

IAN RUTHERFORD

THE AMPHIKLEIDAI OF SICILIAN NAXOS: PILGRIMAGE AND GENOS IN THE
TEMPLE INVENTORIES OF DELOS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 122 (1998) 81–89

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE AMPHIKLEIDAI OF SICILIAN NAXOS: PILGRIMAGE AND GENOS IN THE TEMPLE INVENTORIES OF DELOS*

1) The Delian Temple-Inventories

Temple-accounts from Delos survive over a period of two centuries, from the Athenian Amphictyony in the 4th century BCE through the period of Independence until the renewal of Athenian rule in the 2nd century BCE. They were compiled yearly as one group of hieropoioi handed over responsibility to the next. Most of the surviving temple accounts consist of two main parts: accounts of incoming funds (e.g. rents) and expenditures; and inventories of precious items and dedications stored and displayed in the sacred buildings of the Delian sanctuary. They list dedications in accordance with the buildings in which they were stored, including the Temple of Apollo, the House of the Andrians, the Temple of the Seven, the Porninos Naos, and the Artemisium.

The data on precious items they contain is of unparalleled detail for a Greek sanctuary.¹ They include *phialai*, made of gold or silver or at least overlaid with them; other types of vessel and culinary utensil; crowns and *stlengides* (head-bands, an offering characteristic of Delos); rings, necklaces and other jewellery. There are a few special objects: the Panionian *krater*, for example, and the “Geranos”, perhaps a collection of offerings made by participants in the famous Delian Crane-Dance. There is also one mythological relic: the “Necklace of Eriphyle”, one of several copies, apparently, since there was also one in Delphi (until the Phocians carried it off in the 4th century BCE) and another in Amathus in Cyprus.²

Other precious objects were inscribed with the names of dedicators. Some of the dedicators were locals and others visitors, mostly pilgrims, particularly members of official delegations. Two traditions of state-pilgrimage are well-documented. First, golden crowns relating to twenty quadrennial enactments of the Athenian pilgrimage were preserved in the “Temple of the Athenians” during the period of the Amphictyony; *stlengides* dedicated by Nikias, Kallias, Autokles on the Athenian state-pilgrimages they led in the late 5th century were still kept in the 4th century. Second, during the period of Independence, Delos is visited by sacred delegations from the Nesiotic League, particularly from Kos and Rhodes, as well as from the Ptolemies in Alexandria, and numerous offerings from these delegations were preserved in the sanctuary. State delegations came from other areas as well, including Sicily. There are also a large number of dedications by private individuals. These tend to come from less

* Thanks to Barbara Kowalzig and John Morgan. The Delian inscriptions discussed here are:

Pre-314 BCE: J. Coupry, *Inscriptions de Délos. Période de l'Amphictyonie Attico-Délienne. Actes Administratifs* (No. 89–104.33) (Paris, 1972).

314–250 BCE: F. Dürrbach, *Inscriptiones Graecae XI.2, Inscriptiones Deli Liberae. Tab. Archontum. Tab. Hiero-poeorum. Annorum 314–250*, comprising ID 105–289 (Berlin, 1912);

250–166 BCE: F. Dürrbach, *Inscriptions de Délos. Comptes de Hiéropes* (No. 290–371) (Paris, 1926) and id., *Inscriptions de Délos. Comptes de Hiéropes* (No. 372–498) (250–166 BC), *Lois et Règlements, Contracts d'Enterprises et Devis* (No. 499–509) (Paris, 1929).

166 BCE– : F. Dürrbach and P. Roussel, *Inscriptions de Délos. Actes de Fonctionnaires Athéniennes Préposées à l'Administration des Sanctuaires Après 166 Av. J.-C. (No. 1400–1479), Fragments d'Actes Divers (ca 1480–1496)* (Paris, 1935)

¹ Parallels include the Lindian Chronicle, where many of the entries are mythological in nature (see C. Blinkenberg, *La chronique du temple Lindien* [Copenhagen, 1912]; the temple chronicle from Roman Perge (see R. Merkelbach and S. Şahin, *Inchriften von Perge*, *EA* 11 (1988), 97–167, where, however, the data is much less detailed.

² Geranos: Coupry, *Inscriptions de Délos. Période de l'Amphictyonie Attico-Délienne* (above, n.*): 44; P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Delos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Bibliothèque de l'École française d'Athènes et de Rome, 217 (Paris, 1970), 175–6; Eriphyle: Coupry, *id.*: 45.

well defined geographical areas, including areas on the Greek mainland (Sicyon, Thessaly, Elaia, Cnidus), and in the Hellenistic period Asia Minor.

We might expect that a dedication would appear in one list, in the year when the dedication was made or soon afterwards, and remain there in all subsequent inventories. And we might expect that some early dedications would appear in all the surviving inventories, from the 4th century BCE to the 2nd. Some dedications are permanent fixtures in the inventories. However, many of the dedications are attested for a sequence of inventories and then cease to appear. Often, a number appear and cease to be mentioned together at key watersheds (e.g. at the end of the Athenian Amphictyony; around 296 BCE (ID 154); around 276 BE (ID 161); around the end of the 3rd century BCE (ID 338); and at the end of Delian rule in 166 BCE³). How do we explain such disappearances? Among the obvious possibilities are that dedications were looted, or that they were melted down to provide funds, or sold.

But it is also possible that the inventories are not consistently comprehensive in what they record. As Tullia Linders observes in a study of the inventories: “The list of offerings . . . never gives more than a selection of the treasure – and . . . a selection which varies from inventory to inventory – is . . . a symbol more than a record that the hieropoioi had fulfilled their duties.”⁴ Accordingly, we might explain the watersheds referred to above by the hypothesis that succeeding generations of hieropoioi usually agreed about what they thought was worth mentioning, but sometimes decided to change the list, including recent dedications and omitting items that for what ever reason had become less interesting.

2) The Phiale of the Amphikleidai of Sicilian Naxos

The inventories of the Independence record the existence of a phiale bearing the inscription: Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξου ἑξικελίας Ἀπόλλωνι (“Amphikleidai of Naxos from Sicily for Apollo”). In the inventory from 229 BCE = ID 320B14, this was the last of a group of so called “Phialai of the Ancients”.⁵ The same position is restored in ID 358.15 from a few years later. Even earlier, a φιαλῆ Ναξίων τ[ῶν ἐκ Σικελίας is restored in IG XI.2.245b4 (precise date uncertain), but this need not be the same one.

The Phialai of the Ancients were an independent group of dedications, first attested in 249 BCE (IG XI.2.287B123); they are usually listed either after the inventory of the temple of Apollo (ID 298, 313, 314, 315, dated by Dürrbach between 240 BCE and 233 BCE) or after that of the Porinos Naos (ID 320, 338, dated to 229 BCE and 210 BCE).⁶ The phiale of the Amphikleidai is mentioned in the latest of the inventories listing the Phialai of the Ancients. In the earlier ones (ID 298, ID 313, ID 314 etc.) there is no reference to the Amphikleidai, although they do mention a phiale of Amphikleides the Naxian (ID 298A61; ID 313A51; ID 314B51); since in the sequence Amphikleides the Naxian ceases to be mentioned precisely when the Amphikleidai of Naxos begin to be mentioned, one wonders whether the references to Amphikleides represent a misreading of the inscription on the phiale; perhaps it has become dirty and was cleaned; such misreadings are not unparalleled in the inventories.⁷

³ The end of the 3rd century is regarded as a watershed for other reasons by Tullia Linders, *The Purpose of Inventories: A Close Reading of the Delian Inventories of the Independence*, *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*, ed. D. Knoepfler (Neuchâtel, 1988), 38 and 41.

⁴ Linders (above, n. 2), quote from p. 41; see also J. Tréheux, *Une nouvelle lecture des inventaires d'Apollon à Délos*, *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*, ed. D. Knoepfler (Neuchâtel, 1988), 29–36.

⁵ τῶν ἀρχαίων φιάλαι is the form transmitted at IG XI.2.287B127; Dürrbach restores αἱ ἀρχαίαι φιάλαι elsewhere.

⁶ ID 314 may in fact predate ID 313, despite Dürrbach's chronology: see below.

⁷ For example, Polyandros the son of Thersandros the Samian in ID 313 (#3) turns into Polyandros and Thersos in ID 314 and following; discussed by Dürrbach, in ID, page 58. Cf. Hegesilaos Pa (#12) . . . which seems to indicate that only the beginning could be read. Timophanes in ID 298 (#39) seems to correspond to Timomachus in ID 320. Carelessness in reading is also attested in a number of repetitions in the list (e.g. #1 repeated as #15, #6 repeated as #45).

Delian inventories mentioning the Phialai of the Ancients

	Year	Ἀμφικλείδου Νάξιου	Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξιοι ἐξικελίας Ἀπόλλωνι
ID 298,A56 ff.	240 BCE	Yes	No
ID 313,a47 ff.	235 or 234 BCE	Yes	No
ID 314,B46 ff.	?	Yes	No
ID 320,B7 ff.	229 BCE	No	Yes
ID 358,8 ff.	around 220 BCE	No	Supplied

In later inventories (after 199 BCE), the “Phialai of the Ancients” disappear; in fact there is a major discontinuity in the temple-inventories around this time (see above). However, from 199 BCE a phiale with the inscription Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξου ἐξικελίας Ἀπόλλωνι appears in the temple of Apollo, among the dedications visible on the left side of the entry in temple-inventories (ID 380.85; ID 396B22; ID 422.28; ID 439a48; ID 442B41 (restored); ID 455Bb15; ID 461Ba57). For the most part the dedications mentioned there are ones that have not been mentioned before. The phiale of the Amphikleidai is last in this sequence, as it was among the Phialai of the Ancients; it is not clear what the position means. This may or may not have been the same phiale; if it is, it was the only one of the Phialai of the Ancients that is mentioned in later inventory lists.

In lists after 169 BCE, there is no mention of Sicilian Naxos; it is not mentioned in any of the inventories from the second period of Athenian rule.

How old was the Phiale of the Amphikleidai? One might have thought no older than its first mention in the inventories. However, there is one strong reason for believing that any dedication from Sicilian Naxos is from the 5th century BCE or before: Sicilian Naxos ceased to exist after 403 BCE. Its successor was a new foundation at Tauromenium, and it may be no coincidence that Tauromenium sent a dedication or dedications to Delos, which are mentioned in inventories between 364 BCE and 240 BCE; these must therefore have been sent at sometime between 403 BCE (when it was founded) and 364 BCE (the date of one of the earliest surviving temple inventories). Tauromenium was perhaps continuing a tradition of pilgrimage that had been established by Naxos.⁸

An association between Sicilian Naxos and pilgrimage in the classical period is attested by Thucydides (*Hist.* 6.3.1), who says that the shrine of Apollo Arkhegetes at Naxos was where theoroi sacrificed on leaving Sicily; these would no doubt have included states that were founded from Naxos, such as Leontini, which sent an early dedication to Delos. Delos would be a natural pilgrimage center for state-pilgrims from Naxos, which was an Ionian foundation from Chalcis. One reason that Naos came to occupy this pivotal position in Sicilian pilgrimage is likely to have been that its own traditions of pilgrimage were particularly strong.⁹

The Phiale of the Amphikleidai and the Phialai of the ancients in the Delian Inventories

A) up to 314 BCE (period of Amphictyony):

no dedication from Sicilian Naxos, no Phialai of the Ancients mentioned

B) 314 BCE – 166 BCE (period of Independence)

Bi) 314–278 BCE:

No dedication from Sicilian Naxos, no Phialai of the Ancients mentioned

Bii) 278–250 BCE:

No Phialai of the Ancients mentioned; a Phiale from Sicilian Naxos is attested (IG XI.2.245b4)

⁸ P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Delos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Bibliothèque de l'École française d'Athènes et de Rome, 217 (Paris, 1970) 113. ἐν ξυλῶ: ID 101.40 (367 BCE), 103.60 (?), ID 104.117 (364 BCE?), 104(11)B10 (?), 104(12), 88 (353/2 BCE), 104(27)B15 (343 BCE), 104(30)5 (334/3 BCE), 104(31)10 (332/1 BCE), IG XI.2.154A64 (296 BCE), ἐν πλιυθῶ: IG XI.2.161B103 (279 BCE), IG XI.2.161A37 (276 BCE), IG XI.2.199B26, IG XI.2.296B12 (244 BCE), IG XI.2.298A114 (240 BCE). On these, G. Manganaro, *Le tavole finanziarie di Tauromenion, Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*, ed. D. Knoepfler (Neuchâtel, 1988), 170–2.

⁹ Leontini: ID 104, 93 (366 BCE) etc; restored at ID 103. 35 (367 BCE); for Naxos as a pivotal centre, compare the case of Kos, discussed below.

Biii) 249 BCE and after (IG XI.2.287B123; ID 298, ID 313, ID 314 etc):

Phialai of the Ancients mentioned (IG XI.2.287) or listed (later ones); when listed, they come after the inventory of Temple of Apollo, including one from Amphikleides the Naxian

Biv) 229 BCE and after (ID 320B14; supplied in ID 358.15 [around 220 BCE]):

Phialai of the Ancients mentioned, listed after the inventory of the Porinos Naos, including one inscribed Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξου ἐξικελίας Ἀπόλλωνι

Bv) 199–169 BCE (ID 380.85; ID 396B22; ID 422.28; ID 439a48; ID 455Bb15; ID 461Ba57):

No reference to Phialai of the Ancients, but a phiale with the inscription Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξου ἐξικελίας Ἀπόλλωνι appears in the inventory of the temple of Apollo, among the dedications visible on the left side of the entry.

C) After 166 BCE (period of Roman Rule):

No reference to Phialai of the Ancients or Sicilian Naxos.

3) Who were the Amphikleidai?

This is the only patronymic-type noun in *-ιδαι* among dedicators in the list of the Phialai of the Ancients, and I think in the whole of the Delian inventories. One possibility is to interpret this as a genuine patronymic adjective: “sons of Amphikles”. In favour of this is the fact that sibling dedicators sometimes identify themselves as sons of their father: among the Arkhaiiai Phialai is one dedicated by the sons of Kullios of Cyrene (#22: see appendix for reference of numbers), another by the sons of Kaphor (#23), others by the paides of Theomedes (#42), and paides of Mandronikos (#43). But against this is the fact that the usual way of expressing filiation is to use the genitive of the father’s name, not a filiation formula in *-ιδαι*.¹⁰

The more likely interpretation, surely, is that the “Amphikleidai” are members of a Naxian *γένος*. Members of *γένη* are often denoted by proper nouns with the “patronymic” suffix *-ιδαι*.¹¹ Until recently, no such *γένος*-name was attested from Sicilian Naxos. But recently discovered terracotta pellets attest the existence of two *γένη* there: the Pollidai (early 5th century BCE), and the Hermondai (later 5th century BCE).¹²

Πολλίδαι	Ἐρμώνδαι
Πρόταρχος	Ὀνομόστατος
Ἐπικρατίλο	Ἐπαμένος

In each case the name of the *γένος* is accompanied by a man’s name and patronymic, presumably indicating a member of the *γένος*.

The link between *γένη* and religious practices is well-established in the Greek world, particularly in Athens, where members of different *γένη* were concerned with different cults (the Praxiergidai with the Plunteria and so on). One explanation for their religious involvement would be that *γένη* are anachronistic and highly conservative forms of social organisation, which preserve older religious traditions. However, that is not the only explanation available. The key-point might be that religious practice in the ancient Greek polis can be the inherited prerogative of a family of priests; such priestly families may well have been included in or identical to *γένη*; thus, families or *γένη* of priests might be as likely to control recently established religious practices as ancient ones.¹³

One class of religious activities in which *γένη* concern themselves are those that involve pilgrimage. For Kos, an inscription from about 300 BCE describes the elaborate rituals that take place at the time

¹⁰ On the morphology, see most recently M. B. G. Keurentjes, The Greek Patronymics in *-(ί)δας/- (ι)δης*, *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997), 385–400.

¹¹ The material is well gathered in J. Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin, 1889); D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique* (Paris, 1976); see now R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History* (Oxford, 1996), 56–66 and 284–327.

¹² F. Cordano, Gruppi gentilizi presso i Nassi di Sicilia, *BA LXXIII*. 48 (1988), 18–22. The Pollidai are attested also from Ceos (SIG³ 927) and Teos (CIG 3064). For inscriptions from Sicilian Naxos, see G. Nenci and G. Vallet ed., *Bibliographia topographica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nella Isole tirreniche XII* (Pisa–Rome, 1993), 265–312.

¹³ Roussel (above, n. 7), chapter VI, 65–78; J. K. Davies in *OCD*³, s. *genos*.

when the Koan *θεωρία* sets out for Delos.¹⁴ Delegations from neighbouring states, such as Knidos, and probably Kalymna, come and take part in the sacrifice. The Coan rituals are supervised by the so-called Amphiaraidai, apparently a priestly guild who traced their lineage to Amphiaraus.¹⁵ We do not know that they went on the pilgrimage, however.

Athens supplies other examples of *γέννη* concerned with pilgrimage. The Puthais-inscriptions describing the hellenistic Puthaides to Delphi mention certain priestly *γέννη*, the Purrhakidai and the Euneidai, and these do take part in the pilgrimage.¹⁶ The founding hero of the Purrhakidai, Purrhakos, was a contemporary of Erusikhthon, according to Hesychius, and they are known to have been active on Delos also.¹⁷ The Euneidai are more obscure: Euneos was a Lemnian, a child of Theseus and Hippolyte, but no connection with Delphi is known, or with Apollo. It seems likely that these same families had a traditional association with the *Puthais*, going back at least to the 5th century BCE. The Erusikhthonidai who take part in the *Puthais* in 97 BCE (FD III.2 10.II.17); perhaps had a long-standing involvement with Apollo, in view of the tradition reported by Pausanias that Erusikhthon transported a statue to Delos. They were associated with Prasiai.¹⁸

Still more links between *γέννη* and pilgrimage have been suggested. Borimir Jordan argued that the crews of Athenian theorides may have belonged to special artificial *γέννη*. One of the functions of the *γέννος* of the Salaminioi, he suggests, was to man the sacred trireme the *Salaminia*.¹⁹ Similarly, the crew of the *Paralos* were a group called the “Paraloi”, who may also have constituted a *γέννος*.²⁰

Finally, the Attic *γέννος* of the Gephuraioi sent delegates to Delphi to consult the oracle, according to an Athenian inscription reconstructed by Merritt. In this activity, members of the *γέννος* act on behalf of the *γέννος*, and do not contribute to a state-pilgrimage.²¹

My suggestion is that the Amphikleidai mentioned in the Delian temple inventories were members of a similar priestly *γέννος* who organised and performed the Naxian theoria to Delos. Amphikles will have been their mythical founder, presumably a hero worshipped in the area of Naxos (in connection with the cult of Apollo Arkhegetes?). It must be admitted that we do not know of any hero Amphikles, either on Naxos or anywhere else. But the eponymous founders of the Athenian Euneidai and Purrhakidai are obscure as well.

¹⁴ Herzog, HIK 5b; S. M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period* [= *Hypomnemata* 51] (Göttingen, 1978), 299–30; LSCG 156B; M. Dubois, *De Co insula* (Nancy, 1884), 44, n. 17.

¹⁵ No cult of Amphiaraus is otherwise known from Cos, but there was a cult of Amphilochoi at Rhodes: D. Morelli, *I culti di Rodi* (SCO, 8) (Pisa, 1959), 161; connected in M. Segré, *L’agorà degli dei Camirene*, *Atheneum* 12 (1931), 146–7.

¹⁶ Another family seems to be indicated by . . . Ἰπτιδῶν in the introduction to the list of *kanephoroi* in *Puthais* 3. E. A. Boethius, *Die Pythais: Studien zur Geschichte der Verbindungen zwischen Athen und Delphi* (Diss. Uppsala, 1918), 109.

¹⁷ P. Roussel, *Deux familles Athéniennes à Délos*, *BCH* 53 (1929), 166ff. The Delian inscriptions are *ID* 6. 66 and 67, both 4th century BCE. Cf. F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du genos* (Lille, 1976), 2. 1162–5.

¹⁸ Pausanias; Eusebius, *PE* 3. 8 (= Tresp, 79), says that the statue of Erusikhthon was used ἐπὶ θεωρίων (for the purpose of *θεωρία*?); Erusikhthonidai on Delos: P. Roussel, *Deux familles Athéniennes à Délos*, *BCH* 53 (1929), 166 ff., 179ff., supplementing *ID* 4. 1624, 5. 2616, 2517, 2518; Bourriot, 2. 1087–91. The Erusikhthonidai are discussed by N. Robertson, *The Ritual Background of the Erysikhthon Story*, *AJPh* 105 (1984), 385. Cf. Erusikhthon’s involvement in *θεωρία* in Callimachus, h. 5.

¹⁹ B. Jordan, *The Athenian Navy in the Classical Period. A Study of Athenian Naval Administration and Military Organisation in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.* [= UCPCA, 13] (Berkeley, 1975), 166ff., particularly 170. The basis for his argument is the fact that the Salaminioi sacrificed in honour of Poseidon Hippiodromios, and the heroes Phaiax, Teukros and Nauseiros (Sokolowski, *Supp.* n. 19, 90–1); this seems to have happened at Phaleron, because according to Philochorus, *FGrHist* 328F111 (= Plutarch, *Theseus* 17. 6) there were *heroa* there in honour of Nausithoos (= Nauseiros?), and Phaiax, the pilot and look-out man of Theseus. This association gives us a *prima facie* reason to associate the Salaminioi with sea-faring. Jordan, 168, thinks that Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 2. 40. 2: τιμάται δέ τις καὶ Φαληροῦ ἑκατά πρύμναν ἥρωος’ (“a hero of the stern is honoured also in Phaleron”) refers to Phaiax, but the Σ takes it of Androgeos, son of Minos, backing this up with a reference to Callimachus, *Aitia* 4 (independent testimony as fr. 103).

²⁰ Jordan (above, n. 15), 173 ff, referring in particular to *IG* II² 1254.

²¹ B. D. Merritt, *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 9 (1940), 86–96.

4) The Phialai of the Ancients

As for the other “Phialai of the Ancients”, when the inventories report ethnicity of the dedicators, they usually turn out to be Ionians: Lukinos the Naxian; Polyarchus the Samian; Perillus the Phogelandrian; Pathon of Tenos; Anaxidamas of Samos; Petraios of Naxos, Kleinos of Kea, ? son of Krines, a Samian (the writing was apparently difficult to read) . Preximenes seem to be an Ionian name. There are communal dedications from Ios, Mukonos and Naxos. One, Xeniadadas, comes from Megara. Two come from Cyrenaica: one by the sons of Cyllus of Cyrene; the other from Esthloikos and Onasitimos of Barke. All in all, this suits the period before the Athenian take-over described by Thucydides, when the catchment area of Delos was principally Ionia.²²

If all, or most of these, are really come from the 5th century, it does not follow that the arrangement of them in to a group of “Phialai of the Ancients” is as old. It seems more likely that this grouping is a Hellenistic development, when someone rearranged them as a display for tourists. Did ideological factors influence the decision to arrange them in this way? We would expect a Delos which had newly regained its independence to be interested in presenting a view of its past in which Athens played little or no part. There is some support for this view in that we know that the temple which during the period of the Athenian Amphictyony was referred to in the inventories as “the Temple of the Athenians” is referred to differently in inventories from the period of Independence as the “Temple of the Seven (Statues)”.²³ The change of name is presumably motivated by a desire to minimise the appearance of Athenian influence in the sanctuary. In the Athenian period it contained many golden crowns and other dedications made by the leaders of Athenian delegations; in the period of Independence, only a small number of these are still mentioned in the inventories.

It is possible to interpret the appearance of the Phialai of the Ancients as part of the same reassessment of their past by the Delians. Although most of the Phialai purport to be by Ionians, none is dedicated by an Athenian. They seem represent a choice to look back to a period before the Athenian one to when the island was the center of Ionian pilgrimage, as described by Thucydides.

To allow that there was a political motivation in the selection of the Phialai of the Ancients opens the door to the possibility that some or even all of them could have been forgeries (it would be necessary only to forge the inscription on ancient-looking vessels). It is impossible to prove that they were not. But it is surely more likely that they were genuine, having simply been ignored for two hundred years, presumably because they were comparatively plain and inelaborate.

5) Conclusion

In the 5th century BCE, or before, a *genos* called the *Amphikleidai* from Sicilian Naxos organised and took part in a sacred delegation to Delos. They dedicated a phiale there. This phiale is mentioned in Delian temple inventories between 229 BCE and 169 BCE. Its absence from earlier inventories is perhaps to be explained by the hypothesis that the inventories were never meant to be complete records.

Lists of the Arkhaiiai Phialai

NB IG XI.287B127 specifies 49 phialai; ID 298 gives 53; but fewer are actually listed.

A = ID 298Aa, 56ff. (240 BCE);

B = ID 313a47 ff. (235–4 BCE)

²² One factor that might provide guidance in the dating is the reference to “the games of Lysimachides” in #3, the phialai of a Samian, but unfortunately it seems impossible to pin this down in any way.

²³ See Courby, *Notes topographiques et chronologiques sur le sanctuaire d’Apollon Délien*, *BCH* 45 (1921), 179; Bruneau (above, n. 2), 60–2.

- C = ID 314Ba47 ff. (dated by Dürrbach to 233 BCE, but see below)
 D = ID 315.10 ff. (date uncertain; this is only a small fragment)
 E = ID 320B7 ff. (229 BCE)
 F = ID 338 (223–2 BCE)
 G = ID 358 (ca. 220 BCE)

The basic enumeration is from A, with additions from other inscriptions marked with i and ii. It is assumed that entries occur in A unless otherwise mentioned. Asterisk * means “supplied”.

The lists are fragmentary, and in many cases only parts of entries survive. For example, in the case of #1 we have:

- #1 Ἀρχάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου: B,
 Ἀρχλάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου: C,
 Ἀρχάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου: D,
 Ἀρχλάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου: E

To save space, I cite details only when there is reason think that there is variation.

There is one indication that the true chronology is (AC) followed by (BE): in #32 and #33, A, C separate the two entries, B and E seem to collapse them together. There seem to be no case of agreement of AB against CE. Dürrbach’s dating (p. 76) of C is conjectural; he acknowledges that the latest arkhon mentioned is Timagenes in B76, dated to 237 BCE; but conjectures that later arkhões were mentioned in lacunae, e.g. in B58.

Title	ΚΑΙ ΑΙΔΕ ΦΙΛΛΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ ΦΙΛΛΩΝ	C, D
#1	Ἀρχάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου:	A*, B, C, D, E
#2	Λυκίνου Ναξίου:	A, B, C, E
#3 ^a	Πολυάρχου τοῦ Θερασάνδρου Σαμίου ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου: Πολυάρχου Θέρσου Σαμίου ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου: Πολυάρχου Θέρσου Σαμίου: Πολυάρχου Θερασίου Σαμίου ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου: ἰς ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου:	A B C E F
#3i ^a	Θέρσου Σαμίου	could be a distinct dedicant in B, C, E
#4	Ἐχεκράτου Δηλίου: Ἐχεκράτης . . χ:	A*, B, C, E* F
#5	Λεωχαρίδου καὶ παίδων Λεωχαρίδου καὶ οἱ ἱπαῖδες	B, F* (?) C, A* (?)
#6	Τύννωνος καὶ Μενέφρονος:	A*, B, C*, D, E
#7b	Τεισίου τοῦ Τεισάρχου Δηλίου Τεισίου Δηλίου	A C*, D, E B* (lacuna of uncertain size)
#8	Περίλλου Φογελανδρίου:	A, B, C, E
#9	Παυσανία ἀνάθημα Παυσανία Παυσανία Παυσανία ἀνάθημα ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου Παυσανία ἀνάθημα	A B, F F C, E
#9a	Ναξίων ἀνάθημα	C, om. A, B, E, F
#10	Ἐλικάνδρου ἀνάθημα: Ἐλικάνδρου	A* B, C, E*, F, G
#11	Δηλίων ἀνάθημα:	A*, B, C, E*, F
#12	Ἥγησιλάω πα[. . . (παῖδες ?)]:	A*, B, C, E*
#13	Καλλι]σθένου:	A*, B, C*, E*
#14	Πετραίου Ναξίου:	A, B, C*
#15	Ἀρχάνδρου καὶ Πολυδῶρου: (= #1?)	A, B, C, E
#16	Ἀρπάλιος καὶ Πάθωνος Τηνίου: Ἀρπάλιος, Πάθωνος] Τηνίου: Ἀρπάλιος, Πάθωνος: Ἀρπάλιος, Πάθωνος Τηνίου: Ἀρπάλιος καὶ Πάθωνος Τηνίου: [[Πάθων] Τηνίος	A; C, D, E (B uncertain) F(?)
#16i	Πάθωνος Τηνίου	seems to be separate in C, D, E, F
#17	Θάλλου τοῦ Θεομβρότου: Θάλλου τοῦ Θεομβρότου ἀνάθημα:	A*, B, C, D, E, F, G

#18	Ίήτων ανάθημα:	A*, B, C, E
#19	Ξειάδου Μεγαρέως:	A*, B, C*, E*
#20]του Κρίνεω Σαμίου:	A; om. B, C, D, E, F
#20i	Κωμίωος καὶ Θάλλου:	B, C*; E*, om. A
#20ii	Πολ . . .:	B, C*, E*, om. A
#20iii	Ἐναξιδάμα Σαμίου :	B, C, E*, om. A
#21	Κυλλίου Κυρηναίου παῖδες: Κυλλίου Κυρηναίου:	A, B, E C,
#22	ύεις Κάφωνος:	A, B, C, D, om. E
#23	Ἐναξιδάμα Σαμίου ανάθημα (NB = #21iii): Ἐναξιδάμα Σαμίου	A, B*, C D, F, E
#24	Κλεινίου Κείου:	A*, B, C*, E, om. F
#25	Ναξίοι Ἀπόλλωνι: Ναξίων ἀνάθημα: ἄλλη μέλανι ἐπιγεγραμμένη [Ναξίων	B, F, A* C; E, G
#26	Ἐλικάνδρου:	B, A* C*, E*, om. F
#27	Πρηξιμένου:	B, F, A*, C*, E*
#28	Κλέωνος καὶ Σημαγόρα: Κλέωνος, Σημαγόρα Κλέωνος Σημαγόρα ἀριστεῖον ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου:	A; B, C, E*
#28i	Σημαγόρα:	B, E*;
#29	Ἐπάρκουσ τοῦ Ἀλυαίου: Ἐπάρχου τοῦ Ἀλυ[?]αίου: Ἐπάρχου Ἀλυδαίου :	A, C B E
#30	Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου Δηλίου ἄθλον: Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου: Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου. Δηλίων ἄθλον: Εὐκλείδου τ[οῦ] Νεωκόρου Δηλί[?] ἄθλον:	A, C E B
#30i	Δηλίων ἄθλον: Δηλίων ἄθλον τῶν [ἄ]θλων τῶν ἐγ [Δήλου]	E (maybe B?) F om. A, B, C*, D, A*, B, C*, D, E
#31	Παντέλου ἀνάθημα:	A
#32, 3	Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα. Ναξίων ἀνάθημα τῶν ἄθλων τῶν ἐγ Δήλου: Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα. Ναξίων ἀνάθημα τῶν ἄθλων ἐγ Δήλου: Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα τῶν] ἄθλων ἐγ Δήλου: Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα. Ναξίων ἀνάθημα τῶν] ἐγ Δήλου ἄθλων: Μυκοίνων ἀνάθημα τῶν] ἐγ Δήλου ἄθλων:	C B, D E F, G A*
#34	Ἐσθλοίκου καὶ Ὀνασιτίμου Βαρκαίων ἀνάθημα Ἐσθλοίκου καὶ Ὀνασιτίμου : Ἐσθλοίκου καὶ Ὀνασιτίμου Βαρκαίων ἀνάθημα Ἐσθλοίκου καὶ Ὀνασιτίμου - - ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου] ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου :	C B E
#35	Ἐμφικλείδου Ναξίου :	B, C, A*, om. E
#35i	Κλεινίου = #24:	F, om. A, C (in E Dürrbach supplements Ἐχεκράτου, from #4?)
#36	Ἰητῶν ἀριστεῖον ἐγ Δήλου: Ἰητῶν ἀριστεῖον ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου Ἰητῶν ἀνάθημα:	A*, B, C E om. F
#37	Ἰπποτάδεω ἀνάθημα	A, B, C*, E, F
#37i	Ναξίων ἀνάθημα:	B, C*, E, G, om. A
#38	Τιμοφάνους Δηλίου:	A, D, B*, C*, om. E
#38i	Τιμομάχας:	E, om. A, B, C*; seems to be a misreading of Τιμοφάνους
#39	Λεωμύθου:	A, B*, C*, E
#40	Ἐρξηνόρος τοῦ Γλαύκου:	A, B, C*, E*
#40i	(E seems to have space for an extra name here)	

#41	Θεομέλεω παίδων Θεομέλεος παίδων :	A B, C, E*
#42	παίδων τῶν Μανδρονίκου: παίδων τῶν Μανδρονί[κ]ου ἀνάθημα: τῶν παίδων τῶν Μανδρονί[κ]ου]	A*, B, C; E F (in F this is after #43)
#42i	Ναξίων ἀνάθημα:	B, om. A, C, E;
#42ii	Ἀριστοκλείας: Ἀριστοκλείας ἀνάθημα	F; E; om. A, B, C
#43	Εὐκλέος καὶ Τιμησαρέτης:	A*, B, C, F, om. E
#44	Τύνωνος καὶ Μενέφρονος (= #6?):	A*, B, C, E, G (order of #44 and #45 reversed in E, G)
#45	Ἀριστοκλείας: Ἀριστοκλείας ἀνάθημα:	A, B, C E
#45i	Ἀμφικλείδαι Νάξιοι ἐξικελεύει:	E; om. A, B, C

ἀριθμὸν φιαλῶν τῶν ἀρχαίων ΠΙΠ Α; B, C, E, F are blank; D*

Notes

a (a propos of #3)

- A Πολυάρχου τοῦ Θερσάνδρου Σαμίου ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου
- B Πολυάρχου Θέρσου Σαμίου ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου
- C Πολυάρχου Θέρσου Σαμίου
- E Πολυάρχου Θερσίου Σαμίου and perhaps ἄθλον ἐγ Δήλου ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου

B, C, E seem to interpret as two different offerings

b (a propos of #30)

- A, B: Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου Δηλίου ἄθλον
- C: Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου
- E: Εὐκλείδου τοῦ Νεωκόρου. Δηλίων ἄθλον

E seems to split one title into two.

c A, C: Μυκόνων ἀνάθημα. Ναξίων ἀνάθημα τῶν ἄθλων ἐγ Δηλίοις
B, E: Μυκόνων ἀνάθημα τῶν ἄθλων ἐγ Δηλίοις

B and E collapse two inscriptions into one.