STUDIA HERCYNIA XXIII/1, 11–25

Hera and the Sea. Decoding Dedications at the Samian Heraion

Hannah L. Ringheim

ABSTRACT
The paper examines the Near Eastern and Greek dedications at the Sanctuary of Hera in Samos during the 8th to 6th centuries BC. Contextualising the types of dedications and their origins indicate the identity of the dedicators, and whether they were Samians, other Greeks or from the Near East. Much scholarship has been devoted to the Samian Heraion and this paper contributes to these discussions by tracing the socio-economic and political objectives of the dedicators and bringing different theories into a single narrative. The paper presents a selection of votive dedications that embody broader exchanges: firstly as a political act between states; as a display of social power; the growing trade routes and role of sanctuary markets; and finally, the other modes of contact that emerged, such as mercenaries and pirates. Overall, the Samian Heraion played an essential role as a timely crossroads between the East and West, where the dedication practices shed light on the various groups of dedicators.

KEYWORDS
Samos; Egypt; dedications; seafarers; bronze; sanctuaries; trade; aristocracy; mercenaries.

INTRODUCTION

The Sanctuary of Hera at Samos bears some of the earliest traces of Greek ritual activity in the Iron Age. From the 10th c. BC onward, the continuity of cult activity is visible in the sequence of altars and temple structures, as well as from the milieu of votive offerings, which have been investigated in depth in past and recent scholarship (Jantzen 1972; Kyrieleis 2009).[1] In comparison to contemporaneous sanctuaries from the Ionian Islands and mainland Greece, the Samian Heraion surpassed these other centres with the unrivalled plethora of non-Greek votive dedications from neighbouring regions in the Near East, including Egypt, Cyprus, Phoenicia, North Syria, Urartu, Caucasus, and the Neo-Hittite Kingdoms (Kyrieleis 1993, 127).

The sanctuary provides an ideal starting point for investigations into the renewed interactions between the Greek world and the Eastern Mediterranean, predominantly during the 8th to 6th c. BC. The discussion seeks to identify who were the dedicators of the Near Eastern votive offerings and how the Heraion came to acquire such an exceptional variety of dedications; could this be due to the Samian elite or seafarers travelling abroad on expeditions, who then brought back these dedications? On the other hand, could the dedications reflect foreign travellers visiting Samos and dedicating these objects to Hera? This paper presents a small selection of published Near Eastern votive objects, with the aim to analyse the types

1 Selected recent scholarship on the excavations and finds from the Samian Heraion include Ebbinghaus 2006; Hölbl 2006; Kyrieleis 2016. See Baitinger 2011 for a comprehensive study of the Italic weapons at the Heraion, which are not discussed in this paper as the focus is on the Near Eastern votives.

and functions of the offerings that ultimately shed light on their significance and the identity of the dedicators. In light of the scholarship on various aspects of the dedications and their significance, this paper coalesces four key insights that define the dedicators: the political alliances, the socio-economic role of the elites in the Archaic Greek world, sanctuary markets, and other exchanges such as merchants, mercenaries and pirates. In addition to revealing the cross-cultural ritual practices that transcend Samos and the Eastern

Mediterranean, the votives are further emblematic of an overarching development in networks and political exchange between Egypt, the Near East and Samos.

THE SANCTUARY

The first altar to Hera existed by the 10th c. BC in this context. It consisted of merely an altar and the defined *temenos*, i.e. the intangible boundaries of the sacred space, which was delineated by a Lygos tree as the symbolic representation of Hera (Kyrieleis 1993, 87, 135; Walter 1976, 33). By the 8th c., the altar was in its third phase and was contemporary with the first monumental construction of the large temple to Hera (Walter 1976, 35). The first hundred-foot temple to Hera, the *hekatompedos*, typifies the developing monumental temple construction that was resonating throughout the Greek world by the 8th c. Two centuries later, the second dipteros temple, the Rhoikos, was constructed under the direction of the Samian tyrant Polykrates (Kienast 1998, 117–131). In addition to the temple phases, there were at least ten other structures found in the sanctuary complex; while the main function of the buildings remains uncertain, there was a clear association with Hera based on the votive offerings found in these contexts (Kyrieleis 1993, 132).

Along the route of the Sacred Way, the 7 km road that led from the settlement to the sanctuary, the elaborate offerings to Hera were on display, with some smaller buildings lining the way, identified as treasuries (Mohr 2013, 40–41; Coldstream 1977, 327). Such a practice here is reminiscent of what is occurring simultaneously at the Greek mainland Panhellenic sanctuaries in Delphi and Olympia, where treasuries represent the socio-political and economic connections of the *poleis* to ritual and large-scale worship (Morgan 1990, 53, 125). If these structures are indeed treasuries, then it is suggestive of a wealthy local elite, as well as likely non-Samian groups, that constructed the treasuries to protect and exhibit the dedications (further discussion below).

Additionally, the excavations in 1983–1984 provided more insight into the types of offerings. Two wells, dating between 630–550 BC, were excavated in the northern area of the complex and the objects discovered, such as bronze offerings and ceramics, were refuse from the *hekatompedos* and the altar (Kyrieleis 1991, 129–131). The two wells were built into a vein of underground water, covered by large storage vessels. This recurrent act of depositing sanctuary dedications into wells and pits is attested at other Greek sanctuaries as well, for instance at Olympia and the Athenian Acropolis (Morgan 1990, 53).

Although Samos is not considered a Panhellenic sanctuary (Morgan 1990; Sourvinou-Inwood 1993, 1–17), from the *hekatompedos*, the treasury-like structures, the Sacred Way and the two well deposits filled with dedications, this sanctuary was indeed a significant landmark in the Aegean during its prime use. Various visitors frequented the sanctuary with a decisive objective to display wealth and piety to Hera for others to see, as well as a subliminal socio-political message. A closer glimpse into the imported dedications and the origins illuminates how such votives reveal the identity of the dedicators and the underlying reasons for bestowing non-Greek offerings.

BRONZE STATUETTES OF EGYPTIAN ORIGIN

Dedications of Egyptian origin encompass the largest repertoire of foreign offerings at the sanctuary (Bumke 2012, 13; Bianchi 1990, 72). Also known as *Aegyptiaca*, objects such as mirrors with inscriptions, papyrus capitals, umbels, scarabs, and amulets were disseminated widely across Greek sanctuaries in the 8th and 7th centuries (Bumke 2012, 12; Gunter 2009, 142; Hölbl 2000). Some of these objects, such as the scarabs and amulets, have been argued to indicate dedications to Hera by women and children due to their spheres of protection and fertility (Hölbl 2000, 137). Yet, what distinguished the Samian Heraion in particular from other contemporary sanctuaries was the exceptional number of imported bronzes, including images of Egyptian deities not previously seen outside of Egypt: of the 317 published bronzes found at the Samian Heraion, 133 of them originate from Egypt, dating to the 25th and 26th Dynasties (ca. 719–525 BC) (Gunter 2009, 143; Hölbl 2007, 451; Guralnick 1997, 130).

The types of bronze depictions are exceptional for a Greek sanctuary. Some of the votives are representations of Egyptian deities, including in particular four bronze and ivory hollow cast statuettes of the goddess Mut, two depictions of the goddess Neith, a depiction of Bes, and another of Hathor (Guralnick 1997, 133; Jantzen 1972, 22–23). Furthermore, two bronze mirrors with dedicatory inscriptions to Mut are also found in the temple deposits; in comparison, a similar Egyptian bronze mirror dedication comes from the Heraion in Perachora with parallels dating to the 25th Dynasty in Egypt (Jantzen 1972, 31, pl. 33). This similarity suggests that the statuettes were not considered heirlooms, but rather contemporaneous in production and subsequently brought to Samos (Bianchi 1990, 74). Bronze statuettes were ubiquitous in Egypt, with production at a number of local centres, and then taken to various temples as dedications (Vassilika 1997, 291–302); however, their unique presence at Samos suggests another use for the bronze statuettes in a new context overseas.

The presence of the statuettes indicates a notable connection between the Samian Heraion and Egypt, and there is much evidence to point to this connection as a consequence of Greek dedicators. For instance, in the contexts of Greek sanctuaries in Egypt, there is a lack of evidence for Egyptians participating in Greek ritual practices in the 8th to 6th c. Even at centres of Greek ritual, such as at the five Greek sanctuaries at Naukratis in Egypt, Egyptian religious activity was kept separate in the southern precinct of Amun Ra (Villing – Thomas 2013, 82). There is virtually no evidence for Egyptian dedications taking place in the Greek sanctuaries, despite the proximity to Egyptian temples and likely settlements. Likewise, albeit there is a plethora of Greek ceramics at the Egyptian temple at Daphne (also known as Tel Dafana), their provenance within the Egyptian temple precinct evinces that the imports were restricted in use to the storage facilities (Leclère – Spencer 2014, 163; Weber 2014, 118). The Greek imports were not used as objects in the ritual activity itself. Therefore, if Egyptians brought the bronze statuettes to Samos as offerings to a Greek sanctuary, it would not be part of the same pattern found in Egypt.

Looking then at Greek sanctuaries outside of Egypt, and specifically at the sanctuaries of Hera, there is a palpable connection between Hera and Egyptian deities that has been explained in depth in past scholarship (Weitz 2006, 135; Ebbinghaus 2006, 194–196; Baumbach 2004, 156; Brize 1990, 321). Evidently Greeks continued their ritual traditions while using Egyptian religious objects that were either acquired abroad or brought to Samos. It was acceptable for Greeks to dedicate statuettes of Near Eastern goddesses to Hera, especially in this case with Mut, Neith, and Hathor. Other contemporaneous sanctuaries of Greek goddesses in Ionia evince similar dedications of *Aegyptiaca* (mainly scarabs, faience, and amulets), such as the Artemision in Ephesos, the Sanctuary of Aphrodite in Miletus, the Sanctuary of Athena in

Erythrai, as well as the Heraions at Perachora, Naukratis, and Gravisca (Hölbl 2000, 116–117; Arrington 2016, 11–12; the earliest evidence for *Aegyptiaca* in Greece comes from burial contexts since the 10th c. at Lefkandi and Skyros, Cf. Lemos 2002).

Certain bronze statuettes suggest another possibility about the identity of the dedicators. As posited by Helga Bumke, specific aspects of the Heraion statuettes and their contexts point to non-Greek ritual practices. In particular, the unexplained presence of at least 12 statuettes of male deities and two Egyptian priests differ from the patterns of female deity statuettes, suggesting an intriguing transition of Egyptian cult practices at the Heraion (Bumke 2012, 17–18; Jantzen 1972, 12–14, 23, 26). The juxtaposition of Egyptian priest statuettes alongside male deities in a ritual context is conventional in Egyptian ritual offerings and differs from Greek practices. Therefore this presents a circumstance in which potentially Egyptians had dedicated these offerings.

In total, what can the modern viewer take away from these multifaceted dedications: there is a complex picture of dedicators, where certain Egyptian bronzes are indicative of Greek dedicators and in line with such dedication practices, including the many Ionian sanctuaries with *Aegyptiaca* and the Greek sanctuaries in Egypt. On the other hand, some objects, such as the male deities and priests, are enigmatic at the Sanctuary of Hera and likely point to rituals carried out by non-Greeks. If this is so, the possibility construes a novel perception of movement and trade, where Egyptians in turn were travelling to Samos as well and visited the Heraion for their own purposes.

VOTIVE OBJECTS OF ASSYRIAN ORIGIN

The Assyrian dedications at the Heraion provide a unique glimpse into Assyrian objects in new contexts. Throughout the height of the Assyrian Empire, between approximately the 10th to 8th c., material exchanges with the Greek world did not result in a significant amounts of trade, and traces of Assyrian material remains in the Aegean are for the most part limited. Likewise, Greek objects and vases in particular did not reach Assyrian palaces in notable amounts within this time frame. This is a significant point to clarify, as it drastically contrasts with dynamic trade between Greece and the Levant prior to the height of the Assyrian Empire, in the Early Iron Age, and then again after the empire's collapse by the 7th and 6th c. To find bronze and ivory offerings from the Assyrian Empire at the Heraion is indeed an anomaly and implies an extent of exchange between the Assyrians and the Samians.

The objects depict various deities or divine images. At least three of the Assyrian bronzes clearly denote a deity: there are three statuettes of a figure alongside a dog, which symbolise the healing goddess Gula of Babylon, appropriated into Assyrian religion during the empire's expansion into Mesopotamia (Ornan 2014, 7; Ornan 2004, 14; Guralnick 1997, 134). Direct parallels for the iconography of Gula are found in ritual contexts in Mesopotamia, such as at Susa, Nippur and Isin (Guralnick 1997, 134). Similar to the Egyptian goddesses Mut, Neith, and Hathor, Gula would be a suitable goddess to dedicate to Hera and is in line with Greek ritual practices to Hera. As a healing goddess with protective powers and an association with women and fertility, Gula encompasses similar domains to Hera and the Egyptian goddesses.

Other statuettes do not portray Assyrian deities, but rather divine images of priests. For instance, one statuette depicts a male figure wearing a horned headdress with outstretched arms, where both of these attributes are typically used to distinguish divine images in Assyrian wall iconography (Jantzen 1972, no. B165, pl. 69; Curtis 1994, 2–4). The outstretched arms with closed fists most likely held divine symbols, similar to those on wall reliefs at the palaces of Nimrud and Khorsabad (Curtis 1994, 6). A second bronze figure depicts a bearded

man with one arm raised and the other pointed downwards (Jantzen 1972, no. B1594, pl. 70). A third Assyrian bronze figure is of a man adorned in an embroidered dress with a sash, and with both arms raised (Jantzen 1972, no. BB7733, pl. 71).

The divine, male statuettes are reminiscent at first of the Egyptian bronzes discussed above: they reveal male figures that are not deities and do not connect to the domains of Hera. In the case of the Egyptian types, this could directly relate to Egyptian ritual practices. However, the same practice is not typical for the Assyrian statuettes. Similar bronze divine figures are depicted on Assyrian wall reliefs as pieces of furniture, attached to thrones and tables. For instance, such furniture pieces in Assyria are shown on the wall reliefs at Til-Barsib, which date to the reign of King Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727 BC).[2] Similarly, comparable ivory furniture pieces have been also found in the necropolis at Salamis in Cyprus, while Cyprus was under the Assyrian hegemony politically and economically (Karageorghis 1969, 82). The Assyrian dedications found in the Heraion, therefore, were perhaps originally used as decorative pieces of furniture in a palatial or funerary context, as evinced in wall reliefs and at Salamis. The furniture pieces then took on a secondary function when placed in a new context in Samos, as appropriate offerings for Hera. In this case, the divine statuettes resemble a non-Assyrian ritual custom in their final deposition at the Heraion, thus suggesting non-Assyrian dedicators.

VOTIVE OBJECTS OF NORTH SYRIAN ORIGIN

One particular dedication with origins from North Syria is noteworthy for its implications at the Heraion. A trapezoidal bronze horse blinker used functionally as a protection and decoration for the forehead of a horse was dedicated to Hera (Jantzen 1972, no. B1123, pl. 52). The bronze relief on the blinker clearly indicates its origins: the relief portrays a winged sun with three naked females held up by a fourth female, flanked by two lion heads. The fourth female holding up the other three is reminiscent of contemporary representations of the Mesopotamian goddess Ishtar (Kyrieleis 1993, 146). An identical parallel of the horse blinker and similar iconography of a deity flanked by two animals comes from the Sanctuary of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria in Euboea (Charbonnet 1986, 140–144).

Both of the horse blinkers from the Heraion and from the Apollo Daphnephoros have inscriptions that further clarify a specific date and origin: 'That which Hadad gave our lord Hazael from Unqi in the year that our lord crossed the river,' referring to King Hazael of Damascus in the 9th c. (Bron – Lemaire 1989, 35–44). From the inscription, it is evident that the horse blinkers were acquired from the Levant and brought back as dedications in Greek sanctuaries approximately two centuries after their initial manufacture and use. By that point, these older objects would be considered heirlooms and may further point to the seafaring activities of the Ionians, as objects of plunder by seafarers, or even perhaps mercenaries (Hdt. II, 152).

As a consequence of exposure to such dedications, North Syrian bronze work and iconographic motifs began to permeate the local Samian workshops by the 7th c. For instance, an impressive crescent bronze sheet that is part of a breast piece for a horse was also found at the temple (Kyrieleis 1991, 131, pl. XXX:3). This piece is decorated with mythological scenes, such as the battle between Herakles and Geryon, the three-bodied giant. The North Syrian iconographic details manifested in the type of horse harness, the palm tree motif in the background of the scene, and in the depiction of wild animals. Yet, the breast piece is a fragment of local Samian production and also a dedication in the Heraion.

2 Curtis 1994; 6. For Til-Barsib wall paintings showing throne decorations, see Thureau-Dangin 1936, pls. XLIX, LII.

VOTIVE OBJECTS OF CYPRIOT ORIGIN

Cypriot terracotta imports encompass approximately one third of the early terracotta figurines at the sanctuary (Kyrieleis 1989, 52). Throughout the Early Iron Age, Cyprus played a substantial role in the dissemination of ceramics and figurines across the Mediterranean, as an active trade hub between the Levant and the Greek world. The Greek imports that arrived to the Levant and Eastern Mediterranean as early as the 11th and 10th c. likely arrived via Cyprus, due to the strategic trading position and their active seafaring role (Sherratt – Sherratt 1993, 361). The island continued to have a strong mercantile position and the terracotta figurines at Samos attest to these exchanges. Cypriot figurines of deities dating to the 8th and 7th c. at the Heraion included male figures with hoods, wearing sleeved tunics and a fringed himation draped over one shoulder, which are similar to other examples from Samos and Cyprus.[3] At least four identical male heads were also discovered at the Heraion with typical Cypriot features, such as a painted beard, a prominent nose and tight camp around the head (Kyrieleis 1989, 53, no. T3796; Schmidt 1968, pl. 14). Direct comparisons of the figurines from Cyprus are evident at contemporary cult sites such as at Agia Irini, Meniko, and Limassol, to name a few.[4]

Depictions of male worshippers grasping an animal in their arms for sacrifice is another frequent characteristics of Cypriot statuettes. An example of a calf-bearer from the Heraion exhibits preserved traces of polychromy, such as red lips, black hair, and red paint on the clothing (Kyrieleis 1989, 54). This sacrificial motif of the calf-bearer relates to exact parallels at Agia Irini and Meniko in Cyprus. Additionally, this motif illuminates the the types of predecessor for well-known Late Archaic sculptural dedications, such as of the calf-bearer on the Athenian Acropolis (Hurwit 1999, 102; Hutchinson – Boardman 1954, 220). From the Cypriot statuettes as dedications to Hera, it is clear that these were primarily ritual items for Cypriot cult; yet, at the Heraion they were appropriate dedications for the goddess, similar to the Egyptian, Assyrian, and North Syrian votives. Their similar deposition in sanctuaries on Cyprus and Samos could suggest either Samians or Cypriots dedicating the offerings, as the rituals with these particular figurines seem to transcend practices on both islands, further suggesting similar domains for female deities like Hera. As a central point for exchanges between East and West, it is likely that as objects from the Eastern Mediterranean were brought to Samos, Cypriot ritual objects were also obtained while in transit.

DISCUSSION: SANCTUARIES AND POLITICAL ALLIANCES

The array of votive offerings at the Samian Heraion illuminates various spheres of exchanges between the island and its neighbours. First and foremost, the Near Eastern offerings represent the political alliances that manifested. In particular, Herodotus refers to the exchanges between the Samian tyrant Polykrates and the Egyptian Pharaoh Amasis of the 26th Dynasty. The Pharaoh Amasis allegedly gave a gift of two life-size wooden statues of himself to the Samian Heraion: '[...] and to the goddess Hera in Samos two likenesses of himself, in wood,

3 Kyrieleis 1989, 53, fig. 1 shows a limestone statuette of a hooded male. For other similar Cypriot statuettes in the Heraion, see Schmidt 1968, nos. T274, T1095, T892, T2458, T210, pl. 12. An estimated 2000 terracotta statuettes have been recovered at Lindos in the Dodecanese and are parallels to those from the Heraion.

4 Tatton-Brown 1979, 86–95. Specifically, nos. 274–283. For more on descriptions of Cypriot characteristics of terracotta statuettes, see Tatton-Brown 1987, 50–52. See Karageorghis 1977 for comparisons at Meniko and Limasol in Cyprus.

which until my own time stood behind the doors in the great temple [...]' (Hdt. II, 182). This ritual action points to Amasis' allied relations with the Samian tyrant, Polykrates, and with the city-state of Samos. In turn, Polykrates could further strengthen his authority as tyrant with support from nearby neighbours.

To create political and economic alliances, Egyptian pharaohs began to give gifts to Greek sanctuaries directly, as a means of establishing the guest-friendship with neighbouring Greek leaders (Tsetskhladze 2010, 41–61).[5] Notably, the sanctuaries that supposedly received similar gifts included the Heraion, as well as Didyma in Asia Minor and Cyrene in Libya. The strategic locations of these gifts demonstrate the periphery in which Egyptian pharaohs had communication with their neighbours, and especially with island populations. The Samian Heraion, and likely other sanctuaries in Eastern Greece and those on the coast of Libya and Egypt, began to act as political centres, used for negotiations with the Egyptians, and perhaps with other Near Eastern powers. Likewise, similar gift-giving alliances were formed between other *poleis* and sanctuaries on mainland Greece and foreign leaders: Pausanias tells us about dedications by the Etruscan king Arimnestos in Olympia (Paus. V, 12.5), while Herodotus elaborates on panhellenic dedications in Delphi by the Phrygian king Midas (Hdt. I, 14) and by the Lydian king Croesus (Hdt. I, 50–52). The motives behind such offerings varied; the Greek sources present the case that foreign kings chose to honour the Greek gods in hopes of receiving divine favour (Kaplan 2006, 151). However, there are certainly practical motivations behind these actions as well, for instance, to gain information about the city-states, such as to gain support or to reward certain poleis; to obtain soldiers and mercenaries (discussed below); and in the case of the Lydian monarchs in the late 6th c., to bolster claims of hegemony over various Greek cities (Kaplan 2006, 152). The offerings in the Samian Heraion, such as those by the Pharaoh Amasis, can be perceived in this light, as an objective within a wider political manoeuvre.

The act of giving to Greek sanctuaries presents an aspect of cross-cultural ritual, where evidently Greek sanctuaries were not limited to dedications only by Greeks and indeed it was acceptable for non-Greeks to dedicate offerings. Furthermore the broad domains of Hera evince that there was an exceptional affinity for Near Eastern dedicators. Although the historical sources tell us that foreign leaders gave offerings to the Samian Heraion, when looking at patterns of material evidence from Egypt and the Near East, there is a special connection with sanctuaries of Hera. The exhaustive amounts of *Aegyptiaca* from the contemporary Sanctuary of Hera at Perachora, the cups with Hera dipinti and imports at the Sanctuary of Hera at Naukratis, and the *Aegyptiaca* from the Heraion in Gravisca, point to the reception of these objects within the cult of Hera (Avramidou 2016, 49–65). Though in many cases with *Aegyptiaca*, they reflect offerings by Greeks. Nonetheless, some votives certainly point to Near-Eastern dedicators other than the Pharaoh, as is evident with a selection of the Egyptian bronze statuettes.

This is not to say that the majority of Near Eastern dedications and *Aegyptiaca* indicate foreigners arriving to Samos. There are indeed some objects that, based on the change in the object's function, point to Samians or travellers bringing objects back from abroad. For instance, some Assyrian statuettes mentioned earlier originally belonged to parts of lavish palatial furniture in Assyria and now attained a new social meaning in a Greek context as a votive (Appadurai 1986). In this case, it is unlikely that an Assyrian would dedicate a piece of furniture in a ritual, as this was not customary in Assyrian religion.

5 Hdt. I, 14; I, 50–51; II, 159; II.182. Two Saite pharaohs sent gifts to the Apollo sanctuary at Didyma; the Pharaoh Ahmose sent a painted portrait of himself to Cyrene.

SANCTUARY MARKETS AND AN EMPORION

In comparison to the plethora of Near Eastern objects, some local offerings from the Heraion are indicative of the mercantile role of the sanctuary. Two well deposits excavated at the site, dating between 630–590 BC, preserved a notable amount of wooden remains (Kyrieleis 1991, 129–131). From the preservation of the wood, approximately 200 carved pieces were discovered that had been used as votives for Hera. Of these 200, there were at least 40 depictions of little wooden boats that were carved in the shape of Greek ships well-known from vase iconography.[6] The discovery of these boats presents a view of the type of wooden offerings that were not preserved at the Heraion, but would have been abundant. It also suggests that not only lavish or foreign gifts were appropriate for the deity. One can envision that an easily manufactured image in wood reflects the more common votives made at the Heraion, which could even infer implications of various social classes and access to the sanctuary. Other associations of Hera with boats have been found in the 8th and 7th c. in Greece. Sanctuaries to Hera at Tiryns and Perachora yielded terracotta figurines of Hera grasping a little boat (Kyrieleis 1993, 143). Hera has also been associated with boats and seafaring in later literary sources, such as in Athenaeus' reference to pirates attempting to steal the cult statue of Hera; as a result of Hera's power over seafaring, Hera stopped their ship and made them turn back (Ath. XV, 671–672). Likewise, Herodotus presents the obligation seafarers had to give offerings to Hera:

> 'A tenth of their profits, amounting to six talents, they spent on the manufacture of a bronze vessel [...] this bowl, supporting upon three kneeling figures in bronze, eleven and a half feet high, they placed as an offering in the temple of Hera' (Hdt. IV, 152).

Here the Samian sailor, Kolaios, upon his return from a voyage to Egypt, arrived at Samos and dedicated a tithe of his trading profits to Hera after a safe return. One envisages that this ritual obligation cultivated many dedications to the Heraion, especially the statuettes from Near Eastern cities. Overall there is indeed a ritual connection between Hera, ship representations and seafaring; thus, the dedications of wooden boats would certainly be an appropriate offering for the Heraion, where seafaring was plentiful and within the sanctuary's domains of worship.

With the repertoire of dedications and postulations of who the dedicators were, it is possible to place the Samian Heraion in the wider context of the Eastern Mediterranean. The votives appropriated from Near Eastern ritual contexts and the strong role that Samian seafarers played exemplify the expanding trade networks between Samos and the East, terming the sanctuary as an ἐμπόριον, a 'Port of Trade,' i.e. a neutral frontier zone where mutual entities can meet and trade (Hdt. II, 178; Polanyi 1963, 30–32; Luke 2003; Krämer 2016, 88). Emporia developed across numerous Ionian sanctuaries between the 7th to 5th c. (Krämer 2016, 76); however, this paper focuses on a single network that comes to light as a product of the burgeoning sanctuary markets.

Specifically, a unique relationship materialised between the Samian sanctuary market and the sanctuary complex at Naukratis in Egypt. This particular network of exchange is best reflected in the Laconian Black-Figure pottery that is well attested at both the Sanctuaries of Hera in Samos and Naukratis, as well as from the sanctuaries of Demeter and Kore in Cyrene. The imported ceramics from Laconia in the Peloponnese were produced by at least five specific painters, predominantly between 575–530 BC. Based on the various iconographic themes and

6 Kyrieleis 1993, 141 and Kopcke 1967, 145 discussed the wooden offerings at length. For other wooden artefacts beside ship models, see Kyrieleis 1980.

the function of the vases, such as open-shaped, cult-dining equipment, the Laconian vases were manufactured specifically for use at the two sanctuaries to Hera in Samos and Naukratis (Pipili 2006, 126; Pipili 1998, 84; Venit 1985, 392). Some of these iconographic themes, for instance, included depictions of the outdoor Heraia festival that would take place at the sanctuaries (Pipili 2000, 417). The context and movement of the vases at only these sanctuaries illuminate the prevalence of sanctuary markets in the Archaic period as main proponents of novel trade networks. It is also suggestive that this network between Samos and Naukratis was known and established, thus craftsmen from other areas in the Greek world, like Laconia, were able to capitalise on this connection. The established relationship between Samos and Naukratis is attested through the cult dining ceramics and from the fact that Samos was supposedly one of the founding Archaic city-states to establish Naukratis as a Greek sanctuary complex and trading port, according to Herodotus (Hdt. II, 176).

SOCIAL ELITES

Alongside seafaring, the Samian Heraion played a key role as a platform for displays of power and competition amongst aristocrats and social elites, precipitating the use of monumental sculpture. A colossal *kouros* was produced from local Samian marble and placed along the Sacred Way to the sanctuary (Kyrieleis 1993, 148–151, fig. 7.16). The life-size dedication typified characteristics of *kouroi* found at this time from other Greek sanctuaries: the round, almond-shaped eyes, the Archaic smile and the conventional Egyptianising posture. In the other contexts of *kouroi* statues, such as the numerous dedications on the Athenian Acropolis, the production centres on Paros and Naxos, and sanctuaries at Sounion and Delphi, they were used as displays of piety and wealth of the Archaic elite (Mohr 2013; Pedley 2007, 176–179). The socio-political use of these dedications disseminated to the Heraion to an extent as well.

What is further enlightening on the cooperating and competing social elites are the numerous other bases discovered at the sanctuary that indicate clusters of sculptures once existed (Mohr 2013, 44). Their chronological connection with the different phases of the temple construction during the 6th century reveals certain decades when collective groups of elites together were funding life-size, monumental sculptures. One particular sculptural group is the family of Genelaos, set up along the Sacred Way depictiong a reclining male, typical of the symposium style posture, with a seated figure (the mother), and two daughters (Baughan 2011, 19–53). In addition to the long platform of the familial dedication, other round platforms and column bases have been found without sculpture (Mohr 2013, 43–4). The placement of the majority of the sculptural bases is strategic along the Sacred Way, where there was a notable concentration of bases close to the main altar so the dedications were as visible as possible to the passing visitor (Mohr 2013, 48: the extant bases date to the mid-6th c.). These factors reveal that a community of social elites were actively participating in offerings at the Samian Heraion on a substantial scale that surpasses those found on mainland Greece, such as at the Athenian Acropolis. The large-scale sanctuary functioned politically as a way to build upon social classes within Samian communities (Kyrieleis 2016, 238: Kyrieleis further argues that other votive offerings, such as tripods, functioned in a similar way of traditional elite display).

The presence of the familial sculpture group, as well as the *kouros*, connects directly to the existence of the Samian aristocracy and expounds on the political and social realm of the Heraion. The elite used the sacred space as representation for their status and power in Samos. This display of power correlates with the wider historical image of aristocracy and tyranny on Samos, especially with the Samian tyrant Polykrates. The lavish Rhoikos temple itself attests to

this aristocratic activity, as it was commissioned under Polykrates' rule. Contemporaneously, the smaller, easily attainable materials, such as wooden boats or Near Eastern trinkets, used for dedications infer ritual practices of other professions like seafarers, pirates and perhaps merchants. One can only speculate on who the elite were in 6th c. Samian society and whether such seafarers would be part of that social class; either way, the local Greek offerings suggest that sanctuary access was open to numerous members of society, alongside an underlying aristocratic objective for display of power.

MERCENARIES AND PIRATES

Finally, the paper turns to the other known group of travellers, and likely dedicators, at the Samian Heraion: mercenaries and pirates. There has been much discussion on the circulation of Archaic Greek mercenaries and their material influence in sanctuaries in recent scholarship, though it is worth presenting here to add to the holistic image of the sanctuary's dedicators (Fantalkin 2008, 199–208; Trundle 2004; Ringheim 2018; 2020 Forthcoming; Iancu 2017, 49–61). The original foundation for mercenaries' comes from Herodotus' record about their employment in Egypt by the Pharaoh Psamtik, who were then paid in plunder and land (Hdt. II, 152). Stemming from this presumption, scholars have sought further material and textual evidence for mercenaries in Egypt and the Levant to solidify their presence.

The main plausible connection between mercenaries and the Heraion is the dedications and whether it is possible to attribute some of these practices to mercenaries. Firstly, there is a clear connection between Samos and Egypt that resonates in various ways, as is evident with the establishment of Naukratis, and the sanctuary market connection between Naukratis, Samos, Cyrene, and Laconia. The connection is further strengthened by the political alliance and guest friendship between Polykrates and Amasis, where Amasis as a philhellene has an overarching goal to achieve connections that can ultimately reinforce his sovereignty in Egypt. Polykrates, on the other hand, needs manpower and support to maintain his tyrannical reign. It is within these active and defined political-economic networks that mercenaries feasibly circulate.

The repercussions of mercenary presence can manifest in dedication practices, and in one particular instance, a dedication of a foreign deity to an Ionian sanctuary. The Egyptian block statue of Pedon, dating between 575 and 600 BC, refers to a mercenary that acquired an Egyptian statue, inscribed his victories and forms of payment and that it was a gift from the pharaoh, and dedicated it to a sanctuary in his homeland in Ionia (Şahin 1987, 1–2; Ampolo – Bresciani 1988, 237–243; Iancu 2017, 49–61). The process of procuring this foreign object and then dedicating it to an Ionian sanctuary typifies how these gifts were appropriate for mercenaries upon their return home. Though Pedon still remains the only clear dedication by a mercenary with an epigraphic inscription on an Egyptian object in the 6th c., it falls in line with dedication practices of mercenaries in the subsequent century. Throughout the Classical period onwards, mercenaries frequently dedicated their weapons to major sanctuaries after battles, a well-known example being Olympia.

The initiation of this practice began as early as the Archaic period, where Greek soldiers abroad would bring exotic objects to dedicate to their home sanctuaries, as is seen with Pedon. Likewise, objects from the Samian Heraion could reflect this; for instance, the North Syrian horse blinker, and the fact that matching inscriptions on blinkers are found at both Samos and the Apollo Daphnephoros in Eretria, suggesting that as Greeks attained plunder abroad, it was acceptable to bring such objects back and dedicate them. The other offerings reflect-

ing Greek practices, such as some of the Egyptian bronzes, could also be part of mercenary plunder, if not acquired by trade abroad. Although the line between objects acquired by trade, mercenaries or pirates remains ultimately ambiguous in their final context in the sanctuary, there is indeed the possibility that there are earlier instances of Greek mercenaries dedicating objects as the precursor to the later Classical mercenary.

In regards to the piratic activities in the Aegean, the historical context provides an idea of how these objects arrived at the Heraion and by whom, especially when looking at the contemporary Assyrian letters. Texts dating from the reigns of various Neo-Assyrian kings in the 9th and 8th c. BC provide much evidence for interactions with the supposed 'Greeks.' In various letters, there are identifications of Ionian pirates, identified and interpreted as "Yāwanāya" and "Yāwnāya," which translate to Ionian, while the term "Yāwan(a) / Yāwna" signify Ionia, (Rollinger 1997, 162–172; Rollinger 2001). These groups circulated the Levantine coasts, causing quandaries for the Assyrian kings. For instance, one letter dating between 738–732 BC from an Assyrian officer addressed to King Tiglath-Pileser III discussed the afflictions the Ionians were causing at sea:

> 'The Ionians came [and] attacked the cities of Samsimuruna, Harisu[...] A cavalryman came to the city of Dana[bu]. I gathered up the available men and went [after them]. [The Ionians] did not get anything. When they saw my troops, they got into their boats and [disappeared] into the middle of the sea.'[7]

The main objective of the Ionians in this case was to attack the Neo-Assyrian cities and to loot and plunder (Luraghi 2006; Desző – Vér 2013). Thus, as a collective group, the Ionians from the west gained a reputation as aggressive seafarers. The connection then of piratic groups venturing in the Aegean and the Levantine coast to the extraordinary offerings at sanctuaries like the Heraion is plausible. If such activities were frequently occurring as the Assyrian letters suggest, then seafarers acquiring objects like elaborate Assyrian furniture pieces or bronze divine statuettes as part of plunder is a strong possibility. These Ionian pirates would then repurpose these objects from furniture pieces to dedications to Hera, perhaps to commemorate successful seafaring ventures, or merely representing exotica to the local Samian.

CONCLUSION

A re-examination of the votive offerings from the Samian Heraion provides a comprehensive approach to reading the dedications and to extrapolating their wider significance. From an overarching view into the types of dedications and their Near Eastern origins, it is clear that the offerings to Hera incorporate a complex system of ritual, where various levels of dedications occurred simultaneously; firstly, the majority of the offerings were given primarily as part of Greek ritual conventions. The Samians had appropriated figures of foreign deities for their own cultural practice and dedicated them in significant quantities to Hera. Nevertheless, a portion of the dedications at least can be attributed to non-Greeks.

---

7 Saggs 1978, 77–78, pl. XII, lines 1–12; Luraghi 2006, 30. Luraghi pointed out various questionable translation points, see footnotes 36–40. This final translation above is from Luraghi's publication. The date of this letter is approximately 738–732 B.C.E (see Lanfranchi 2000, 15 for a discussion on the dating). Other translations of this letter include Parker 2000, 69–77.

The ritual activities at the Heraion further reflect the socio-economic and political motivations at the time. The Samian dedications provide evidence for the aristocratic desire to express power and wealth through the sanctuary, similar to the tyrant Polykrates' exemplification of power through the construction of the Rhoikos temple. Notably the elites also presented cooperative group dedications and clusters of monumental sculpture, an act indicating that clear class structures were in place. At the same time, the seafarers and local Samians also gave numerous dedications of varying materials, suggesting that access to the Heraion was not restricted to any particular group. It also posits the question of who was included among the Archaic social elites; is it feasible to assume that smaller trinkets from the Near East were dedicated by non-elites? The domains of Hera are evident as well; representations of boats and her role in seafaring are fundamental to the use of the Heraion as a place of worship. This aspect of Hera reoccurs at other coastal sanctuaries, such as Perachora.

Lastly, the dedications and the dedicators evince the developing trade routes and networks between Samos and the Eastern Mediterranean. The role of sanctuary markets is essential to establish political and economic ties with neighbouring regions, such as the connection between Laconia, Samos, and Naukratis. Seafarers, merchants, pirates, and mercenaries all play a role in these markets, especially with obtaining objects from Cyprus, Assyria, and Egypt. Tyrants and Near Eastern leaders also made significant use of the sanctuary markets; the particular connection between Samos and Egypt is reflected in the guest-friendship of Polykrates and Amasis, among others. Sanctuary markets were especially prominent in Ionia, where sanctuaries burgeoned into a different purpose and nature than that of mainland Greece; they became centres of negotiation, alliance, and exchange outside the Greek world and the *poleis*. The Samian Heraion was undoubtedly an exemplary case for Greek sanctuaries in the Archaic period and the dedications are telling of the how the sanctuary became a central point for communication and networks. Within the wider historical narrative, the materials and the sources coalesce to present a dynamic image of a sanctuary on the peripheries of the Greek world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ath. *The Deipnosophists*. Transl. C.B. Gulick. London. 1941.

Hdt. = Herodotus. *The Histories*. Transl. A.D. Godley. Cambridge, Mass. 1920.

Paus. = Pausanias: *Description of Greece*. Transl. W.H.S. Jones – H.A. Ormerod. *Pausanias Description of Greece* IV. Cambridge, Mass., 1918.

Ampolo, C. – Bresciani, E. 1988: Psammetico re d'Egitto e il mercenario Pedon. *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 11, 237–243.

Appadurai, A. 1986: *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge.

Arrington, N.T. 2016: Talismanic Practice at Lefkandi. Trinkets, Burials and Belief in the Early Iron Age. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 62, 1–30.

Avramidou, A. 2016: Reconsidering the Hera-Pottery from the Samian Heraion and its Distribution. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2016, 49–65.

Baitinger, H. 2011: *Waffenweihungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*. Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 94. Mainz.

Baughan, E.P. 2011: Sculpted Symposiasts of Ionia. *American Journal of Archaeology* 115/1, 19–53.

Bianchi, R.S. 1990: Egyptian Metal Statuary of the Third Intermediate Period (circa 1070–656 BC), from its Egyptian Antecedents to its Samian Examples. In: *Small Bronze Sculpture from the Ancient World*. Papers delivered at a symposion. Malibu 1990. Malibu, 61–84.

Böck, B. 2014: *The Healing Goddess Gula. Towards an Understanding of Ancient Babylonian Medicine*. Leiden – Boston.

Bron, F. – Lemaire, A. 1989: Les Inscriptions Araméennes de Hazaël. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 83, 35–44.

Bumke, H. 2012: Fremde Votive oder fremde Dedikanten? Ägyptische Weihgaben in ionischen Heiligtümern und ihr Zeugniswert für Kulturtransfer. In: L.-M. Günther (ed.): *Tryphe und Kultritual um archaischen Kleinasien – ex oriente luxuria?* Wiesbaden, 11–30.

Charbonnet, A. 1986: Le dieu aux lions d'Erétrie. *Annali dell'Instituto Orientale di Napoli. Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico. Sezione di Archeologia e Storia Antica* 8, 117–173.

Coldstream, J.N. 1977: *Geometric Greece*. London.

Curtis, J. 1994: Mesopotamian Bronzes from Greek sites. The workshops of origin. *Iraq* 56, 1–25.

Desző, T. – Vér, A. 2013: Assyrians and Greeks. The Nature of Contacts in the 9th–7th Centuries BC. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 53, 325–359.

Ebbinghaus, S. 2006: Begegnungen mit Ägypten und Vorderasien im archaischen Heraheiligtum von Samos. In: A. Naso (ed.): *Stranieri e non cittadini nei santuari greci*. Atti del convegno internazionale. Firenze, 187–229.

Fantalkin, A. 2006: Identity in the Making. Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Iron Age. In: A. Villing – U. Schlotzhauer (eds.): *Naukratis. Greek Diversity in Egypt*. London, 199–208.

Gunter, A.C. 2009: *Greek Art and the Orient*. Cambridge.

Guralnick, E. 1997: The Egyptian-Greek Connection in the 8th to 6th centuries BC. An overview. In: J.E. Coleman – C.A. Walz (eds.): *Greeks and Barbarians. Essays on the interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in antiquity and the consequences for Eurocentrism*. Bethesda, 127–154.

Hölbl, G. 2000: Die Problematik der spätzeitlichen Aegyptiaca im östlichen Mittelmeerraum. In: M. Görg – G. Hölbl (eds.): *Ägypten und der östliche Mittelmeerraum im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr*. Akten des interdisziplinären Symposions am Institut für Ägyptologie der Universität München, 25.–27. 10. 1996. Wiesbaden, 119–161.

Hölbl, G. 2006: Ägyptisches Kulturgut in der griechischen Welt im frühen ersten Jahrtausend vor Christos (10.–6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.). In: H. Beck – P. C. Bol (eds.): *Ägypten, Griechenland, Rom. Abwehr und Berührung*. Städelsches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie 26. November 2005. Frankfurt, 114–132.

Hurwit, J.M. 1999: *The Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.

Hutchinson, R.W. – Boardman, J. 1954: The Khaniale Tekke Tombs. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 49, 215–228.

Iancu, L. 2017: "A Golden Bracelet and a City as a Prize for Valor." Aegean Mercenaries and a New Theoretical Model for the Archaic Eastern Mediterranean. *Anthesteria* 6, 49–61.

Jantzen, U. 1972: *Ägyptische und orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos*. Samos VII. Mainz.

Kaplan, P. 2006: Dedications to Greek Sanctuaries by Foreign Kings in the Eighth to Sixth Centuries BCE. *Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 55, 129–152.

Karageorghis, V. 1969: *Excavations in the Necropolis of Salamis*. London.

Karageorghis, V. 1977: *Two Cypriote Sanctuaries of the end of the Cypro-Archaic Period*. Roma.

Kienast, H.J. 1998: Der Niedergang des Tempels des Theodoros. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 113, 111–131.

Kopcke, G. 1967: Neue Holzfunde aus dem Heraion von Samos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 82, 100–148.

Krämer, R.P. 2016: Trading Goods – Trading Gods. Greek Sanctuaries in the Mediterranean and their Role as emporia and 'Port of Trade' (7th–6th Century BCE). *Distant Worlds Journal* 1, 75–98.

Kyrieleis, H. 1969: Orientalische Bronzen aus Samos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 84, 166–171.

Kyrieleis, H. 1969: *Salamis in Cyprus*. Suffolk.

Kyrieleis, H. 1980: Archaische Holzfunde aus Samos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 95, 87–147.

Kyrieleis, H. 1981: *Führer durch das Heraion von Samos*. Athens.

Kyrieleis, H. 1988: Ein Altorientalischer Pferdeschmuck aus dem Heraion von Samos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Ableilung* 103, 37–75.

Kyrieleis, H. 1989: New Cypriot finds from the Heraion of Samos. In: V. Tatton-Brown (ed): *Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Iron Age*. Proceedings of the seventh British Museum Classical Colloquium, April 1988. London, 52–55.

Kyrieleis, H. 1991: The relations between Samos and the Eastern Mediterranean. Some aspects. In: V. Karageorghis (ed.): *The civilisations of the Aegean and their diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, 2000–600 BC*. Proceedings of an international symposium, 18–25 September 1989. Larnaca, 129–132.

Kyrieleis, H. 1993: The Heraion of Samos. In: N. Marinatos – R. Hägg (eds.): *Greek sanctuaries. New Approaches*. London, 125–153.

Kyrieleis, H. 2009: Intercultural Commerce and Diplomacy. Near Eastern, Egyptian and Cypriot Artefacts from the Heraion of Samos. In: V. Karageorghis – O. Kouka (eds.): *Cyprus and the East Aegean. Intercultural Contacts from 3000 to 500 BC*. An International Archaeological Symposium held at Pythagoreion, Samos, October 17th–19th 2008. Nicosia, 139–143.

Kyrieleis, H. 2016: Anathem und Gesellschaft. In: S. Hansen – D. Neumann – T. Vachta (eds.): *Raum, Gabe und Erinnerung. Weihgaben und Heiligtümer in prähistorischen und antiken Gesellschaften*. Studies of the Ancient World 38. Berlin, 237–247.

Lanfranchi, G.B. 2000: The Ideological and Political Impact of the Assyrian Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries B.C. In: S. Aro – R.M. Withing (eds.): *The Heirs of Assyria*. Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Tvarminne, Finland, October 8–11, 1998. Melammu Symposia 1. Helsinki, 7–34.

Leclère, F. – Spencer, J. 2014: *Tell Dafana Reconsidered. The Archaeology of an Egyptian Frontier Town*. London.

Lemos, I.S. 2002: *The Protogeometric Aegean. The Archaeology of the Late Eleventh and Tenth Centuries B.C.* Oxford.

Luke, J. 2003: *Ports of Trade, Al Mina, and Geometric Greek Pottery in the Levant*. Oxford.

Luraghi, N. 2006: Traders, Pirates, Warriors. The Proto-History of Greek Mercenary Soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean. *Phoenix* 60, 21–47.

Mohr, M. 2013: *Die Heilige Strasse – Ein ‚Weg der Mitte'? Soziale Gruppenbildung im Spannungsfeld der archaischen Polis*. Zürcher Archäologische Forschungen 1. Rahden/Westf.

Morgan, C. 1990: *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century B.C.* Cambridge.

Ornan, T. 2004: The Goddess Gula and Her Dog. *Israel Museum Studies in Archaeology* 3, 13–30.

Ornan, T. 2005: *The Triumph of the Symbol. Pictorial Representation of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban*. Göttingen.

Parker, P. J. 2000: The Earliest Known References to the Ionians in the Cuneiform Sources. *Ancient History Bulletin* 14, 67–77.

Pedley, J.G. 2007: *Greek Art and Archaeology*. New Jersey.

Pipili, M. 1998: Archaic Laconian Vase-Painting. Some Iconographic Considerations. In: W.G. Cavanagh – S.E.C. Walker (eds.): *Sparta in Laconia*. Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium held with the British School at Athens and King's and University Colleges, London 6–8, December 1995. London, 82–96.

Pipili, M. 2000: Vases from the Samian Heraion. Shapes and Iconography. In: *Αγαθος Δαιμων. Mythes et cultes. Études d'iconographie en l'honneur de Lilly Kahil*. Athènes, 409–421.

Pipili, M. 2006: The Clients of Laconian Black-Figure Vases. *Les Clients de la Céramique Grecque.* Actes du Colloque de L'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Paris. Paris, 75–83.

Polanyi, K. 1963: Ports of Trade in Early Societies. *The Journal of Economic History* 23, 30–45.

Ringheim, H. 2018: *Mercenaries in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Oxford.

Ringheim, H. 2020 Forthcoming: Archaic Greek Mercenaries. An Archaeological Perspective. In: M. Trundle – D. Gómez-Castro – T. Fujii (eds.): *A Companion of Greek Mercenaries in the Classical Mediterranean and Hellenistic World*. Warfare in the Ancient Mediterranean World Series. Leiden.

Rollinger, R. 1997: Zur Bezeichnung von 'Griechen' in Keilschrifttexten. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 91, 167–172.

Rollinger, R. 2001: The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East. Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective. In: *Mythology and Mythologies. Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, Paris, October 4–7, 1999. Helsinki, 233–264.

Saggs, H.W.F. 1978: The Nimrud Letters, 1952 – Part VI. *Iraq* 25, 70–80.

Şahin, S. 1987: Zwei Inschriften aus dem Südwestlichen Kleinasien. Archaische Inschrift aus Priene, aus der Zeit des Psammetichos. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 10, 1–2.

Schmidt, G. 1968: *Kyprische Bildwerke aus dem Heraion von Samos.* Samos VII. Bonn.

Sherratt, S. – Sherratt, A. 1993: The Growth of the Mediterranean Economy in the Early First Millennium BC. *World Archaeology* 24/3, 361–378.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1993: Early Sanctuaries, the Eighth Century and Ritual Space. In: N. Marinatos – R. Hägg (eds.): *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*. London – New York, 1–17.

Tatton-Brown, V. 1979: *Cyprus BC. 7000 Years of History*. London.

Thureau-Dangin, F. 1936: *Til-Barsib*. Paris.

Trundle, M. 2004: *Greek Mercenaries from the Late Archaic Period to Alexander*. London – New York.

Tsetskhladze, G.R. 2010: "Beware of Greeks Bearing Gifts." Gifts, Tribute, Bribery and Cultural Contacts in the Greek Colonial World. In: R. Rollinger – B. Gufler – M. Lang – I. Madreiter (eds.): *Interkulturalität in der Alten Welt. Vorderasien, Hellas, Ägypten und die vielfältigen Ebenen des Kontakts.* Philippika 34. Wiesbaden, 41–61.

Vassilika, E. 1997: Egyptian Bronze Sculpture Before the Late Period. In: E. Goring – N. Reeves – J. Ruffle (eds.): *Chief of Seers. Egyptian Studies in Memory of Cyril Aldred*. London – New York, 291–302.

Venit, M. 1985: Laconian Black Figure in Egypt. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89, 391–398.

Villing, A. – Thomas, R.I. 2013: Naukratis Revisited 2012 – Integrating New Fieldwork and Old Research. *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan Online Journal* 20, 81–125.

Walter, H. 1976: *Das Heraion von Samos. Ursprung und Wandel eines griechischen Heiligtums*. München.

Weber, S. 2014: The Greek Painted Pottery from Tell Dafana. In: Leclère – Spencer (eds.) 2014, 118–126.

Hannah L. Ringheim
Research Fellow
W.F. Albright Institute for Archaeological Research
Jerusalem
hlringheim@gmail.com