by investigation and description – and in the case of Ctesias both. The fact that some Greeks had never been effectively conquered made this easier, of course. The Jews, on the other hand, dealt with it by telling stories in which Yahweh gets the credit for Achaemenid power and Jewish figures manipulate Persian rulers and make them look a little silly. There is an element of that in the Greek tradition (as there is in the story about the Heliopolis priests getting away with contrasting Darius with Sesostris to the former's disadvantage – if that *is* an Egyptian rather than a Greek story), but on the whole the Jewish approach lies somewhere between the Egyptian and Greek – as perhaps befits the distinct nature of the Jewish politico-historical experience of Persian rule.

At the same time it has recently been suggested that incorporation of Cyrus into the cosmic plans of Yahweh or Marduk in Deutero-Isaiah and the Cyrus Cylinder is not so different from the diviner Onomacritus' selection of literary Greek oracles to demonstrate the necessity and viability of a Persian invasion of Greece, and that Xerxes' sacrifice at Ilium and alleged interest in Protesilaus go alongside the opening chapters of Herodotus' *Histories*, yielding the conclusion that Persians appropriated Greek literature for pragmatic political purposes. The association of the "Ethiopian" Memnon with Susa (and thus the Achaemenid state) presumably comes from a similar background – and engendered a spin-off in which the Eteocypriot Amathusians asserted a special link with Persians by connecting themselves with Ethiopia. In a similar vein we find elsewhere in Herodotus two different ways in which Persians linked themselves with Perseus, who was either an Assyrian who became Greek or the father of the Persians' eponymous ancestor Perses.<sup>2</sup> Further reflections may be seen in the use of *Perseidai* to describe the Persians in a Delphic Oracle (Herodotus 7.220) and Persian kings in Herodotus 1.125 and, in an ingenious interpretation of a fragment of Ion of Chios, to link the Achaemenid dispensation with kings of Sparta, specifically Demaratus. Once again this was not mythological game-playing for the sake of it: Persians wished to prove kinship with Argos for the purpose of political influence (Herodotus 7.150) – and for this purpose were even willing to acknowledge a version in which they were genealogically posterior to the Greek Perseus. It is hard to forget this

background when contemplating a Dascylium seal showing Perseus fighting the sea-monster or the figure of Perseus and Medusa on the tomb of Pericles of Limyra – though it is also to be sure exactly what message is being conveyed.

In any event, but especially in the light of the papers of Margaret Miller and Maria Brosius, the issue of cultural interaction in the context of the Achaemenid Empire is bound to induce reflections upon the method and character of Persian imperialism. As a scene-setting compare-and-contrast exercise one might begin with a vision of Assyrian imperialism expounded some years ago by Simo Parpola (in *Symbiosis*) – an imperialism based on a policy of systematically reducing semi-independent vassal states to the status of Assyrian province, involving destruction of urban centres, new building in Assyrian style, installation of Assyrian governor and garrisons, imposition of uniform taxation, weights & measures, military conscription, language (Aramaic) and cults (Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty requires vassals to accept Aššur as their god; and the regular reference to erection of images of gods and of Kings implies emperor cult). This process turned provincial inhabitants into Assyrian citizens, whose economic environment was organised to satisfy Assyrian requirements and who were directly ruled by a governor established at an Assyrian court-in-miniature. The elite of this "citizen body" were a primary target in a strategy of assimilation; when they visited Assyria they were lavishly entertained; and their children could find themselves as quasi-hostages at the royal court, receiving an Assyrian education.

This is a rather extreme vision, but worth citing to illustrate the sort of thing that might seem to be implied if we speak unguardedly about Persianization or the wish of Achaemenid kings to create a Persian empire of happily assimilated subjects. I do not think it is an image anyone would readily buy whole as applicable to Persia (the governor's court-in-miniature plainly has Achaemenid resonances, of course), but I comment here on just two inter-related matters, citizenship and education.

When Miltiades' son Metiochus was captured by the Phoenician fleet in 493 he was honoured by the Persian King, and his children were (Herodotus says) "counted as Persians" – *es Persas kekosmeatai* (6.41). A similar phrase is used of the cities Cyrene and Barca counting as part of the Egyptian satrapy, so Herodotus is, in a sense, treating *Persai* as a formal category. This is perhaps as close as we are going to get to a concept of citizenship (I leave aside the implications of the notorious Constitutional Debate), and it may have an educational overtone – one notes immediately that it is Metiochus' children (still to be born at the time of his capture and so definitely in need of education) who are said to become Persians. Metiochus himself got a Persian wife, but was perhaps never a *Perses*. But, although Metiochus' children will have been Persian-educated, the idea of more general application of Persian education to children of elite subjects hardly figures: there *is* a story in Philostratus that Protagoras was educated by magi after his father Maeandrius had entertained Xerxes at Abdera in 480 – an experience that was the supposed source of Protagoras' agnosticism. But this is clearly a tale from within the discourse of Greek philosophical history: it *may* say something about perceptions of Iranian influence on Greek thought (though for that to be a source of agnosticism is arguably strange), but it is not likely to be a genuine reflection of a widespread practice of educating foreign children who are then going to remain resident in their own culturo-political setting. If anything, one's impression from the Greek sources that comment on Persian education is that it was – as the Metiochus story implies – a discriminatingly distinctive feature of the Persian experience, not

something lightly to be shared with outsiders.

There is one further incidental point: we are not told the names of Metiochus' children, or that Metiochus was ever called anything but Metiochus. The same goes for long-term defectors such as Themistocles or Demaratus. In other pre- and post-Achaemenid near Eastern contexts we hear of Kings bestowing new names upon favoured foreigners, but I do not recall any Persian example of this, and the various attested bits cross-cultural personal nomenclature (onomastic Persians with onomastic non-Persian offspring; onomastic non-Persians with onomastically Persian offspring; apparent Persians with non-Persian names, sometimes as second names; apparent non-Persians with Persian names) must be assumed to involve people taking names or bestowing them on children on their own cognisance: this will apply equally to Persian and non-Persian names appearing in contexts where they seem out of place; and both phenomena show no more than that the attitude of Persians to (some) subject groups was not so systematically disdainful as to preclude mixed marriages or outlaw name-sharing. But, so far as we can tell, the vast majority of people on both sides of the divide saw no reason to mitigate or modify that divide by their onomastic choices. (There is one slightly oddity, though: the onomastically Elamite population of western Fars seems unrepresented in the highest echelons of the Achaemenid state. Were they treated as foreigners, despite their position in the imperial heartland and their ancestors' importance in "Persian" ethnogenesis? Or did they take Iranian names? It is striking that rebels suppressed by Darius included men with Iranian names who took Elamite ones when proclaiming themselves king.)

Professor Miller's paper focuses in detail on a single marker of the adoption of Persian *mores* in provincial settings, the particular way of holding a drinking-bowl on finger tips identified by Xenophon as an aspect of Median etiquette. In Xenophon it is the servant who holds it this way, and the reason is to ensure that it is easy for the recipient to take hold of it (and perhaps to keep the servant's fingers away from the rim). Nothing is said about how the recipient holds it once it is safely in his possession, and the result can perfectly well be what we find on the Afirözü picture, where the servant hands a cup on three fingers and the banqueter grasps it more ordinarily. What the wider range of iconographic adduced by Miller adds is an indication that the banqueter sometimes in fact also held the cup perched on his finger ends. At the same time there is nothing *de rigueur* about such behaviour either from the servant or the banqueter: to my eyes, the banqueters on the Zurich seal and Aksakal and Ödemiş stelae and the servants on the Cavuşköy and Ödemiş stelae are at least straying away from pure finger-tip hold; and, among items not mentioned by Miller, the presence of finger-tip hold is at least questionable on stelae from Dereköy (Nolle 1992: S4) and Manisa (Inv.172: *Ep.Anat.* 2005), the Satrap Sarcophagus (side D), Myra Tombs Tomb 38 (Borchhardt, *Myra* pl.67) and 81 (*ÖJh* 2003: 212), the Nereid Monument (block 903) and the Merehi Sarcophagus (where the cup has handles as well). By contrast finger-tip hold *may* appear in one or other participant on the seal in *BHA* 2.192 (fig.21), the Uzbeemi sarcophagus (Kadyanda: *AA* 1968: 237 fig.45 – but in association with a rhyton: cf. the son of Manes stele), a Phellos sarcophagus (*ÖJh* 2003: 215), and Myra Tomb 9 (Zahle, *JDAI* 1979, nr.45). It is hard to know how much all of this says about lack of punctiliousness in the artists (not to mention the difficulty of being sure what one can see on photographic reproductions of damaged monuments) as against lack of perfect etiquette on the part of banqueters. But a combination of Xenophon and some

of the monuments does show there *was* a model of behaviour which one or both groups did not always live up to – and the decisive contribution to this conclusion from a Greek author writing a rather curious example of fictive history deserves explicit notice.

There is probably a larger discussion to be had about drinking in Persian culture and those cultures under its influence. There is the fact that, judging by the ceramic assemblage, people near the heart of the satrapal court in Dascylium had a great taste for Greek wine, something not equally demonstrable (on that ground at least) in Sardis. Or there is the contrast between the “refinement” of drinking etiquette that viewers are apt to find in the three-finger-tip hold and a strand in Greek literary evidence that pictures Persians as heavy drinkers in the “warlike barbarian” mould: Persians could be boors or sophisticates according to taste and proximity to their example and power. But what I would like to stress here is the relative modesty of the Persian element involved in the images with which Professor Miller is concerned and relative paucity of other Persian elements that these and other banquet images contain: almost everything we see is given by existing local custom. In particular, whatever the ultimate origins of the practice and whatever we make of Heraclides' claim that the Great King reclined at his symposia, the *kline* is not a new cultural import. It is interesting to contrast another repeated icon in a similar set of monuments, the horseback hunt. Whereas the banqueters on Anatolian and Sidonian monuments generally do not wear Persian clothing (Afirözü is an exception; and some think the Karaburun man has a *kypassis*), the hunters almost always do: the notable exceptions (so far as one can tell from available photographs) are the Payava sarcophagus from Xanthus, the Golgoi and Amathus sarcophagi from Cyprus (all of which have no Persian hunters) and the so-called Lycian sarcophagus from Sidon which has mostly Greek hunters<sup>3</sup> – of which the first is perhaps the most striking, given that Payava does sport what we are inclined to think of as Persian *parameridia* (i.e. rider's leg-guards).

Not all hunting need be “Persian” (consider an Aramaic text from Saryaydin in Cilicia in which Wašunaš records that he dined there while hunting - an inscription associated with an image of an armed foot-soldier), but these images may call to mind the perceived centrality of horse-riding in Persian culture, and perhaps even Herodotus' celebrated summary of Persian education: horse-riding, archery and speaking the truth. If so, that also draws attention to the fact that archery is *not* a feature of the relevant monument-set. If depictions of Persian-dressed horseback hunters are a sign of the actual adoption of Persian behaviour – and an adoption that this time has clothing implications – then it is still a selective business. To become an archer would be a step too far.

What about wearing Persian clothing, except for hunting? There are various images of Persian-dressed individuals in the west Anatolian iconographic corpus (servants; horsemen in processional and/or explicitly military contexts; occasional non-horseback warriors), but their ethnic identity is usually unclear, so they are not of much certain use in the present context. Neither, though, are textual sources. Persian clothing could figure among the gifts handed out by the Great King and one presumes that, if they were given to a non-Persian, the recipient was entitled to wear them – but hardly required to do so (especially if he was an ambassador from somewhere outside the empire). Herodotus says nothing about the dress adopted by people like Democedes or Histiaeus; but Pausanias and Alcibiades did dress *à la perse*, and

Darius III's mercenary general Charidemus was perhaps in Persian clothes at the time of his fatal quarrel with the King in 333. Was it all a matter of free choice? Alcibiades wore Persian clothes when trying to conciliate Pharnabazus (according to Athenaeus 535E) – but was this the consequence of, so to say, a tolerated programme of acculturation (he was also learning Persian) or did he just turn up one day with a new wardrobe? Could anyone do that? Eratosthenes is cited by Plutarch for a story that presumably implies the King might reward someone with villages and the right to use Persian dress – but perhaps Eratosthenes or Plutarch misunderstood. Athenaeus 30A reports that Themistocles and Demaratus were told never to wear Greek clothing again; Themistocles had Percote and Palaescepsis for *stromne kai himatismos*; and Gambreium seems to be Demaratus' hypothecated grant to enable this (*eis stolen*), though Athenaeus expresses himself slightly awkwardly.<sup>4</sup> This is a – rare? unique? – case of *obligatory* Persianization; and the story about Demaratus and the upright tiara (Plut.Them.29, Phylarch.F21) confirms that Demaratus actually wore Persian clothing. But is the case reliable – and extendable – evidence? There may be genuine misunderstanding about the hypothecation of income. There may also be something special going on in the Greek tradition (or even in reality) about two rather special "defectors". Josette Elayi seems to suppose that Phoenicians (or elite Phoenicians?) adopted Persian dress rather generally (this allows her *inter alia* to argue that the Persian chariot-borne figure on some controversial Sidonian coins is actually a Phoenician god, and permits the dynast-like figure of the Satrap Sarcophagus to be the king of Sidon). Not everyone will agree, perhaps, and the conclusion could not be casually applied elsewhere. Even optional adoption of Persian dress might be inhibited by cultural considerations. In the Hellenistic Egyptian Oracle of the Potter the "typhonist" representatives of disorder are called *zonophoroi*, belt-wearers. If, as Koenen claims, this term had a pharaonic history, it might have put Egyptians off dressing *à la perse*. Certainly there's not much sign of their doing so. (Djedherbes, son of Artam, is not a straightforward case, the clue being in his patronym.) As for western Anatolia, the message of the monuments must be that one might put on special clothes to hunt, rather as one puts on a special kit to play games. But the behaviour of individuals more closely associated with the exercise of power remains obscure: what was Pharnabazus' Greco-Phrygian sub-satrap Mania wearing as she stood in a chariot watching her mercenary forces capture cities for her Persian master – and was it the same as what she wore when visiting Dascylium to seek the goodwill of Pharnabazus' concubines and hangers-on?<sup>5</sup>

The issue of permission to Persianize is one that Dr Brosius raises in her paper. Perhaps it is part-answered by her vision of Persianization as a systematic but not consciously planned by-product of the practice of giving Persian gifts to non-Persian elite subjects. Certainly the view that Persianization was not a centrally directed policy is one shared by Professor Miller and, I suspect, most observers of the Achaemenid realm. Let me articulate some more observations on this issue.

Our sources do allege one notable exception to the principle enunciated by Dr Brosius (as being the modern consensus) that the Persians "deliberately left the cultural identity of their subject peoples intact", viz. the treatment of Lydia after the rebellion that almost immediately followed Cyrus' conquest: for turning a warrior nation into a crowd of effeminized music-playing shop-keepers (*kapeleuein*) certainly interfered with cultural identity, even granted that Herodotus elsewhere says the

Lydians were the first to be *kapeloi* – making the Lydians "teach their children *kapeleuein*" implies that the characteristic is to become much more widespread. It is hard to be sure how far the story betokens something genuinely different about the Lydian experience of Persian conquest and how far it is merely a somewhat disdainful product of purely Greek discourse about Lydian wealth and soft-living and its deleterious effect upon their Hellenic neighbours – discourse with roots before the Persian conquest. But it is certainly not the sort of thing we are habitually told about the effect of Persian conquest on subject peoples.

Now, a model in which a conquering power renders subjects intrinsically incapable of causing trouble seems quite sensible, and at least as sensible as the very different one in which it seeks to turn them into copies of itself – copies of something *ex hypothesi* capable of causing trouble. Of course, in a perfect form, the latter model involves creating a copy so perfect that there is no room for any wish to make trouble. But that requires a copy that is perfect in its acquisition of loyalty to the imperial idea but not in its acquisition of any special technical skills or mental attitudes that would be threatening if conjoined with the competitive urge that is always lurks at the heart of an imperial power: it is no use turning a bunch of foreigners into *Ersatz* Persians, if they then fight effectively in support of a pretender to your throne. In fact, if as an imperial ruler you want subjects to take on any of your own characteristics, it is ideally those characteristics that render them inert. One way of looking at the Lydian story (at least in hindsight) might be that that is what the Persians did to them. Although the up-front story in Herodotus involves a contrast between wealthy Lydians (who are fine fighters) and impoverished and unsophisticated Persians (who turn out to be better), by the time the Persians had themselves come to be seen as paradigmatic owners of ostentatious wealth, things might look different. But it does not quite work: failing to carry weapons, wearing chitons and cothurni, playing musical instruments, and engaging in trade (*kapeleuein*) – this is a natural summary of Persian manners, even if the result (they will be like women) matches one disdainful Hellenic representation of the Persian enemy (a type not actually *very* prominent in Herodotus). So, though cultural identity has been changed, one cannot confidently say (even metaphorically) that it is a case of Persianization.

When Greek sources do envisage such a thing it is characteristically the behaviour of a particular individual in relation to specific forms of behaviour – Pausanias with his clothes, bodyguards and Persian table, Themistocles learning Persian, Alcibiades wearing Persian clothes or the Argive Nicostratus setting up a table for the *daimon* of the King, because he thinks that is what "people at the gates" (the King's courtiers) do. In all these cases the individual is explicitly or implicitly seeking to impress / manipulate powerful Persians; the Nicostratus case, perhaps less familiar, is specially interesting because there is at least a vestigial suspicion that he has not perfectly understood the *mores* he is seeking to copy and exploit. If so, Persian observers will have been either outraged or amused. When people got it right, they may have been flattered. But that they cared very much is hard to demonstrate.

In the Hellenistic world Greco-Macedonian kings communicated in writing with the Greco-Macedonian *ethno-classe dominante* in Greek, and acquisition of that language inevitably (if not necessarily intentionally) became a skill worth having and a potential source of advantage. In the Persian empire Iranian kings (and other agents of the imperial system) were liable to communicate in writing with far-flung members of

the Persian *ethno-classe dominante* through the medium of other languages, notably Aramaic; and in the early decades of the empire, at least, at the very heart of the empire the administrative bureaucracy was conducted in Elamite. If the invention of a means of writing OP had ever been thought to have a potential beyond the writing of royal inscriptions (and I do not know that the existence of a single OP tablet in the Fortification tablet really proves that it was), that potential was not realised. The disjunction apparent in later Achaemenid OP inscriptions between the spoken Persian language of the time and the linguistic manner established in the early inscriptions (and the inability of scribes to deal with the gap) demonstrate the marginalisation of written Old Persian. This is a remarkable phenomenon, strangely (at least to our minds) at odds with the insistent sense of Persian identity that may appear to emerge from other sources. Darius' inscriptions figure the imperial project in terms of the conquests of "the Persian man" and "Persian spear"; the new royal city was called Parsa; however much power indigenous people had in one satrapy or another, there was a level above which (so far as we can see) one almost always only found people with Iranian names; in the Herodotean perception of things Persians looked down on non-Persians – and were more disdainful of foreigners the more distant they were from the Persian heartland.<sup>6</sup> That this disdain coexists with the view that Persians were keen to borrow from foreigners – clothing from Medes, breastplates from Egyptians, pederasty from Greeks – presumably means that such borrowing was a matter of sovereign appropriation rather than sympathetic assimilation. On that point one might compare a remarkable passage in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (4.2.33) in which Socrates takes it to be a perfectly familiar fact that "many" have been deported (*anaspastoi*) to the King because of their cleverness – evidence not only of a Persian desire to make use of the skills of their subjects (thus creating cultural links) but also of the perception that this was simply an aspect of the exercise of violent power.

If against this background and in a Near Eastern world in which the models of imperial power were provided by peoples who – so to say – "wrote" that power, the Persians created but then neglected a means of writing peculiar to themselves, we do have to conclude that insistence upon identity was subject to cost-benefit analysis: the empire had acquired too many non-Iranian subjects too quickly and the dynastic classes of Perso-Elamite SW Fars were too habituated to a differentiation between spoken and written communication from pre-imperial times for the project of re-tooling the linguistic environment to seem worthwhile. Written language was not part of the inherited sense of identity and the effort of changing that fact was not worth the candle.

But that that judgement might be made is certainly a sign that these are not a people driven by a need to force their cultural *differentiae* on others. The central iconographic and written texts of imperial ideology point the same way.

We are used to saying that royal inscriptions and the images at Persepolis and Naqš-i Rostam attempt to evoke the image of a peacefully ordered, unified and co-operative empire. That is true, so far as it goes. (The existence of over 50 seal-images of combat between Persians and Greeks, Scythians or Egyptians, in use in various parts of the empire, at least sometimes demonstrably by Persians, shows that there was a market for a more robust view of Persian military prowess; and a Tatarli painting exemplifies the sort of larger scene from which such seal-images might seem to be vignettes.) In any case, even in the heartland monuments, there is no doubting that the subjects are subordinate to the Great King; and in the Apadana composition the



representatives of the entire empire are balanced in space and presumably importance by representatives just of the royal court entourage. So, there is great inequality.

There is also diversity. The court entourage is (as a visual image) systematically divided between those dressed in riding costume and those dressed in robes – though in other respects it is homogeneous and lacking much internal status differentiation. The subjects in the lands of the empire are represented with clothing and other *Realien* (including their gifts) that mark them out one from another even if, in some cases, relatively subtly. The inscriptions similarly list subjects *in extenso* and globally make them representatives of many lands and many tongues. (The significance of this is not undermined by the fact that the lists do not draw as many distinctions as they might have done and employ somewhat culturally indiscriminating terminology – *Yauna* arguably being a case in point.) The same rhetoric is used in a description of the building of Susa that makes the palace a culturally diverse object symbolising the extent of the empire through the range of artisan skills and materials it contains. If that seems banal, it is worth contrasting, for example, the treatment of Khorsabad in Assyrian texts. The texts provide a lavish description of the city-project but say nothing about the sourcing of the component materials, save for (a) the Hatti-land plants for the Amanus-like park, (b) the Hatti-like bit-hilani style portico, and (c) cedars from Mt Amanus - in other words three references to a single area. Even the surviving official correspondence relating to the project, while revealing the involvement of at least 26 provincial governors, seems disinclined to mark the specialist craftsmen in any strongly ethno-cultural way (they are simply work-forces belonging to individual governors); and the materials we hear about are treated neutrally and pragmatically.<sup>7</sup>

An empire of diversity is not necessarily inconsistent with the project to assimilate some elements to the ruling power: after all, that diversity underlines the special status of the master race. Everything depends on whether members of that race see greater practical advantage – or other less tangible form of satisfaction – in sharing their supposed superiority than in keeping it to themselves. I suspect that the pace of initial conquest and the fact that it took in peoples with claims to cultural superiority of much greater historical depth worked in favour of what might unkindly be called a sort of triumphalist *apartheid*. Greek discourse about conquerors from a harsh homeland who were in danger of corruption – men with a simple code of riding horses, shooting straight and telling the truth – is perhaps a reflection of this. It is not a million miles from the rather unflorid manner of Persian royal inscriptions – whether it be the formulaic inevitability of Darius' victories in the Behistun text or the unadorned affirmation of skills and virtues in the same king's self-presentation at Naqš-i Rostam. Of course, rhetoric and reality are different things, and the new masters of Lydia, Babylon and Egypt were not merely simple men from the mountains; but they knew their own worth and perhaps had little reason to think they needed to increase their numbers beyond what was achievable by natural reproduction (with special rewards for mothers of male children).

Amidst the diversity of the Apadana subjects, there is (as several historians have observed) at least one element of uniformity, namely the bowls and other vessels that figure among the gifts brought to the king by a number of different delegations. The role these played in the larger system of imperial control is a matter of discussion: were they retained in the centre or recycled as outward-moving gifts? and was what is seen on the Apadana paralleled by processes at satrapal level? I do not propose to try to

resolve these questions, but I would like to draw attention to an observation of Isocrates: people who bring to kings clothes or worked metal or other things of which they themselves are short but the kings have plenty are not making gifts but engaging in business and selling things in a much more artful way than those who openly engage in *kapeleia*.<sup>8</sup> One cannot be sure how specifically he has the Achaemenid King in mind, but the passage articulates the idea of a *quid pro quo* for the relevant sort of gift-giving in rather striking fashion and one consistent with the King's contribution to the system being something more concrete than, for example, a general undertaking to provide protection. However that may be, these uniform vessels also still lead to diversity.

It is true that the objects in question are probably to be imagined as having been made in the various regions from which they are being brought, so that there is a system at work that makes it clear to people in a great variety of places that particular sorts of precious metal vessel are an appropriate gift for the King. It is also a system which allows for such vessels actually to be found in prestige settings in various provincial locations; so perhaps they are also handed out as gifts by the king and/or his satrapal representatives. The lack of uniformity arrives when one considers two other related bodies of material: (a) what might be called hybrid deviant vessels in the same material and (b) quite good copies (as well also as hybrid deviants) in the wrong material. Category (a) embraces vessels from the Lydian treasure and elsewhere that bring together elements of Achaemenid iconography in an entirely non-standard, even slightly bizarre, fashion. Category (b) embraces the reproduction of vessel forms in pottery: a particularly category found at Sardis has received special attention in this context, but the phenomenon is more widespread, and might be extended to include bowls unearthed recently in a ritual deposit Ilium (but also known from Dascylium and Aeolian Larisa) which are claimed to be ceramic copies of stone service dishes of the sort found in the Persepolis treasury. What both phenomena show is that the basic "standard" Achaemenid bowl has a significant status value but that nothing protects it either from reproduction in cheap material (for use by people who are not in a position to acquire the real thing) or from formal mistreatment (for use by people who evidently at least have the wealth that should in principle allow them to have acquired the real thing). So, even if certain types of vessel originating at the heart of the empire are being made in the periphery for the use of elite Persians resident there (both as vessels and as gift-objects directed to the local non-Persian elite), the result is a market in imitations and/or the actual extension of the "standard" category to include deviant members. This extension of the range of people using quasi-Achaemenid vessels is paradoxically a demonstration of the extent to which Persians are not interested in deliberate Persianization and rich or not-so-rich locals do not believe one has to possess exactly the "right" tableware in order to make a point about status or attitude to the prevailing political circumstances or (just) fashion. There is a *laissez-faire* attitude that may even betoken that disdain of which Herodotus spoke.

In any case, we should perhaps not invest drinking vessels with an excessive ideological weight. Xenophon writes in *Cyropaedia* 8.2.8 that there are bracelets, necklaces and horses that you can only have them if they are gifts from the king. I suppose he must have in mind some fairly specific types of the general commodities in question; but is it significant that those general commodities do *not* include drinking vessels? When later on (8.4.24) Cyrus gives Gobryas a horse and a gold cup, can that be construed as sign that cups (or *some* cups) join the category of only-from-king

possessions? Does Ctesias' report (F40) that ceramic cups are for those whom the king dishonours (*atimasei*) have any bearing? If we read this as saying that, unless the king honours you, you cannot have gold/silver cups, then it arguably puts the latter into the category of only-from-the-king possessions. But if the fragment is only about the etiquette of particular royal banquets – contexts where the tableware is used in some sense in the King's presence – no such conclusion follows. Drinking cups did strike the Greek viewer as a feature of the Achaemenid environment (*ekpomata* are often specified in lists of goods from Persian camps and the like), but this hardly demonstrates that every silver or gold cup is a royal gift.

It must also be stressed that the tableware mentioned above, standing in a fairly close if wayward relation to metropolitan models, is only a (small) part of the cultural mix, and only one aspect of such Persian imprint as there is upon the imperial provinces. In particular the deviant hybrid objects, with their syntactically irregular combination of (in themselves) standard Achaemenid elements, have few real parallels and need to be carefully distinguished both from the eclectic character of the art and architecture in the heartland and from the general run of material that normally enters the discussion of quasi-Persian monuments in the provinces.

In searching for signs of the impact of the Achaemenid on the material cultural environment of its subjects we naturally look for objects with a "Persian" imprint. In doing so we should be wary of adducing "style" as an indicator. The message of the seal repertoire of the Persepolis Fortification archive is that a broadly homogeneous population of seal-users active in a relatively restricted time and administrative context use seals of strikingly different style. The range of available choices and the selections made by particular individuals should not be thought of as simply casual and insignificant: it undoubtedly says *something* about the Persepolis environment that the so-called Persepolis Fortification style has a strong archaizing element and that Margaret Root can speak of the re-tooling of Assyrian tradition or that Gobryas can wield a seal described by Boardman as "virtually early greco-persian" (contestable terminology – but one sees what he means); and it is not impossible (but hardly to be proved) that items in so-called Royal Court style might have had a special cachet. But none of this says anything reliable about the ethnicity of individual users or their relation to the ruling power, and its only contribution to a discourse about acculturation is to suggest that representatives of that ruling power were not locked into a mind-set hostile to diversity. That is not a negligible conclusion and, given the culturally mixed ethnogenesis of the "Persians", the eclectic nature of some heartland monumental art and remarks already made above, perhaps not entirely surprising. But when we look at the seal or bulla evidence from Dascylium or Gordium or Sardis or Memphis or a recently revealed find at Dülük Bab Tepesi on the road from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean – each set of which displays its own pattern of stylistic variety – does it authorize anything stronger than the *negative* conclusion that we cannot rule out the possibility that all the seals involved were wielded by Iranian officials? When we do not (as we do at Persepolis) have the documents that went with the seals we cannot in the end *know* anything about who used the latter. So – always allowing that the dichotomy may be somewhat artificial (since style and content can have exclusive associations) – we do best to focus on content (where there is an iconography to be assessed) and form (where there is not). This does have the disadvantage that it is much less difficult to talk about the engagement of provincials with Achaemenid content or form (because

the Achaemenid content is, so to say, "out of place") than about the engagement of those Iranian imperial agents who found themselves in provincial regions with local content or form (because the user is apt to be invisible and the content locally unremarkable): we simply cannot know, for example, whether an Iranian official might have used the Dascylium seal that shows a combat between two Greeks.<sup>9</sup> So our sense of the acculturation process is liable to be skewed.

Instead, then, of talking about Greco-Persian monuments or the role of Royal Court style, we should be clear that we are searching for (a) monuments that show visible Persian *Realien*, (b) monuments that show activities that may reflect distinctively Persian behaviour, and (c) monuments that resonate with the content of Persian iconography. These are overlapping categories; and both (b) and (c) might occur without any visible Persian element being present – provoking difficult questions. But the key criterion is whether the object in question could have existed if the Persian imperial state had not.

It used to be commonplace to say that the Persian imperial state was remarkably invisible in the material record. In recent years the rhetoric has turned around to some degree and scholars are liable to insist upon how much more visible it is (if sometimes through a glass darkly) than we used to think. Fair enough. But I think it still needs stressing that the imprint is globally modest and locally variable and that we have to figure out its relative impact within particular cultural environments.

The Persian imprint is actually more modest than some traditional terminology would suggest. People still speak of "Persian" bowls from Palestine or the "Persian robe" sported by certain Egyptian dignitaries. These are misnomers: Persian bowls may be common in the period but they are not intrinsically Persian, and the Persian robe not only existed before the Persian era but does not look at all Persian. (It is something of a mystery to me why the terminology ever arose.) The case of the terracotta "Persian" riders from Levantine and Syrian is slightly different. Rider-figurines with a similar distribution pattern existed long before the Persian era, so the version with Persian hat and a production method mixing hand-modelling with the use of moulds or stamps is simply a new fashion. But it is, of course, interesting that people making a traditional type of dedicatory statuette now sometimes incorporated Persian features because they were part of the real environment. (In the same way the Astarte plaques with which they are often associated occasionally acquired quasi-Persian garment – and after 333 the riders sported Macedonian *kausiai*.) This certainly *is* a cultural response, though it is hard to make out how significant a piece of acculturation is involved – simply speaking of "Persian riders" *in vacuo* risks giving a false impression.

The rider-figurine tradition also existed in Cyprus and that island offers an interesting example of distinctiveness of the pattern of Persian imprint on a particular area. There are isolated pyramidal or "greco-persian" seals, occasional pieces of jewellery or precious-metal vessels and some ceramic imitation of *phiaiai*, *rhyta* and cups, a very few coins incorporating what might be Persian iconography,<sup>10</sup> and eight individuals with Iranian names: that is all like a low-level echo of western Anatolia. But there is no impact from Iranian deities, and none of the stelae, sarcophagi, or other tombs or monuments bearing images including "Persian" figures that are the staple of discussion in western Anatolia: the famous sarcophagi from Amathus and Golgoi, of very different aspect one from another, are united by almost total innocence of Persian

elements – and this despite the presence of procession, hunting and banquet scenes. The closest approach is the saddle-cloth on the Amathus horses and perhaps (in the light of mythological associations mentioned above) the Perseus scene on the end face of the Golgoi item. Cyprus is also unlike western Anatolia in producing a rich repertory of stone and terracotta statuary includes what have been claimed (perhaps optimistically) to be *harmamaxai* (the covered wagons used by Persian women) and a number of figures dressed wholly or partly in Persian dress: this is a difficult category to summarize, but let us note a very considerable number of terracotta figures at Curium (and occasionally – and rather better made – elsewhere) with various forms of oriental headgear and trousers, and a smaller corpus of stone figures with oriental headgear, some of children, others (eight in number) of adult figures sporting additional Persian features (e.g., *candys*, *akinakes*). This material, often of modest artistic value, was created for the purpose of private dedication in the Cypriot sanctuaries of (broadly) Greek deities. Like the Levantine rider-figures, they are part of traditional behaviour and we are bound to wonder whether we are in all (or many) cases looking at an aspect of elite behaviour. In any event, it is a reflection of the empire's existence of a sort not directly paralleled in other western regions.

It is also happening in a context in which the elite (even the kings) are represented by monuments that (when not purely Cypriot) are likely to display Egyptian or Egypto-Phoenician cultural markers. Some historians of Cyprus have been inclined to regard almost any putatively royal image as a reflex of the model of autocratic kingship provided by the Great King; I am not sure of the validity of that attitude, but the fact that there is nothing to see that proves it correct is already important enough. The crucial point is that Cyprus is, above all, Cypriot and that the only possible sign that its rulers felt inclined to resort to Persia in the visible expression of their kingship is in the existence of a bull-protome capital at Salamis (which may be Hellenistic), a few torus column-bases at Old Paphos and Vouni (but one from Amathus bears a polyhedral column and probably has an Egyptian background, and the same could go for the others), and some (perhaps not very convincing) talk of Achaemenid palace design at Hadji Abdullah.

Other regions have more to offer in that vein. Maria Brosius spoke of independent Thracian rulers buying into the Achaemenid model with the creation and circulation of more or less Achaemenid-style precious metal vessels. The emergence of remarkable and unambiguous evidence of prestige buildings of Achaemenid aspect in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan has prompted the conclusion that a ruling elite previously lacking an appropriate tradition of architectural self-representation took the Iranian one. Other possible examples are more complex or controversial.

Beside the Afirözü item in Professor Miller's catalogue and a lion from Merzifon which Durugönül describes slightly bafflingly as "Anatolian-Persian", "Assyrianized" and "executed in Aramaic style by reflecting mid and young Hittite characteristics" (152), Paphlagonia is represented for the purposes of this discourse by a number of rock-cut tombs. We find occasional lion-griffins, eagles, aberrant bull-capitals and a recurrent obsession with the figure of a man fighting a bull. Are the Achaemenid elements strong enough to justify seeing the man-bull contest as a conscious allusion (through a different icon) to the Achaemenid royal hero's animal confrontations? That is, is the whole package informed, however oddly, by an idea of "royal style" brought in from outside to fill a local gap? That would hardly be a safe conclusion.

By contrast, whoever designed the procession image on Building G at Xanthos apparently had the Persepolis Apadana (directly or indirectly) in mind: that seems clear from the distinctive stance of the grooms, with their arms over their horses' backs<sup>11</sup>). But the procession includes riders and a charioteer and involves no one wearing Persian dress, so is not really Persepolitian. Perhaps we can say that Persian *mores* of royal representation are being exploited to invent a new model of Lycian dynastic rulership. Perhaps something similar was already going on in the quasi-audience scene images of the Xanthian Harpy-tomb. In both cases the strictly Persian element remains small, and the Lycian audience may not even need to be conscious of it.

Two or three generations later the game has taken on a more explicit but sometimes subversive character. On the one hand, we have the poem of Symmachus in honour of the dynast Arbinas. This tells us that he was famed "throughout Asia" (virtually, in the Persian realm) for being good at the things known by wise men, viz. archery, *arete* and chasing things on horseback; that is plainly related to Herodotus' summary of Persian education and perhaps more distantly to Darius' grave-inscription, so (without prejudice to further speculation about the possible Iranian significance of *arete* or of an earlier reference to *synesis* and *dunasis*<sup>12</sup>) the poet is affirming what are meant to be Arbinas' Persian credentials. On the other hand, on one of the friezes of the Nereid Monument (which is often identified as Arbinas' tomb) we find another reflection of the Apadana icon. In the original, subjects of diverse origin and dress bring gifts to the enthroned Persian ruler; but in the Lycian version the gift-bringers are all in Persian dress, and the gifts are brought to a group of standing figures dressed *à la grecque*. In the context of a huge monument with very slight Persian presence (the only other concentrated element is, predictably, a horse-back hunting scene) there seems to be a message of Lyco-Greek superiority here. Perhaps, on reflection, the poem is not so different: that Arbinas is celebrated for knowledge of the Persian syllabus and has fought successfully against his enemies in Lycia may simply be twin affirmations of mastery. In any event, the effect on the Nereid monument is paralleled by the presence of a Persian-dressed servant figure in the warfare frieze on the same monument's podium (a narrative in which the participants are otherwise non-Persian) and, in a different way, is somewhat reminiscent of the mausoleum of Pericles of Limyra, where Persian-dressed soldiers are but one element of the dynast's army, and he himself is definitely not presented in Persian apparel. Further afield, the suggestion of subversion finds a parallel in the presence of an Amazonomachy (with its inescapable overtones) and a depiction of Greeks fighting Persians among the decorations of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. The subversive elements of Athenian *Perseie*, safely outside the Persians' reach are unsurprising. To find it in mainland Anatolia is more striking. These south-west Anatolian dynasts do not seem to have thought that any Persians were going to be conducting an audit of their version of royal self-representation. For Bruno Jacobs at least, who believes the Achaemenid rulers had long since lost any interest they had ever had in the propaganda messages of monumental art even in the heartland, this would be no great surprise. But one is bound to wonder whether, in any down time there may have been during Alexander's siege of Halicarnassus, the satrap Orontopates spent a few pensive moments in front of Mausolus' tomb. Herodotus arguably understood that Persian grandees would expect a local dynast to ape the Great King – perhaps dangerously so: Megabyzus reports to Darius that the locals in Thracian Myrcinus do what Histiaeus tells them "night and day", a turn of phrase that

appears in Darius' own description of his subjects obedient subservience. What Orontopates could see in down-town Halicarnassus was a dynasty that certainly aped the Persian ruler's capacity to think big but did not at all obviously think Persian. I doubt he would have thought that its habit of sister-marriage was a comforting appropriation of the occasional (alleged) inclination towards incestuous unions in the Achaemenid royal family.

To return to Lycia, the truth is that the most important cultural story of the Achaemenid period there is that the interaction of Hellenic and Lycian phenomena that had been in train before the mid-6th c. continued, and that the progress of hellenization was not a passive phenomenon but the result of deliberate choices made against the background of a still-vital Lycian tradition. Such Iranian markers as are also present in Lycian coins and monuments are simply another element in the mix – not dominant, perhaps even rather secondary. It is characteristic that, whereas the combat imagery of other parts of the Achaemenid Anatolia sometimes has a Persian element, Lycian depictions of warfare seem so largely local in colour. Individual coins on which a dynast is figured in Persian dress do bear quite a strongly Persian imprint, of course; but the coin corpus as a whole is decidedly not of that character. The strength of the Persian strand in the Karaburun tomb-paintings is exceptional for a single monument. One might wonder, indeed, whether the fact that Karaburun lies in Milyas, not in the heartlands of dynastic Lycia<sup>13</sup> and that the paintings were not designed for long-term public view has some bearing on its presentation of a relatively undiluted Persian image. Dynasts or other elite Lycians who had a public message to display were perhaps inclined to hedge their bets slightly more. Noella Vismara had made this sort of claim about coins, including those with Persian heads – viz. that any Persian iconography is liable to be associated with images that, so to say, look in the opposite direction (heads of Athena, for example). The Greek poem mentioning Erbinas' Persian credentials appears on the base of a statue of Leto and is accompanied by another Greek text (about a sanctuary of the same goddess) and two Lycian texts – a characteristic mix: the dynast was aiming to impress Greeks and Lycians quite as much as Persians – indeed (arguably) to subordinate the Persian within his SW Anatolian (and SE Aegean) identity. Let us remember that this was a world in one recurrent icon on funerary monuments is a sort of *conversazione* whose overtones are more those of the Greek agora (or stoa) than of the Lycian battlefield (itself the object of much iconographic representations), let alone the Achaemenid court. As for Karaburun, Mellink claimed that a false-door monument that once stood on the edge of the tumulus was deliberately destroyed in an act of *damnatio memoriae*.<sup>14</sup> Perhaps the deceased's Persian associations did not please everyone.

Mention of the false door monument prompts a new train of thought leading us north. Monuments of this sort, recently discussed as a group by Christopher Roosevelt, are found in various parts of western Anatolia, though mainly in Lydia. A feature of the Achaemenid era, they have, of course, nothing Persian about them and are but one example of the continuing vitality (and creativity) of local cultural forms under the Persian aegis. That, not widespread Persianization, seems to be the consequence of the relative prosperity of the era.

Further north again the false door figures in two monuments at Dascylium that do bring Persian and local into direct contact – stelae on which magi stand or even sacrifice before false doors. Is this a hint at religious activity crossing the border

between Persian and non-Persian? That would not be wholly bizarre: there was a Cybele sanctuary in the Dascylium palace-site, and it is well known that Persians could engage with Greek cult. The "Zeus of Baradates" at Sardis is a notable example, as is Tissaphernes' sacrifice to Artemis in the last sentence of Thucydides' *History*, and his reported summons to local forces to "defend Artemis" against an Athenian attack on Ephesus in 408. (Would a Greek general have spoken thus, I wonder?)

Both Persians and Greeks were polytheists, so this was an area they could find things in common. The extent to which they did so remains hard to tell, and Dr Brosius postulates that Persians imposed limits on Greek access to some Persian cultic practices. But there are (as she also indicates) certainly other indications in the direction of openness. Persians were themselves actually *capable* of permitting the assimilation of Ahuramazda himself to other gods: the reproduction of the Behistun monument erected in Babylon apparently spoke of Bel where the original spoke of Ahumazada (and perhaps substituted a star, sun and crescent moon for the winged disk of the original icon).<sup>15</sup> The emergence of "magic" as a term of abuse in Greek literary and medical texts from the 430s onwards is a (rather indirect) sign that some sort of cultural mingling is going on, though beyond the margins of ordinary cultic behaviour and with what relationship to the sort of people figured on those Dascylium stelae it is hard to say. A century later Greek observers distinguished respectable and unrespectable magi, but by then the former definitely belong within the discourse of philosophy not cultic religion. For cultic religion we may look instead to the dossier of (mostly long-post-Achaemenid) evidence about Persian Artemis / Artemis Anaitis / Aphrodite Anaitis / Anaitis. As ever, the data are localised and distinctive: Persian Artemis, Artemis Anaitis and Aphrodite Anaitis are found only in western and eastern Lydia, Anaitis only in eastern Lydia (where she is sometimes Meter Anaitis) and central/eastern Anatolia. Meanwhile Ephesian Artemis has a Persian *neokoros* in Ephesus and at Carian Amyzon, east Lydian Artemis Anaitis can be figured in Ephesian mode, and west Lydian Persian Artemis is sometimes just called Artemis. Interpreting these data is a tricky business, but they plainly say something about the intrusion of Anahita into the consciousness and religious practice of some non-Iranian groups of people in Anatolia. (I should say explicitly that I sympathize with Dr Brosius' inclination to see a Persianized Artemis, as distinct from a Hellenized Anahita, not least because it is in line with the normal implications of the use of epithets in divine nomenclature.) Why North-West and South-West Anatolia are unaffected is an interesting question. One answer is to link the phenomenon not only with Artaxerxes' erection of a statue of what Berosus calls Aphrodite Anaitis in Sardis (presumably he means Anahita: this is a Babylonian priest explaining a Persian king to Hellenistic Greeks...), but also with special exposure of Lydia to Iranian settlement – even specifically to military settlement.

That suggestion prompts a final remark. The role of soldiers in other contexts as objects and agent of imperial acculturation and what one might imagine to be the importance of the army in an Achaemenid imperial state that created itself by stunning military conquests naturally make one think about the military aspect of Persianization. But there is not much to tell. It is sometimes claimed one can recognise soldiers in the Levant from the presence of a certain type of cist-grave and associated grave-goods: the Deve Hüyük cemetery is the paradigm case. But I am not sure that one is supposed to see these people as Iranized foreigners. A reverse situation has been



postulated with another body of evidence: the increased incidence of Bes material in the Levant, Mesopotamia and Iran has been connected with the movement of military personnel from Egypt. But that would be the reverse of Persianization – though (if true: the specific evidence is meagre) culturally interesting in its own right, of course. We can see actual Iranians and other non-Iranian easterners settled in the west in Xenophon's evidence about the Caicus valley and the Alexander historians' about the army at Granicus; but we cannot see their specific cultural impact, if any. The fact that they come before us as Assyrians or Bactrians or Hyrcanians is interesting: a specific identity seems to be retained; they are not just generic "Persians". The best documented military group of the imperial periphery is, of course the garrison at Elephantine. They have (mostly) Iranian officers; and various other aspects of the Iranian administrative/legal system do impinge upon their lives, but (as they present themselves to us in their own documents) they appear profoundly unaffected by being part of the Persian war-machine. Naturally the case could be misleading. After all, this is a set of people whose ancestors were *in situ* before 525 and they are in a fairly remote place. These factors may tend to reinforce inherited cultural identity, especially as that cultural identity is distinctive: one need only consider the religious contrast with their Egyptian or Iranian environment. But my gut feeling is that it is not a particularly special case. Nothing in the historical record suggests that it was the business of the Persian High Command to shape all military servants of the state – whether in field or garrison contexts – into a uniform mould. Of course, the prolific diversity celebrated in Herodotus' Army List had little to do with the reality of a field army, but even the few nations on record as actually participating in Xerxes' operations in Greece are not entirely homogeneous; and any homogeneity that, say, Saka and Persians had was not the product of central planning in Susa. I would add that, when Greeks commented on Persian armies being multi-lingual, there is no ground to suspect them of misrepresentation: outside the Iranian core we must assume orders were disseminated through interpreters (a particularly easy thing to set up in the case of the Elephantine Jews who operated naturally in what was an Achaemenid administrative language). The "Achaemenid army" at large (perhaps a barely valid concept in most circumstances) was not an agent of Persianization through linguistic means.

What was good for military purposes was, I suspect, good for all purposes. There was no point in promoting the codification of pre-525 pharaonic law if one's real desire was to make the Egyptians Persian – but there was no point in even contemplating attempting such a thing. How many individual Egyptians ever Persianized is hard to know: the few who can still speak to us of their engagement with the imperial power are not minded to represent that engagement in such terms, though they can admit to being the recipient of gifts, and occasionally have themselves depicted wearing bits of tell-tale jewellery. But conditions in First Domination were, it seems, tough, and the elite class put up far fewer statues of themselves than we (or they) might have wished. This was a rebellious satrapy (only the accession of Darius II was – oddly given its contested nature – not accompanied by Egyptian troubles) and voluntary Persianization was perhaps rarer than in some other places. But nothing is ever straightforward. After all, it is in the Ptolemaic period tomb of Petosiris, whose textual record is full of adversions to the disturbances of good order associated with the Second Domination, that we find pictures of the manufacture of standard Achaemenid vessels. There is much work to be done before we really understand the cultural

politics of the Achaemenid Empire.

## NOTES

- 1 They can also (selectively) be etymologized in a fashion implying the anteriority of the Greek language: cf. Harrison, *Histos* 2 on the royal names in Hdt.6.98.
- 2 Everyone seems to have wanted a piece of Perseus, for Egyptians made him a descendant of their King Danaus. But perhaps this was precisely because of the Persian interest?
- 3 This has not prevented at least one interpreter from seeing the last-named as a "Persian" representation.
- 4 Podlecki (*Themistokles*) reads Athenaeus as saying Gambreium was for Themistocles. It was actually one of the Gongylid cities (*Xen.Hell.* 3.1.6) Phantias and Neanthes assigned Percote and Palaescepsis to Themistocles *eis stromnen kai ampekhonen* (*Plut.Them.*29).
- 5 The necropolis at Assos, adjacent to Mania's domain, recently produced a nicely symbolic find: a Persian figure together with three nude, *petasos*-wearing horsemen.
- 6 Not inappropriately the OP word *paratara* = "enemy" apparently means "the one who is further away".
- 7 The saplings for the park do not very obviously come from the Hatti land or Amanus.
- 8 2.1: *all'emporian poioumenoi, kai polu tekhnikoteron polountes ton homologounton kapeleuein*: i.e. *kapeloi* sell things for a clear price, people giving presents to kings are after getting something in return in a less well-defined way.
- 9 A similar scene occurs on a plaque in the Oxus Treasure. Does this help?
- 10 The royal hero v. lion on the Sidonian obverse of a hybrid Amathus-Sidon coin and the "satrapal" heads of coins of Evagoras II are both rather special (and external) examples of Persian iconography. Paphian coins have spread-eagle, Citian ones lion-against-stag, both of which might be read as Persian.
- 11 Less convincing in themselves are the horse-hair decoration and apparent merlon saddle-cloth.
- 12 Herrenschmidt *REA* 1985. The latter might recall Thucydides saying that Theseus was *meta tou xunetou dunatos* (2.15.2): Savalli, *AC* 1988.

- <sup>13</sup> cf. Des Courtils, *Rev.Arch.* 1995: 35 (on the cultural distinctiveness of the region).
- <sup>14</sup> Roosevelt, *AJA* 2006: 81 n.80 (citing Mellink).
- <sup>15</sup> This is a very different matter from Cyrus' commission of a purely Babylonian document (the Cyrus Cylinder) picturing him as the agent of Marduk.