

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF INDO-EUROPEAN AND THRACIAN STUDIES

INSTITUTE OF THRACOLOGY – BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION *EUROPA ANTIQUA*

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY, THRACOLOGY AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY – FACULTY OF HISTORY
SOFIA UNIVERSITY "ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI"

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL AND MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES
NEW BULGARIAN UNIVERSITY – SOFIA

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THRACOLOGY

THRACE AND THE AEGEAN

Sofia – Yambol, 25 - 29 September 2000

Editor: Alexander Fol

Volume I

Sessions:

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Museum of History – Yambol
Archaeological Park *Kabyle*

International Foundation *Europa Antiqua* – Sofia
Institute of Thracology – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Sofia 2002

Odryasian and Achaemenid Tribute: Some New Perspectives

David Stronach – California

Antigoni Zournatzi – Athens

In a passage that immediately follows his account of the tribute which the Odryasian rulers required of their subjects (Thuc. 2.97.3), wherein it is stated that the tribute regularly consisted of roughly equal amounts of tax (*phoros*) and gifts (*dora*), Thucydides draws a direct comparison between the Odryasian and Achaemenid attitudes to gifts. He asserts that:

... in contrast to Persian royal practice, they (i.e., the Odryssae) had established a usage, which was also current among the other Thracians, namely, to receive rather than to give (indeed it was a greater shame for someone not to give when he was asked to, than to ask for something and be refused). However, owing to their greater power, they (the Odryssae) carried this custom to greater lengths, so that it was impossible to accomplish anything if one did not offer them gifts.¹

Thus, while the Odryssae, like the Achaemenids, were from a gift-giving nation,² Thucydides clearly chose to insist that the Thracian institution of gift-giving differed significantly from gift-giving in Persia.³ Furthermore, the last phrase of the passage, playing upon the double meaning of the term *doron* as "gift" or "bribe", implies a measure of dishonesty in the manner in which the Odryssae customarily conducted their political affairs. And, perhaps most provocatively, Thucydides' remark, directly appended as it is to his portrayal of Odryasian tribute, appears to draw attention to a pervasive difference between Odryasian and Achaemenid tributary practices.

Interestingly enough, Xenophon, in his description of a banquet given by Seuthes (II) in the *Anabasis*⁴, has been thought to provide a similar description of Thracian dynastic behavior. In brief, Xenophon reports that before the dinner a certain Heraclides, an inhabitant of the city of Maroneia, "came up to each single one of the guests who, as he imagined, were able to make presents to Seuthes," and solicited gifts for their host saying that "it was customary for Seuthes to receive gifts from those he invited to dinner,"⁵ and promised each one of the prospective givers more lavish returns from Seuthes once the latter's bid for greatness had met with success.

In response to these solicitations the other guests offered Seuthes a white horse, a slave, expensive garments, as well as a silver bowl and a carpet worth ten minae.⁶ For his part, Xenophon pledged himself and his soldier-comrades to be faithful friends of Seuthes (on the prospect of receiving from Seuthes "fortresses and territory in Thracian land as others among [his] countrymen [had] done").⁷

The solicitation of gifts for Seuthes, and Seuthes' ultimate failure to reciprocate (at least as far as Xenophon was concerned)⁸ has been seen to affirm the emphasis which, according to Thucydides, the Odryssians placed upon receiving gifts and their allegedly "negligent" approach to the fundamental requirement of reciprocity inherent in the archaic institution of gift-exchange.⁹

Thucydides' allusion to the Persian kings' munificence would also seem to be justified by the numerous instances in which the Persian kings are known to have generously distributed presents to reward their subjects (including Persians), to win over potential enemies, or to welcome members of foreign embassies.¹⁰

In this general context it is appropriate to recall Xenophon's comments in the *Cyropaedia* on the instrumental role of gifts in establishing the authority of Cyrus and that of his successors. Thus, while Cyrus:

... far exceeded all other men in the amount of revenues he received, yet he excelled still more in the quantity of the presents he made. It was Cyrus, therefore, who began the practice of lavish giving, and among the kings it continues even to this day.¹¹

And in a second passage Xenophon asks:

... who has richer friends to show than the Persian king? Who is there that is known to adorn his friends with more beautiful robes than does the king? Whose gifts are so readily recognized as some of those which the king gives, such as bracelets, necklaces, and horses with gold-studded bridles? For, as everybody knows, no one over there is allowed to have such things except those to whom the king has given them.¹²

In direct reference to Cyrus' liberality, Xenophon also asks (*Cyrop.* 8.2.9) if anyone besides Cyrus had been called a "father", that is to say, a benefactor, by those whom he had conquered.

Despite this apparent corroboration of the Odrysian preference for receiving gifts and the Persian *polydoria*, the stark Thucydidean contrast between Odrysian *lambanein* ("receiving") and Achaemenid *didonai* ("giving") is not supported by historical realities.¹³ The intent of this paper, therefore, is to highlight the obstacles which stand in the way of accepting the objectivity of Thucydides' judgment in this instance and to offer an alternative interpretation: namely, that Thucydides' comment, (made at a moment of intense Athenian dealings with both the Persians and the Odrysian regime) may not so much testify to any dramatic departure from the basic principles of gift-exchange in the Near East and contiguous areas on the part of either the Odrysae or the Achaemenids as it may testify to the very different nature of Athens' relations with these two powers at one specific historical juncture.

This view, that the two customs were much more in line with each other than the passage in Thucydides would seem to indicate, is suggested by other evidence that Odrysian royal practice did not depart significantly from protocols that had long been standard in the Near East.

In particular, Xenophon's encounter with Seuthes – which supposedly accords with Thucydides' criticism of Odrysian transgressions – presents no evidence for any atypically excessive "bending" of the rules of gift-exchange by the Odrysae. As Ivan Marazov has perceptively observed, Heraclides' remark that "the greater the gifts [one] bestowed upon [Seuthes], the greater the favors one would receive at his hands"¹⁴ no doubt indicates that the obligation to reciprocate a gift was held to be mandatory in Odrysian perceptions of gift-exchange as well.¹⁵ References to the rich rewards that

would be heaped upon those who collaborated with the Odrysian dynasts are not totally lacking, moreover.¹⁶

Indeed, it may be appropriate at this time to review the importance of gift-giving in the definition of subject-ruler relations not only in the Odrysian kingdom but in the Near East and contiguous areas at various separate intervals.

Gifts and Tribute in the Near East

A beginning may be made by citing Thucydides' description of Odrysian tribute:

As for the tribute which came in from the barbarian territory and from all the Hellenic cities over which Odrysians acquired sway in the time of Seuthes – who, succeeding Sitalces on the throne, brought the revenues to their maximum – its value was about four hundred talents *of silver, paid in gold and silver*; and gifts equal in value to the tribute, not only of gold and silver, but besides these all manner of stuffs, both embroidered and plain, and other *wrought* articles, were brought as offerings to the king, and not for him only, but also for the subordinate princes and nobles of the Odrysians.¹⁷

The offering of gifts over and above a set amount of tax was not exclusive to Odrysian tributary structure. The requirement of tribute consisting of complementary contributions in the form, on one hand, of (unworked) precious metal as well as wrought items (which functioned as regular compulsory conveyances despite the fact that they are called gifts) goes back to at least the second millennium B.C.

As Carlo Zaccagnini has indicated: "The association of gifts and tributes appears to be fully operative in the Syrian milieu at the time of the Hittite supremacy. One of the numerous examples that can be cited in this regard is the list of the tribute imposed by Suppiluliuma on Niqmadu, king of Ugarit, consisting of an amount of gold – the tribute *stricto sensu* – and a series of precious items (gold and silver bowls, garments, purple wool) that were to be delivered to the king, the queen, the crown prince and to a number of high court dignitaries."¹⁸ Incidentally, the references to the "gifts" intended for the Hittite queen, the crown prince and other high officers of the Hittite court offers a nice parallel to that part of Thucydides' description of the tribute that the Odrysian rulers were accustomed to receive when he expressly refers to the "gifts" that were offered not only to the king but also to subordinate princes and nobles of the Odrysae.

Zaccagnini has also drawn attention to Neo-Assyrian administrative records and royal inscriptions which bear unquestionable evidence for the distinction between "tributes" and "gifts". Thus, we learn that "obligatory and regular remittances to the king consisted of two contributions: the 'tribute' (*biltu* and/or *maddattu*) and the 'gift' (Bab. *tamartu* in royal inscriptions = Ass. *namurtu* in administrative texts)."¹⁹ In Neo-Assyrian inscriptions the equivalent of tax in precious metal is reckoned in talents and minas. Separate contributions, identified as "gifts", included worked objects of gold and silver as well as as other wrought items of different kinds, comparable to the *kai he alle kataskeue* offered to the Odrysians. In a general sense, in short, Odrysian tribute consisted of both "taxes" and "gifts" and it cannot be said show any major departure from the customary tributary structures of the Near East.

With reference to Achaemenid gift-giving practices, Herodotus provides the clearest affirmation that Achaemenid kings were also in the habit of receiving gifts from their subjects. Indeed, he asserts that gifts accounted for the entire – presumably far from negligible – imperial revenues of Cyrus the Great and his son and successor, Cambyses:

In the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses after him no regulations whatsoever existed with regard to the *phoros* but gifts (*dora*) were brought (instead). And on account of this (Darius') assessment of the *phoros* and other matters related to it the Persians say that Darius was a petty trader (*kapelos*), Cambyses a 'despot' and Cyrus a 'father'; for Darius made a profit out of all things (*ekapeleue*), Cambyses was harsh and arrogant, (and) Cyrus was gentle and had contrived all benefits for them.²⁰

Herodotus' characterization of Cyrus as a ruler who only received gifts (which stands in such sharp contrast to his characterization of Darius as a royal "huckster") could have been colored by many separate factors, including the strictness of the tributary measures introduced by Darius. At the same time, the situation that prevailed in the time of Cyrus is not likely to have been so very different. It is most unlikely that Cyrus eschewed any kind of taxation throughout the period of his reign, and Darius, whose tributary reform is reported by Herodotus to have significantly modified the tributary practices of his predecessors, is also said to have benefited from the conveyance of compulsory "gifts" (designated as *dora*):

The following peoples paid no *tax*, but brought gifts to the king: first, the Ethiopians bordering upon Egypt, who were reduced by Cambyses when he made war on the long-lived Ethiopians, and who dwell about the sacred city of Nysa ... Every third year these two nations brought – and they still bring to my day – two quarts of virgin gold, 200 logs of ebony, five Ethiopian boys, and twenty elephant tusks. The Colchians, and their neighbouring tribes who dwell between them and the Caucasus – for so far the Persian rule reaches, while north of the Caucasus no one fears them any longer – undertook to furnish a gift, which in my day was still brought every fifth year, consisting of 100 boys, and the same number of maidens. The Arabs brought every year 1,000 talents of frankincense. Such were the gifts which the king received over and above the *tax*.²¹

The passage specifically refers to the gifts given to Darius by the Ethiopians, the Colchians (together with their neighbors to the north), and the Arabs. However, it is not to be doubted that the practice continued in subsequent reigns – and that it was far from being restricted to a select number of subjects in the manner that Herodotus' testimony would seem to infer. As David Lewis has observed, "even after the introduction of tribute, it is fairly obvious that individuals and communities continued to make presents to the King of enormous quantity and variety." Lewis also takes note of the "lavish and crippling display of hospitality" occasioned by each passage of the king through his various territories.²² In a similar vein, in connection with Xerxes' march through the coastal districts of the northern Aegean in 480 B.C., Herodotus refers to the manufacture by the local subject people of gold and silver vessels for the table of the king – and notes that the inhabitants considered themselves fortunate that the king did not dine twice a

day.²³ An even more extensive description of the variety and quantity of the "gifts" that were presented to the Persian king by his subjects is found in Theopompus' *Philippika*:

"Which city and which people of those that are in Asia did not send ambassadors to the King? and what of those that are produced by the earth or fashioned by art, handsome and precious, was not brought as a gift to him? Were there not numerous and luxurious bed covers and mantles, some of sea purple, some embroidered, other white, and many golden tents furnished with all that is useful, and many robes of fine material and many luxurious beds? And, in addition, hollow silver and wrought gold and drinking cups and craters, of which you saw some inset with stones and others prepared with skill and luxury. And, in addition to those, numberless myriads of arms, some Greek others barbarian, and a plethora of beasts of burden and fatted sacrificial animals and numerous *medimnoi* of spices, and numerous were [the bags] and the sacs [and the leafs of paper] (made of) papyrus and of all others that are useful in life. And the preserved meat of slaughtered animals was such in quantity, that the piles of it became so great that those who approached them from a distance supposed them to be mounds or ridges ...²⁴

From the nature of the objects in this list it is clear that the varied gifts that were brought to the Persian king were not dissimilar in nature from the "gifts" that were traditionally included in earlier Near Eastern tribute lists and which are also said by Thucydides to have been regularly received by the Odrysian kings.

With reference to the reigns of Darius and Xerxes one cannot avoid at this point giving some consideration to the meaning of the reliefs which adorn the socle of the Apadana at Persepolis. In part at least the reliefs depict twenty-three separate delegations drawn from all corners of the empire. In most cases the individual delegations are shown bringing a prized or exotic animal into the presence of the king, and special trouble was taken to stress the quality and variety of the other, usually wrought "gifts" that had been brought from afar.²⁵

It is true that the role of the "gift-bearers" has been variously interpreted.²⁶ In the view of the present writers characteristic, obligatory gifts were exhibited – and it seems only logical to suppose that those who saw the reliefs in their original painted glory were meant to marvel at the enviable range of items that were customarily presented to the king over and above the required levels of tribute. In addition, it is hard to deny that one of the more basic messages projected by the friezes was the fact that the Persian kings placed an emphasis in the first place upon receiving gifts rather than on giving them, even if these same monarchs were also known to be willing to lavish rich rewards for services performed or anticipated.

In sum, the picture that emerges is one in which the vital bonds between the Persian king and his subjects were constantly reinforced by the ruler's receipt of gifts and by his bestowal of gifts. In this spirit we also believe that the tributary practices of the Odrysian monarchy were in line with conventional – and contemporary – Near Eastern practice in terms of both the giving and the receiving of gifts.²⁷

Thucydides 2.97.4 and Contemporary Athenian Politics

The question remains, nevertheless, why did Thucydides single out the Odrysian rulers for their supposedly one-sided interpretation of the niceties of gift-exchange, and why also did he look specifically to the Persians for a contrasting example of royal behavior?

Since Thucydides and his contemporaries undoubtedly knew that the Persian king habitually received gifts, just as the Odrysae habitually gave them, we might guess that Thucydides chose to offer no more than a partial picture which, in the political circumstances of the times, painted the Persian kings in a favorable light and the Odrysian rulers in a less favorable light. Indeed, the circumstances that could promote the invention of partial truths about the character of both Odrysian and Achaemenid rule are not difficult to detect in Athenian foreign policy and domestic political discourse at the time when Thucydides was writing.

Looking to the Persians for any positive model of dynastic behaviour would have been unthinkable to the Athenian orator Isocrates, writing after the King's Peace (387/6 B.C.) by which time the Persians had effectively put an end to Athenian aspirations to re-create their fifth-century empire. His *Panygericus*, produced in 380 B.C., launches a fierce attack against the Persian king's economic exploitation and cruel and humiliating treatment of his subjects,²⁸ consistently suppressing the "positive" aspects of Persian rule, notably their *polydoria*. His rhetoric also subscribes to negative Athenian perceptions of the Persians of longstanding:

... our (Athenian) fathers condemned many to death for defection to the Medes; in our public assemblies even to this day, before any other business is transacted, the Athenians call down curses upon any citizen who proposes friendly overtures to the Persians; and, at the celebration of the Mysteries, the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes, because of our hatred of the Persians, give solemn warning to the other barbarians also, even as to men guilty of murder, that they are forever banned from the sacred rites.²⁹

The "enmity ... from of old,"³⁰ however, could be pushed aside when Athens was seeking a degree of accommodation with Persia in order to strengthen her position among her allies³¹ and this was assuredly the case during the course of the Peloponnesian war when Athens sought to secure Persian subsidies in her struggle against Sparta.³² At such times the Athenians were far from insensible to the benefits that the Persian kings were able to bestow upon their friends.

"Positive" Athenian thinking about Persian manners, and a "remembrance" of Persian generosity would have been prompted, not least, by ambassadors returning from the Persian court with vivid memories of the King's hospitality, complete with "golden" promises, i.e. darics, for their state.³³ In Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, first presented on stage in 425 B.C., the Athenian ambassadors to the Persian king, returning from their travels with gifts of peacocks from the king,³⁴ recollections of drinking from gold and crystal cups,³⁵ and assurances of the king's intent to send "basketfuls of gold" to Athens³⁶ vividly document contemporary Athenian awareness of the benefits of Persian liberality.

While the Athenians customarily oscillated between interpreting the *dora* of the Great King as "gifts" or "bribes",³⁷ those prominent individuals and speakers of the *polis*, who found themselves (and their city) on the receiving end of the King's generosity, would have had every interest in magnifying the generosity of the Persian kings and in stressing the "altruistic" approach that the latter had towards gift-giving, even when the Persian rulers themselves appear to have made no conscious effort to leave a record of such behavior.

Like the Achaemenids, the Odrysaes, the other key protagonists of Thucydides 2.97.4, were also already linked with the course of Athenian affairs and they can be seen to have been equally stereotyped in Athenian political debate, by the time that Thucydides was writing. At the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, and while the siege of Potidaea was still in progress, Athens had concluded an alliance with the Odrysonian ruler, Sitalces, 431 B.C., and had extended citizenship to his son, Sadocus, with a view to securing Odrysonian assistance "in controlling," as Thucydides reports, "the Macedonian ruler Perdiccas and the towns in Thrace."³⁸

Space does not allow for a rehearsal of all the evidence which accounts for the collapse of this alliance in 429 B.C. – a failure which Thucydides imputes to Athenian distrust of the military assistance promised by Sitalces.³⁹ The main outlines of this episode are not, however, without implications for the present discussion.

The Persians, notably after the failure of their direct attacks on Greece, can be seen to have adopted a policy of promoting their interests in the Aegean by subsidizing internecine conflict among the Greeks – and, to a large extent, this circumstance can be held to account for the oscillating patterns of appreciation and distrust which accompanied "gifts" from the king. Thracian assistance, in contrast, entailed immediately visible costs. It took the form of paid mercenaries,⁴⁰ and Thucydides makes a point of the fact that, in addition to seeking to befriend the Odrysonian royal house by granting Sadocus Athenian citizenship, the Athenians had sent gifts to Sitalces in order to win his assistance. As it turned out, however, Sitalces' expedition of 429 B.C. was soon seen to entail unpredictable dangers for Athens. Instead of taking the form of a joint expeditionary force under the command of the Athenian, Hagnon,⁴¹ Sitalces himself led "a huge mob" into northern Greece where their ravaging rage inspired fear among the Hellenes "as far south as Thermopylae."⁴² Accusations against Athens by fellow Greeks that they intended to bring the Thracian forces to Greece to use against the Peloponnesians⁴³ and, not least, the Athenians' own fear that Sitalces might in the end keep what he had promised to help them obtain, could well provide, as Ernst Badian has argued, a cogent reason for Athens' desertion of Sitalces.⁴⁴

Indeed, in parodying on stage the "loving feelings" of Sitalces for Athens⁴⁵ and Sitalces' son's concern for his "newly-acquired fatherland",⁴⁶ in comparing the "Odomantian host" that Sitalces sent to the assistance of Athens to "a swarm of locusts...who would targeteer Boeotia all to bits",⁴⁷ and in stressing the exorbitant amount of two drachmas a day that members of that host were expecting to receive as pay,⁴⁸ Aristophanes was doing no more than demonstrate the extent of the distrust of the Odrysaes that Sitalces' expedition had instilled in the minds of most Athenians. It is against the background of this suspicion and an awareness of the cost of Odrysonian assistance that Thucydides' unjust characterization of the Odrysonian royal house – as one which took rather than gave – is perhaps best understood.⁴⁹

Notes

1. Thuc. 2.97.4. Unless otherwise indicated, translations of ancient passages cited are by A.Z.
2. For explorations of the functions of gift exchange in Odrysian Thrace, see especially Mauss 1921, Marazov 1986 and 1989, Briant 1987, 5-6, and Petropoulou 1990, 105. For Kallet-Marx, on the other hand, Thuc. 2.97.4 is not a commentary on the notion of reciprocity inherent in the institution of gift-exchange; instead the passage is taken to elaborate on the importance of gifts in order to establish "their regularity as a form of income" (1993, 126 and n. 44).
3. This notion is most clearly expressed in Hornblower's commentary on 2.97.4 (1991, 373) where the Thracian custom is reported to be "the opposite of that which is found in the Persian kingdom."
4. Xen. Anab. 7.3.15-33. The event took place during the return of the 10,000 through southeastern Thrace.
5. Xen. Anab. 7.3.18.
6. Xen. Anab. 7.3.26-7.
7. Xen. Anab. 7.3.19; cf. 7.5.8.
8. Xen. Anab. 7.5.8-7.47 *passim*.
9. See, e.g., Mitchell 1997, 136-7, who essentially subscribes to the objective nature of Thucydides 2.97.4.
10. References collected and discussed in Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1989, Hornblower 1982, 157, Lewis 1989, 228-9, Miller 1997, 127-30, Mitchell 1997, 112-4.
11. Xen. Cyrop. 8.2.7 (transl. W. Miller, Loeb).
12. Xen. Cyrop. 8.2.8 (transl. W. Miller, Loeb).
13. Cf. Briant 1987, 5-6.
14. Xen. Anab. 7.3.20.
15. Marazov 1986, 102: "The last words of Heraclides reveal best the specific character of this exchange of gifts: the king is always obliged to give more than he has received, moreover, he should offer royal gifts – fortified residences, land, and so on. Therefore, the Odrysian rulers paid with royal privileges for the gifts they received and this was the expression of generosity that was mandatory for the king."
16. For two of the admittedly few extant allusions to the generosity of the Odrysian rulers, see, Xen. Anab. 7.3.19 and and Thuc. 2.97.3. With reference to Thucydides' description of the apportionment of Odrysian tribute in 2.97.3 it is only logical to assume that the gifts to the nobles and subject princes of the Odrysae would have been distributed by the Odrysian ruler.
17. Thuc. 2.97.3 (transl. Ch. F. Smith, Loeb; modifications in italics).
18. Zaccagnini 1989, 197: "The whole of these deliveries is qualified *maddattu* 'tribute' and *sulmanu* 'gift(s)'... There is no doubt that the 'gifts' are the conveyances *ad personas*, that are listed after the 'tribute'." His suggested translation of the incipit of the list is: "Your tribute (*maddattu*) to the Sun, the Great King, your lord (is): 12 minas and 20 shekels of gold – 20 shekels as an addition; 1 golden bowl weighing 1 mina-'before' the tribute (*sa pani maddatti*) – 4 garments, 1 big garment, 500 shekels of blue purple wool – to the Sun, the Great King, his lord (lines 20-24)." For a complete list of the tribute that was imposed on Niqmadu, see Nougayrol 1956, 41-3:20-42.
19. Zaccagnini 1989, 196.

20. Hdt. 3.89.3.
21. Hdt. 3.97 (transl. G. Rawlinson, Modern Library; modifications indicated in italics).
22. Lewis 1989, 228.
23. Hdt. 7.118-20; cf. FGrHist 115 F 113.
24. FGrHist 115 F 263.
25. Schmidt 1953, 82-90, pls. 27-49.
26. Thus, while Herzfeld (1941, 268), Schmidt (1953, 82), Porada (1965, 152) and Godard (1965, 118) have each referred to the "tribute" that was depicted, Frankfort (1954, 230), Ghirshman (1954, 168), Walser (1966, 69), Shahbazi (1976, 42), Root (1979, 234), Calmeyer (1980, 56), Roaf (1983, 1), Cahill (1985, 387), Tuplin (1987, 142) and Briant (1996, 408) are among those who have preferred to believe that "gifts" were on display.
27. Cf. esp. Mauss 1921 and Briant 1987, 6: "... l'opposition entre Thraces et Perses est formelle, voir artificielle. Les rois thraces savent et doivent eux aussi donner: c'est le caractère mutuel des dons qui donne tout son sens social et politique à cette coutume."
28. See, e.g., Isoc. Panegyricus 123, 150, 151.
29. Isoc. Panegyricus 157 (transl. G. Norlin, Loeb).
30. Isoc. Panegyricus 159.
31. See, e.g., Thuc. 3.10.4, where the Mytilenaeans are said to have accused Athens (428 B.C.) of "relaxing her hostilities against Persia and being more concerned with the suppression of the allies." A thorough examination of the evidence for Athenian diplomatic overtures to Persia from the middle of the fifth century B.C., and from "possibly as early as late 464 B.C." is offered by Badian 1987 (quotation from p. 2).
32. See, e.g., Ar. Acharnians 61-127 (Athenian embassy to the Persian court in the archonship of Euthymenes, 437/6 B.C.); And. 3.29 and IG II² 8 ("peace of Epilycus", 424-3 B.C.); Thuc. 8.46, 87-8, 99, 108-9 (Alcibiades' negotiations with Tissaphernes concerning the disposition of the Phoenician fleet starting in the winter of 412/11 B.C.).
33. Ar. Acharnians 61-114. For gifts as a concomitant of the Persian kings' hospitality, see Badian 1987, 14 and ns. 26-7; Lewis 1989, 228; Miller 1997, 128. For a renewal of Athenian sympathetic rhetoric towards Persia in the fourth century B.C., motivated by the rising threat of Macedon, see Dem. 10.33-4 and 51-2, and 11.6 and Raubitschek 1964, 159.
34. Ar. Acharnians 62.
35. Ar. Acharnians 73-4.
36. Ar. Acharnians 108.
37. Cf. Badian 1987, 7-8 (analogous conflicting opinions about the "Peace of Callias"); Lewis 1989, 229 (for disparate Athenian responses to the king's "gifts"). For a Neo-Assyrian precedent to Achaemenid hospitality to visiting dignitaries, see Fales and Postgate 1992, XXIX and 135-6 no. 127 (a fragmentary tablet from Nineveh recording gifts of textiles, shoes and precious metals to Urartian ambassadors).
38. Thuc. 2.29 and 101; cf. Ar. Acharnians 145, D.S. 12.50-1. For the alliance with Sitalces, see Luppino 1981; for the grant of honors to Sadocus, Mitchell 1997, 143 (with references to earlier discussions).
39. Thuc. 101.1. For an insightful analysis of Sitalces' activities and Athenian politics at this juncture, see Badian 1993, 179-85.

40. In Thuc. 2.29.5 the initial promise of Sitalces is said to have been to "send the Athenians a Thracian force of cavalry and peltasts"; further instances of involvement of Thracian mercenaries in the Peloponnesian war in 5.62.2 (summer 422 B.C.) and 7.27.1-2 and 29 (summer of 413 B.C.).
41. Thuc. 95.3.
42. Thuc. 100.5-6, 101.1-4.
43. Thuc. 101.2.
44. Badian 1993, 184.
45. Ar. Acharnians 142-4.
46. Ar. Acharnians 145-7.
47. Ar. Acharnians 153-60.
48. Ar. Acharnians 159-70.
49. In addressing much the same historical context as Thucydides, the characters in Arisrtophanes' Acharnians also describe the Odrysae and the Achaemenids from a closely similar Athenian perspective. Thus they juxtapose the high price of the 'doubtful' support of the one, i.e., of the Odrysae (Ar. Acharnians 135-71), with the benefits to be painlessly gained from the other, i.e., the Achaemenids (Ar. Acharnians 65-108 passim).

Bibliography

- Badian E. 1987. The Peace of Callias. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107, 1-39.
- Badian E. 1993. From Plataea to Potidaea. *Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentekontaetia*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore and London.
- Briant P. 1987. Institutions perses et histoire comparatiste dans l'historiographie grecque. *The Greek Sources. Proceedings of the Groningen 1984 Achaemenid History Workshop*, ed. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt. *Achaemenid History 2*. Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1-10.
- Briant P. 1996. *Histoire de l'empire perse. De Cyrus à Alexandre*. Fayard. Paris.
- Cahill N. 1985. The Treasury at Persepolis: Gift-giving at the City of the Persians. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89, 373-389.
- Calmeyer P. 1980. Textual sources for the interpretation of Achaemenian palace decorations. *Iran* 18, 55-63.
- Fales F. M., Postgate J. N. 1992. *Imperial Administrative Records. Part 1. Palace and Temple Administration*. State Archives of Assyria 7. Helsinki University Press. Helsinki.
- FGrHist = Jacoby F. 1923-58. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, v.p.
- Frankfort H. 1954. *The Art and the Architecture of the Ancient Orient*. Penguin Books. Harmondsworth, Middlesex.
- Ghirshman R. 1954. *Iran from the Earliest Times to the Islamic Conquest*. Penguin Books. Harmondsworth, Middlesex.
- Godart A. 1965. *The Art of Iran* (transl. from the French by M. Heron). Allen and Unwin Ltd. London.
- Herzfeld E. 1941. *Iran in the Ancient East*. *Archaeological Studies Presented in the Lowell Lectures at Boston*. Oxford University Press. London and New York.
- Hornblower S. 1982. *Mausolus*. Clarendon Press. Oxford.

- Hornblower S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides. I, Books I-III*. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
- Kallet-Marx L. 1993. *Money, Expense, and Naval Power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24*. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Lewis D. M. 1989. *Persian Gold in Greek International Relations. L'or perse et l'histoire grecque*. Table Ronde CNRS, Bordeaux, 20-22 Mars 1989, ed. R. Descat. REA 91, 227-234.
- Luppino E. 1981 [1982]. *La ΣΥΜΜΑΧΙΑ tra Atene e Sitalce: Un episodio del primo anno della guerra del Peloponneso (Thuc., II, 29, 1-7)*. Rivista Storica dell'Antichità 11, 1-14.
- Marazov I. 1986. *Odrysiyan Royal Gifts in the Triballian Royal Treasure*. Southeastern Europe 13, 99-109.
- Marazov I. 1989. *The Gifts of the Odrysiyan Kings. The Rogozen Treasure*, ed. A. Fol. Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Sofia, 90-137.
- Mauss M. 1921. *Une forme ancienne de contrat chez les Thraces*. Revue des Etudes Grecques 34, 388-397.
- Miller M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C. A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Mitchel L. G. 1997. *Greeks Bearing Gifts. The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435-323 B.C.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Nougayrol J. 1956. *Textes accadiens des archives sud. Le palais royal d'Ugarit IV*. Imprimerie Nationale. Paris.
- Petropoulou A. 1990. *Σκυθικά νεκρώσιμα έθιμα (Ηρόδ. 4.73.1), Poikila. Μελετήματα 10*. Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity. Athens, 99-113.
- Porada E. 1965. *Ancient Iran. The Art of Pre-Islamic Times*. Methuen. London.
- Raubitschek A. E. 1964. *The Treaties between Persia and Athens*. Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 5, 151-159.
- Roaf M. 1983. *Sculptures and Sculptors at Persepolis*. Iran 21.
- Root M. C. 1979. *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. E. J. Brill. Leiden.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg H. 1989. *Gifts in the Persian Empire. Le tribut dans l'empire perse*. Actes de la Table Ronde de Paris, 12-13 Décembre 1986. ed. P. Briant and Cl. Herrens Schmidt. Peeters. Paris-Louvain, 129-146.
- Schmidt E. F. 1953. *Persepolis I, Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions*. Oriental Institute Publications 68. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Shahbazi A. Sh. 1976. *Persepolis Illustrated*. Offset Press. Tehran.
- Tuplin C. 1987. *The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire. Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires*. Ed. I. Carradice. BAR-IS 343. British Archaeological Reports. Oxford, 137-158.
- Walser G. 1966. *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis: Historische Studien über den sogenannten Tributzug an der Apadanatreppe*. Teheraner Forschungen 2. Mann. Berlin.
- Zaccagnini C. 1989. *Prehistory of the Achaemenid Tributary System. Le tribut dans l'empire perse*. Actes de la Table Ronde de Paris, 12-13 Décembre 1986. ed. P. Briant and Cl. Herrens Schmidt. Peeters. Paris-Louvain, 193-215.