

ANNALI

VOLUME

72



NAPOLI 2012

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “L’ORIENTALE”

ANNALI

Sezione orientale
AION (or)

DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

Redazione AION (or)
Palazzo Corigliano, Piazza S. Domenico Maggiore 12 – 80134 Napoli (IT)
Tel. (+39) 081 6909774/775 – Fax (+39) 081 5517852
annas@unior.it; www.daam.pubblicazioni.unior.it

Direttore: Gianfrancesco Lusini

Vice Direttore: Natalia L. Tornesello

Comitato di Redazione:

Silvana De Maio, Anna Filigenzi, Roberta Giunta, Giancarlo Lacerenza, Gianfrancesco Lusini, Natalia L. Tornesello, Patrizia Zotti (segretaria di redazione).

Consiglio Scientifico:

Marilina Betrò (Università di Pisa), Salem Chaker (Aix-Marseille Université – INALCO, Paris), Riccardo Contini (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Irmela Hijiya-Kirschner (Freie Universität Berlin), Birgit Kellner (Universität Heidelberg), Rudolf Leger (Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main), Ulrich Pagel (SOAS, London), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Adriano Rossi (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Maurizio Tosi (Università di Bologna), Roberto Tottoli (Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”), Wang Xiaoming (Shanghai University – East China Normal University, Shanghai).

Prezzo del presente volume: UE € 90,00; altri Paesi € 110,00

Abbonamento annuale: UE € 90,00; altri Paesi € 110,00

Per informazioni su ordini e abbonamenti:

Arbor Sapientiae Editore S.r.l.
Via Bernardo Barbiellini Amidei, 80 – 00168 Roma
Tel. (+39) 06 83798683; (+39) 3468424032
www.arborsapientiae.com
info@arborsapientiae.com; ordini@arborsapientiae.com

ISSN 0393-3180

© Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Napoli B. 434/63 del 16-1-1964

INDICE

Scritti in onore di Pietro Mander

a cura di Palmiro Notizia e Francesco Pomponio

Premessa	3
Profilo bio-bibliografico di Pietro Mander	5
LUCIANO ALBANESE, Adad e gli <i>Oracoli caldaici</i>	13
ODOARDO BULGARELLI, L'archivio paleo-babilonese di Ipqu-Sîn e la collezione di tavolette cuneiformi della Banca d'Italia	27
FRANCO D'AGOSTINO, Ti ricordi, Pietro? In margine alla prima campagna di scavi ad Abu Tbeirah, Iraq meridionale	41
MANUEL MOLINA, PALMIRO NOTIZIA, Five Cuneiform Tablets from Private Collections	47
MASSIMILIANO NUZZOLO, Man Approaching God: Some Remarks on the Egyptian and Mesopotamian Rituals of the <i>Opening/Washing of the Mouth</i>	65
ANTONIO PANAINO, Nuove riflessioni sulla stella dei Magi tra fonti canoniche e apocrife	77
FRANCESCO POMPONIO, Some Considerations on Rīmuš	99
ANNUNZIATA ROSITANI, The Role of the <i>nadiātum</i> of Šamaš and of Some Officials in Old Babylonian Sippar Organization of Agriculture Work	113
GABRIELLA SPADA, I modelli di contratto nell' <i>edubba</i> paleo-babilonese. Un esempio di contratto di adozione	133
LORENZO VERDERAME, Sedie, troni e portantine nell'antica Mesopotamia	149
GIUSEPPE VISICATO, Two Governors of Umma called Surus-kin in the Sargonic Period	169

Note e Discussioni

BRUNO GENITO, <i>Archaeological History of Iran: the Post-Achaemenid and Hellenistic Time (Archaeological Horizon in Fārs in Late Iron Age, or Iron Age III-IV). A Review-Article</i>	177
R.K.K. RAJARAJAN, <i>Aihole Revisited</i>	211

Recensioni

Robert Hillenbrand, <i>Studies in the Islamic Arts of the Book</i> (Maria Vittoria Fontana).....	223
Georg Bossong, <i>Poesía en convivencia. Estudios sobre la lírica árabe, hebrea y romance en la España de las tres religiones</i> (Francesca Bellino).....	230
<i>El Libro de las Plantas. Sección primera: de árboles y arbustos (al-Qazwīnī, S. XIII)</i> (Francesca Bellino).....	232
Barbara E. Barich, <i>Antica Africa. Alle origini delle società</i> (Andrea Manzo).....	234
Luciano Rocchi, <i>Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)</i> ;	
Luciano Rocchi, <i>Il "Dittionario della lingua turchesca" di Pietro Ferraguto (1611)</i> (Luca Berardi).....	236
Winnie Cheng, <i>Exploring Corpus Linguistics: Language in Action</i> (Patrizia Zotti).....	240

Libri ricevuti	243
-----------------------------	-----

NOTE E DISCUSSIONI

BRUNO GENITO

**Archaeological History of Iran: the Post-Achaemenid and Hellenistic Time
(Archaeological Horizon in Fārs in Late Iron Age, or Iron Age III-IV)*
A Review-Article****

In the new series of *Persika*, a historical journal of Iranian studies since 2000, a volume with number 11 appeared in 2007 within the collection of monographs directed by Pierre Briant.¹ As indicated by its title (*L'archéologie du Fārs à l'époque hellénistique. Quatre leçons au Collège de France* 8, 15, 22 et 29 Mars 2007, Paris, éd. De Boccard, 2007) the book contains the written

* The use of the concept of 'Late Iron Age' within the scientific debate related to the archaeological horizons of ancient Iran, going back to the 70s of last century (Young 1967, 1970, 1985), is strictly connected to the one of Iron Age III (Achaemenid Age) and IV (post-Achaemenid) (Haerinck 1989). It was, also, resumed by Italian scholars dealing with Yaz horizons in south Turkmenistan (Cattani, Genito 1998). This set of denominations and definitions applied to the post-Achaemenid and Hellenistic age in Iran may seem a little stretch, and finds its reason for being, nonetheless, in a long debated difficult and complicated attempt to put at the same level the historical documentation and the archaeological horizons. This use, of course questionable, is very much in line with new trends of a so called 'militant' archaeology. The use of this denomination here has been emphasized within this review-article particularly in some crucial points of a very well done and documented art-historical and historical approach addressed by the Author. The volume in itself presents a detailed analysis in those grounds of research and the fact that the archaeological horizons are practically not existent at all (and this is certainly not due to the Author), makes sometimes very difficult to deal with them.

** In writing this review-article I have considered worth remembering my teacher Umberto Scerato to whom I am indebted along the whole course of my professional life and who practically initiated the Archaeology of Iran of the historical time in our country. He also was teaching in my University till 1975 and contributed very much together with other prestigious scholars (Maurizio Taddei, Gherardo Gnoli) to the realization of a modern University where the archaeological studies found their own collocation. It also seems to me beloved to remember that in 80s He asked me to take care of the Achaemenid period in Fars and especially to start studying the Persepolis plain since the pioneering studies of Sumner (1986). He put me naturally in touch with Giuseppe Tilia in order to try to use the data by him collected on the site and to develop a strategy to publish together with him that material. Unfortunately it has not been possible!

¹ Pierre Briant, famous scholar in the field of the history, has been the holder of the chair of *Histoire et Civilisation du Monde Achéménide et de l'Empire d'Alexandre* at the Collège de France.

versions of four lectures held by Pierfrancesco Callieri at the Collège de France in 2007.

The volume, agile in its typographical dress and essential in the content, after the index and thanks (*Remerciements*, p. 5) presents a quick introduction to the topic the Author will deal with (*Introduction*, p. 7). The volume follows then with the first lecture (*Leçon I, Habitats anciens et fondations hellénistiques du plateau iranien: les témoignages littéraires, épigraphiques et archéologiques concernant la région du Fārs*, p. 11), the second (*Leçon II, Bâtiments religieux et cultes de l'Iran à l'époque hellénistique*, p. 49), the third (*Leçon III, L'apport hellénistique à la production artistique et artisanale du Fārs, des Achéménides aux Sassanides*, p. 87) and the fourth (*Leçon IV, Le Fārs sous les règnes des souverains locaux: les témoignages archéologiques et épigraphiques*, p. 115). The volume concludes with the abbreviations (*Abréviations*, p. 147), references (*Bibliographie*, p. 149) and the list of the figures (*Table des figures*, p. 175).

I would start by frankly saying that I would have never imagined to make a review of a series of lectures; yet, the prestigious editorial set in which they have been published, my personal knowledge of the Author and, last but not least, the issues discussed and related to a period at least controversial of the history and archaeology of ancient Iran have made me feel authorized to write this review-article, even if with a unforgivable delay of five years from the time of publication of the volume. The topic chosen by the Author is historically very complex and archaeologically difficult to be identified; it allows, nonetheless, the Author to write a sort of a *State of Art* of the Hellenistic period in Iran, which is certainly a difficult task for the reasons the Author rightly lists in his introduction:

- a) the short duration of the related historical period;
- b) the lack of consideration given by the same ancient Iranian sources;
- c) the fact that the period touches the fundamental issues of the relationship between the Greek and Latin historiography on one hand, and ancient Iran on the other.

Nevertheless, the crucial and problematic aspect of the archaeology of Hellenistic time and of the Late Iron Age (LIA) in Iran is in line with the same aspects the archaeology of the historical times everywhere has encountered, with the only outstanding exception, perhaps, of the ones dealing with the Greek-Roman and the Chinese civilizations: the difficult combination of the two classes of the related documentary materials, the historical and the archaeological, for their very different nature from each other.

I am referring, for the former, to the set of direct and indirect sources dealing with a given territorial context, with cities, settlements, architectural

remains, material or spiritual culture² and, for the latter, to the concrete urban, architectural, material remains actually uncovered from archaeological excavations, topographical investigations or fortuitous and antiquarian discoveries.

Actually the Author's main aim is rather ambitious: «définir le profil culturel de l'Iran à l'époque hellénistique» (p. 7), setting it, as much as possible, on the iconographic and archaeological evidences; more precisely, he defines these evidences as «architecturaux, épigraphiques et iconographiques» (p. 8), referring to the presumed reasons of the major importance of the Achaemenid and the Sasanian period in respect to the Macedonian, Seleucid and Arsacid.

Differently from the two previous volumes of the same series, dedicated to the archaeological evidence of the Achaemenid Empire (Briant, Boucharlat 2005), and to the transition from the Achaemenid to the Hellenistic period (Briant, Joannès 2006), Callieri's volume is devoted to the archaeological evidence of the Hellenistic period in Fars:³ this term referring both to the Seleucid period in its initial phase, and to the dominion of the Arsacid rulers of Fars.

It is clear, however, that in the reconstruction of any early times, the more the historical documentation is absent or deemed unreliable, the more the use of the archaeological material becomes significant; on the contrary, when a rich and complex archaeological documentation is available, the historical documentation tends to be unfairly overlooked.

The issue, however, should be faced in a different way since the two major categories of documentation (the historical and the archaeological) should never be neglected; basically, they should not be subjected to undue straining when one does not fit well to the other, and vice versa.

I would say that the concept expressed by Wiesehöfer (2005: 77) «neither revolutionary nor insignificant» quoted by Callieri (p. 9) and referring to the

² In this proper field of research which is not my own, as it is not that of the Author (p. 7), are equally significant and important both the contents of the philological translations of the texts and their long-standing interpretation story which has, however, been part of the history of the matter.

³ On the basis of the extensive iconographic and architectonic documentation, the studies that have followed this type of approach have provided us with an image of the Hellenistic age in which the latter is depicted as much as already revealed by the epigraphic and Greek historic tradition. From an archaeological standpoint, the Hellenistic period in Fars stands out more like a highly complex, relatively incomprehensible political period with a high degree of regional fragmentation. This does not seem the right place to recount the history of this relationship. Suffice it to say that it was at the end of the sixties, with the so-called 'New Archaeology' growing out from the social anthropological school, that the break with the old style art-historical methodology was most striking. The publication of 'Analytical Archaeology' (Clarke 1968) starkly revealed the differences between the approaches, but it also set out to be a political and ideological *manifesto*, proclaiming the 'loss of innocence' for any archaeological research. According to this program, it was no longer enough to carry out a historical reconstruction of the events and economic structures of ancient societies, and more reliable was to study extensively the patterns of behavior that could be deduced from the material remains, and, in turn organized, according to anthropological schemes.

influences the Greek and the Iranian cultures mutually exercised, more than a catchy slogan, could well and easily be extended to more than one period of the archaeological history of Iran. In other words, we should consider the quantity and quality of the main aspects of the ancient Iranian civilization as proportionally the same as those of the Hellenistic period; moreover it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish between the quantitative and qualitative sets of data as they overlap or compensate each other in a framework of unity. Without contrasting different approaches of study, and conscious that the material remains are not more important or more complex than other set (the spiritual *e.g.*) and *vice versa*, one should recognize that the archaeological evidence of ancient Iran and, inside it, that of the Hellenistic period, requires a very specific knowledge. Its cognitive potential, in my opinion, has not yet been fully exploited, because it does not always match very well the rather reassuring framework of historical, religious, epigraphic and linguistic data, even though they are scanty as well. Conversely, the archaeological record of the ancient Iranian civilization, if properly analyzed, may offer more than a hint of unusual and innovative interpretation (Genito, in press). The most proper line of research could thus be recognized in the combination of two cultural aspects always present in the history of that culture and that may be summarized with the already misused formula of 'tradition and innovation' (*ibidem*). These concepts and expressions seem to be related to a specific cultural and political strategy to modernize the 'ancient', spreading over the Iranian plateau and starting from the time of the early Iranians in the plateau and the Achaemenid dynasty. Nevertheless, this interpretative line is not easy either to be followed or identified, or assumed as mono lineal in its development; it is, instead, full of variables, sometimes coherent and parallel, sometimes also conflicting and contradictory.

Iran, in general, and the province of Fars, in particular, are associated to the outstanding glories of the Achaemenid and Sasanian dynasties, which had their deep roots in the region. If each of these two very famous periods provides, by itself, quite interesting elements to the study of the Iranian civilization, the long chronological interval between them opens the discussion on the key-aspects of the possible relationship between Iran and Greek culture (then Hellenism): already originated in the Achaemenid period, this *liaison* was much extended under the Macedonian dominion, over the Iranian plateau and Central Asia.

As we said, the division of the book into four chapters follows the order of the papers presented by the Author at the Collège de France in March 2007; he collected and analyzed the very little archaeological evidence of Hellenistic Fars.

To my knowledge, this is the first time that, although divided into four parts, a sort of monograph is brought to completion within a perspective that seeks to place this documentation in its historical and cultural context. The history of the Hellenistic period in Iran, though still fragmentary and incomplete, constitutes a moment that crucially gives evidence of the first big changes oc-

curred in the area between the late Achaemenid and the early Parthian period. In short, we can say that this is the period of the transition from the 'old' to the immediately preceding the 'late-antique' periods of the history of Iran.

As Callieri wishes in different points of the volume and, particularly, at its end (p. 146), his lectures undoubtedly represent a new pioneering contribution in the field of the studies both on the Iranian and the Hellenistic civilizations.

In regard to the first lesson *Habitats anciens et fondations hellénistique du plateau iranien: les témoignages littéraires, épigraphiques et archéologiques concernant la région du Fārs*, we clearly and immediately understand the methodological approach followed by the Author, who lets the literary (from page 11 to 33) and the archaeological sources (from page 33 to 48) available on the Persis (current *ostan* of Fars) meet with and contrast each other according to the single events and documents. Also the use of the Greek denomination *Persis*, derived, as it is, from a culturally oriented definition of the territory, leads us to understand the *Greek* geographically regional vision. As a matter of fact nobody actually knows to what extent the local Iranians knew, called and considered the area of Parsa (Fars) as Persis.

A territory may be defined on the basis of different aspects: the geomorphological; the historical-topographical and geographical; the archaeological-topographical; that based on the concrete material (epigraphic, numismatic, sphragistic, either minute or macroscopic) evidence, or on the more modern approach of the so-called 'landscape archaeology', etc.⁴ Yet, an area may also be defined in itself, regardless of the ideologically oriented literary

⁴ The *Landscape Archaeology* is currently considered the study of the ways in which people in the past constructed and used the environment around; and inherently it represents a multidisciplinary approach to the study of culture, and is used by both pre-historical, classic, and historic archaeologists. The key-feature that distinguishes landscape archaeology from other archaeological approaches to the sites is that there is an explicit emphasis on the study of the relationships between material culture, human alteration of land/cultural modifications to landscape, and the natural environment. The study of landscape archaeology (also sometimes referred to as the archaeology of the cultural landscape) has evolved to include how landscapes were used to create and reinforce social inequality and to announce one's social status to the community at large. Advances in survey technology have permitted the rapid and accurate analysis of wide areas, making the process an efficient way of learning more about the historic environment using: Global Positioning System, remote sensing, archaeological geophysics, Total stations and digital photography, as well as GIS, which have helped to reduce the time and cost involved in such work. Geographic Information Systems, commonly referred to as GIS, provides a way in which archaeologists can visually represent archaeological data, and can be done in two ways: data visualization and representative visualization. View-shed Analysis has aided in the archaeologists ability to study behavioral relationships between humans, their landscape, and material culture, in order to study migration, settlement patterns, and agency. View-shed analysis also provides means with which archaeologists can recreate through an ability to recreate the line of sights possible from one point on a landscape and to situate a person within a defined landscape. Ground Penetrating Radar, Global Positioning System, Remote Sensing, Archaeological Geophysics, Total Station and last but not least Excavation.

definition of the sources, which, generally, starts to denominate it long time after it developed and completed the process of its 'territorial identity' (Genito 2010). Moreover, in the case of the Greeks, it is very well known that they often were partial and culturally and politically too much oriented, especially with respect to the foreign cultures and countries; after all we know that the same definition of Persia and Persis might contain, in itself, elements of an historical misinterpretation.

In consideration of this, in front of the enormous risks to define and chronologically locate an area, the Author makes very interesting critical observations about the difficult direct transposition related to the independent governors of Fars from their archaeological evidence (in this case numismatic) (p. 11) to the historical reconstruction. Whereas, among other aspects, the same short duration of the period investigated becomes an essential element to be considered if we want to try to propose historical assignments and cultural affiliations. Such a short period constitutes, nevertheless, mostly a political span-time rather than an archaeological horizon.

The constant quotation of the Greek and Latin sources (among which, in particular Quintus Curtius and Diodorus Siculus) in relation to the nature and extension of villages and settlements of Fars, so as of the area of Persepolis (*fertile land, riche en cites et villages*: Quintus Curtius, V, 4), does not prevent Callieri to leave his attention constantly open to the details of the archaeological and topographic documentation of the area that, in recent decades, was produced by different scholars, as Briant (1982), Sumner (1986), Wenke (1976), Miroshedji (1981), Maurer Trinkaus (1983), Alizadeh (1997, 2003), Gotch (1968, 1969), etc.

The presence of a geographic map in Figure 1 (p. 13), of a representation of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* in Figure 7 (p. 25), a map of Fars according to Ptolemy in Figure 8 (p. 29), a photo-satellite (not aerial!) by Landsat in Figure 9 (p. 30), and the indications of Ptolemy's map overlapping the photo-satellite in Figure 10 (p. 31), does nothing but try to modernize the more traditional historical geography in the direction of a satellite-based surveying. A daunting but necessary task if you want to understand more about what is known, already problematically, from the sources. The difficulty is not only to compare the historical and archaeological documentation (a complex and contradictory and, at the same time, essential and inevitable task) but also (and even more) to propose cultural and political attributions to some material remains which, although architecturally characterized as Achaemenid, as it happens at Qasr-i Abu Nasr, do not necessarily reveal an 'Achaemenid' archaeological horizon.

A similar and controversial issue concerns what can be recognized in the Fahlyan/Nurabad area and in eastern Fars, as in Fasa and Darab, where traits of Achaemenid occupation can be identified, even if consisting only of pottery fragments. Of course, today there are new techniques of surface surveys, such as the geomagnetic and geo-radar prospection that the French have used both in the

plains of Persepolis and Pasargadae. The impression, however, is that you are faced with an usual problematic issue: the need to realize broad and detailed computerized maps (or GIS; see note n. 3) in the regions to be investigated, which requires an enormous amount of human and time investment, on one hand;⁵ and, on the other, the difficulty to accept the simple and elementary principle that the identity of a territory is definable only with the help of different methods, even when they are presented in an absolutely contradictory way.

The possibility that the settlements of the Achaemenid period are still characterized by nomadic aspects, and therefore not archaeologically identifiable and recognizable, goes hand in hand with the idea that the territorial knowledge is still so incomplete that only new survey techniques (p. 15) could, as if by magic, resolve the difficult issues of the presence and nature of the settlements of the period.

The quality of the finds at Pasargadae and, in particular, those in Tang-i Bulaghi plain, have been evidenced in the context of a rescue excavation project by joint Iranian/Italian team for the construction of the Siwand dam. They are also evidenced by the excavation of buildings with buttresses of Achaemenid period, either isolated, or rural in character, with different interpretative hypotheses proposed in the light of historical-religious aspects, based on the Elamite epigraphy (p. 20). The correspondence between the historical and the territorial data hypothesized by Briant (1982) and the complete failure, according to Leriche (1977: 301), to find such a concrete evidence represent a probably insuperable dichotomy; a possible way out would be to observe more carefully a given micro-geographical area, that, by itself, constitutes the only concrete basis, to correctly interpret a territory through an archaeological map.

To quote Polyenus (VII, 40) about the place called 'Komastos' near Persepolis (p. 21), where the Macedonians might have camped may reinforce the hypothesis that the location of a town, a military colony, or an architectural feature can be only directly related to the quality and consistency of historical data. Nevertheless, once again I have reason to believe that when the Greeks dealt with cities, fortifications and architecture, they inevitably thought with their own concept of cities, fortification etc. In the description of the ethnic 'otherness', they did nothing but bring everything back to their cognitive parameters.⁶

If the archaeological record is particularly insufficient, as the case of Istakhr shows (p. 24), the attempts to reconstruct the spatial location and the chrono-

⁵ See the recent article by Franzese, Genito (2012: fig. 10) where the Authors try to put down a preliminary elaborated and methodologically complicated approach to be used in the case of a construction of an Archaeological Map of Fars.

⁶ Starting with the names of the peoples, *e.g.* in Herodotus, one may see how the story of the non-Greek peoples can be traced back to well-known cognitive parameters of the Hecateus's genealogical tree on the basis of which the Persians could be the heirs of Perseus, the Medes have their origin in the name of Medea etc.

logical history of the city (p. 24) seem destined to be systematically denied. At the same time, it is evident that either in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (p. 23), a geographic set of ancient Roman itineraries, or in the *Kārnāmag Ardaxšir Pābagān* (Grenet 2003a), or in the *Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr* (Daryae 2002), historical and literary texts of Sasanian age, apparently arise contradictory issues. In any case, the Author is clearly and logically detached from the hypothesis of a not Hellenistic foundation of the urban context of Istakhr. If, then, the main Seleucid city foundations or re-foundations may be found in Media (*Laodicea*, *Apamea*, *Heraclea*, *Ragha Europos*), other settlements (*Antiochia*, *Seleucia* and *Laodicea*) might be located in Fars as well (p. 24).

The location of these cities and, in particular, of Antiochia and Laodicea of Persis, between Burazjan and Bushihr on the area of Persian Gulf, although still problematic, provides Callieri with the opportunity to make a rundown on other sources and their different interpretations. Thus, a direct geographical relationship between the inner Iranian plateau and the marine Persian Gulf is intertwined with the hypotheses of Marquart (1901, 1905), Herzfeld (1941) and Bernard (1974) to enrich the issue with unpublished ideas and reflections. The list of Persian cities given by Stephan of Byzantium and the chapter of Ptolemy on the Persis (VI, 4, 3; VI, 4, 4) help us to better understand the reasons of the presence of settlements along the three very well-known geomorphological and climatic areas of Fars: the warmest (coastal), the temperate (intermediate) and the cold (mountainous). At the same time, however, the need of a field test led the Author to propose a topographic analysis on the concrete traces to be located on the maps found on the field between the 34° and the 31° latitude degrees.

Then, there are some comparisons that offer a glimpse of a set of relationships and geographic coordinates, which the due attention had not always been paid to; I am referring to the historical geography as that proposed by Ptolemy both for Persis and Central Asia in particular, within the recent revision by Rapin (1998).

The archaeological evidence in Fars is mainly based on materials collected on the surface.⁷ Therefore, is still a task hypothesis to be proven that the discovery at Pasargadae (Fig. 11) and Marvdasht (Fig. 12) of two milestones, consisting of re-used Achaemenid crenellated crowns, constitutes a testimony of a general increase in the road system in Hellenistic time.

⁷ It is amazing and surprising how in Fars, may be the most important region of Iran for the historical times, has been and still is absent, to my knowledge, any project of a complete full archaeological map. A lot of such methodological approach to a given territory have been made in many geographic different areas already, like Mesopotamia (Adams 1965), Bactriana (Lyonnet 1997), Turkmenistan (Gubaev, Košelenko, Tosi 1998), Afghanistan (Ball, Gardin 1982), and Hungary (MRT 1966-1998) etc., for example. Cf. again in this respect the preliminary suggestions of Franzese, Genito (2012).

The last pages of the first part of the lecture are devoted to a close examination of the finds in the neighborhood of Persepolis (the 'temple' of *Frātārākā*) and Pasargadae (Tall-i Takht); here the Author tries to extrapolate from about half a century of research those archaeological features recognized in the field and chronologically identified as post-Achaemenid.

Other sites are further investigated, particularly in northern Fars, as Dehbid (Qasr-i Bahram), where Stein found pre-Sasanian ceramic fragments with red smoothed engobe; Nurabad, where ceramic material of Arsacid period was collected from; in Sarvistan area, at Tall-i Gowda-i Rahim, and that in eastern Fars, at Tall-i Zahak, nearby to Fasa, where fragments of Sasanian and early Islamic pottery and a number of Achaemenid potsherds were also found. These included fragments of carinated bowls of finely-burnished red ware that showing characteristic everted rims. Potsherds of less finely-made bowls with incurving rims possibly document a late Achaemenid presence together with a very probable sub-sequent Hellenistic occupation.

Very interesting is also the description of the ruins of Rishahr in the Bushihr peninsula, with walls most probably belonging to the structures of an harbor; the description precedes a rather bitter conclusion about the archaeology: according to Callieri, in fact, the field research is in a very delay in front of other disciplines. Nonetheless, it is important here to point out that the field archaeological research has completely different modes and times from those of a desk and bibliographical research; human energies and financial investments necessary to investigate a small piece of land are generally much higher than the others and a 'possible' delay cannot be but inevitable.

With regard to the second lecture (*Bâtiments religieux et cultes de l'Iran à l'époque hellénistique*, pp. 49-86), the Author's considerations appear to be very strict in the method even if, in my opinion, they cannot always be completely shared in their 'contents'. It is a fact, hardly debatable that it was Alexander or, better, the Alexandrine period to introduce the Greek culture and the artistic traditions in the most distant regions of his empire. Nonetheless, the Author, underlines that the lack of documentation makes the analysis of all the forms of adoption by the local peoples of an Hellenistic culture particularly difficult (p. 49), almost at last adding that nothing is known about the real interaction between the Greek and the Persian culture (p. 67).

The issue concerning the encounter and clash or the cultural integration or interaction between two civilizations is always difficult to deal with and, by a paradox, it constitutes also the element of a present socio-political dispute.⁸ Not due to his responsibility, on this occasion Callieri devotes about twenty

⁸ On the issue between interaction and integration of different communities a very delicate and sensitive game is played today by the present political forces in the whole European community, in order to find a stable, secure and modern cohabitation between peoples from different countries.

pages to the analysis of documentary sources and only the latest ones to the real archaeological. Already for what concerns the Achaemenian age, and in particular to define an independent artistic imperial production, the scholars had always thought about the contribution of many different other cultures: Assyria, Egypt, central Asian nomads, Greece and the Aegean coast. Unfortunately, in that case among scholars it widespread the assumption that the nature of the Achaemenid art style was mostly related to a form of eclecticism; this hypothesis reflected both the Herodotus' opinion, claiming that the Persians «more than other peoples ... like making foreign use...» (I, 135) and the information from the so-called Cart of Susa.⁹

An archaeological history of Hellenistic and Seleucid Iran is even more complex, whereas later, with intellectual honesty, the Author (p. 69) recognizes that up to that page, the excursus he made was mainly devoted to the literary sources.

Moreover, the multi-cultural (in my opinion, not multi-ethnic, as defined at p. 49, which, given the times, does not sound exact) character of the Hellenistic period, already well documented also for other periods of the imperial ancient Near East, cannot in itself justify a syncretistic cultural character of the new dominant culture. It must also be said that the relationship among the local realities in the more or less 'strong' political-cultural and foreign dominations, has always marked the history of the plateau and characterized also the late historical periods (LIA) for a long time. Thus, the underlying issue actually appears to be the nature of the Greek-Macedonian *colonate*, sometimes addressed to on the historic ground, sometimes even in a unreliable way. In fact, in the light of the excursus Callieri goes to do, the fact that the religious architecture is one of the privileged fields of observation of this complex relationship is certainly an acceptable interpretative aspect; yet, some doubts remain, despite the great effort he makes and notwithstanding the very little available evidence, often documented mostly on the basis of rather questionable data. It

⁹ Amongst the historical documentation of the period is the famous foundation Cart of Susa edited by Darius the I. It is a very important document, constituted by three stone tablets edited in old Persian, Elamic and Accadian, found in an artificial *mound* in the north sector of the city giving detailed information for the construction of some buildings. For the bibliography see Herzfeld (1931: 29 ff.), Kent (1933: 1 ff.), Stolper (1994: 271-72, fig. 190). The document led one to know the splendor and the richness of the differing cultural influences which had left a profound sign in the figural and sumptuous art produced and utilized within the Achaemenid Empire. The text sounds «...The palace which I built in Susa, the material brought her come from far away... The gold which has been worked out here came from Lidia and Bactriana; the lapis lazuli and carnelian, which have been worked out, were taken from Sogdiana; the turquoise was taken from Corasmia, and worked out here. Silver and ebony were taken from Egypt...the ivory, which has been worked out here was taken from Nubia, Sind and Arachosia ... the goldsmiths who have worked out the gold were Medes and Egyptians». For the transliteration of cuneiform see Cameron (1948: 11-15 and mainly 142-43) and furthermore Kent (1950: 143-44).

is interesting and suggestive the part that the Author dedicates to the ceremony mentioned by Diodorus Siculus and that would have occurred in Persepolis in 317 for a sacrifice to the gods of Alexander and Philip. According to the Greek historian, the sacrifice was made by the general (*strategos*) Peukestas who collected everything was needed for organizing the festival. He located the participants, mercenaries, generals (*strategoï*) and *hypparchoi* in a hierarchical order, in four concentric circles. The Author links this sacrifice to another one, documented by Elamic tablets, made by the royal dignitary Parnakka during the Achaemenid reign of Darius I (pp. 50, 51); in my opinion, once again this information reflects a Greek-centric interpretative key as a possible re-interpretation of events lost in time and of which none captures anymore the old assumptions and meanings. Then, the possibility that this represents the evidence of a genuine cult of the dead kings in Iran may seem quite a stretching.

An issue even more complicated is that, most strictly religious, related to the Greek-Macedonian and Persian gods. A famous inscription from Asia Minor (Robert 1975: 327; 1978: 283-85) gives information about the Greeks and Persians. In this regard the Author takes the opportunity to deal with the complicated issue of the so-called 'temple' of *Frātārākā*. Excavated by Herzfeld in 1932, the building is an architectural complex (90 × 55 m) divisible in two parts, a south-eastern and a north-western, at 200 meters north from the Persepolis terrace. The name was given on the basis of an Aramaic legend found on the reverse of a series of coins issued by the independent sovereigns of Fars.

The south-east complex has a rectangular room with 5 openings on the south side, and a square room without any communication with an opening in the middle in the north wall. The interior of the limestone piers of the opening presents two bas-relief figures in profile, one of which dressed in a long tunic (a kind of priestly dress, keeping a twig in his right hand), perhaps the typical *barsom* of a possible Zoroastrian representation, that Herzfeld put in relation with the figures represented on the currencies of *Frātārākā*. The north-west complex consists of two separate non-communicating corps, one to the north, with a large portico (c. 9 × 17.50 m) and two rows of four three-stepped bases of stone columns, leading to another area, the centre of which is a square room (c. 5 × 5 m). The bases are very different from the type widespread over Persepolis.

Any interpretation of these two complexes is particularly complicated also because in the area they were discovered five limestone plates with the written traits of the genitive Greek theonyms of Megistos, Helios, Athena Basileia, Artemidos, Apollonos; three of these plates are located at the Oriental Institute of Chicago (Fig. 30) and two at the Tehran Museum. Another complex discovery is a rectangular base in limestone, interpreted as a fire altar, although many scholars have not shared this idea. The interpretation, already proposed by others, is also followed by the Author; on the basis of technical and architectural aspects, he is in favor of an interpretation of the cult nature

of the base (he is inclined to interpret the base as having a cult function as well), being, most probably, a support of a statue of deity, a typology widespread over the Greek and Hellenistic times since the 5th and the 4th century (Figs. 31-34). The discovery of a marble statue of Greek workmanship, made by an Iranian colleague Chegini (p. 62), when published, might confirm the existence, archaeologically here attested for the first time, of a religious building with statues, as already documented by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. The numerous religious buildings and statues also documented by distinguished scholars of religious history of Iran, would then be confirmed by the fact that those monuments would have been converted into temples of fire in Sasanian time.

A different task concerns the situation of another region, Elymais, located between Fars and the Susiana plain, and documented mostly by the sources; Diodorus writes about a temple built by Antiochus III in 187 BC and dedicated, according to different scholars, to Zeus or Bel; Justin talks about a Jupiter Elymaeus; Polybius attributes to Antiochus IV the building of a temple for a female deity Artemis, and Appian for an Elymaea Aphrodites.

After the excursus on the literary sources (p. 69), Callieri switches finally to the real archaeological documentation, starting from the so-called temple of Shami (Fig. 39), located in the Elymais region, preliminarily investigated by Stein and then excavated by Ghirshman. Within a rectangular enclosure in mud-bricks and stone foundations is an altar of burnt bricks, parallelepiped in shape, whereas seven stone bases were provided to support statues, never unfortunately recovered.

With respect to the two terraces of Masjid-i Sulayman and Bard-i Nishandah, Callieri points out that the old hypothesis of Ghirshman should be a bit re-considered, especially for the later periods; according to him the terraces could be dated between the end of the Achaemenid period up to 150 BC. In the meantime he is forced to admit (p. 70) that, although we may presume the existence of religious buildings of worship at that time, the related testimonies are not, however, so decisive; an aspect also confirmed by the fact that the existence of statues at Shami remains only hypothetical. The *torso* in marble of a female figure from Malamir (Fig. 40) in Tehran Museum, gives the Author the opportunity to make a long historical-artistic disquisition with historical-religious purposes. The *torso* that the Author could see at the time of an exhibition in Rome in 2001 is clearly in line with a rather Greek-Hellenistic typology of statues, cultic in nature, made with different materials (it is clear the presence of a square hole on the bottom tray) (Fig. 41) and intended to be placed alongside a wall. These elements leads him to consider the hypothesis proposed in the same previous exhibition of Wien in 2000 unacceptable because there the *torso* was identified as belonging to Aphrodites *Kallipigia*. Yet, the hypothesis cannot actually be confirmed because the back side of the sculpture was not visible.

Conversely, the iconography of the figure goes in the direction of an eastern deity with some characteristics of Artemis of the 'amazon-type', confirmed by the correspondence between the Elymais' divinity and the Hellenism documented at Susa, where there might have been a temple dedicated to *Nanaia*. According to Hansman (1985), in fact, *Nanaia* represented the ancient Elamite deity of Ishtar. Even if the *torso* does not originate in a proper Iranian cultural context, nevertheless, it is the only statue carved in marble that can be dated to the Hellenistic time and interpreted on the basis of precise Iranian elements. Other examples of small statues always come from Shami: a small head representing *Aphrodites* or Artemis; another one, still representing *Aphrodites*, comes from Tall-i Zahak, in eastern Fars, and is attributable to a micro-Asiatic atelier of the 3rd-2nd century.

Another crucial issue is the spread of these figures in North-east Iran, as in Nisa (Fig. 42), or in Central Asia, as in Uzbekistan, where nude female figurines are present, whereas for the Iranian plateau the sources exclude this phenomenon. Of course, the little statues are regarded as private and non public cultic items.

Now, according to the Author, the core aspects of both iconographic and historical-religious issue are related to the presence of a cult of the dead kings with statues and temples with an oriental plan, and to a possible mixture between the Greek and the local religion of Elymais. And here, of course, we are in front of the *vexata quaestio* of the supposed syncretism of the two religions I dealt with above.

In this regard, Callieri rightly points out the difference between the *theokrac*y (a true fusion of two deities) and the religious phenomena, where a tendency to transfer different characteristics of two divinities into a single iconographic representation that involves phenomena, otherwise not understandable. About this issue, the Author goes on proposing four modes to transfer iconographic motifs (p. 78) into different cultural contexts. The real syncretism or *theokrac*y would be the mode where only a true and decisive cultural change exists, while the other three provide or maintain the same feature, adapting to it some of the new cultural traits thanks to new interpretative ways or imports.

Laodicea city in Media is documented by the famous stele of 193 BC built by Antiochus III (Fig. 43) and now in Teheran Museum. The stele gives some further information about dynastic cults in honor of the living kings. It shows an edict issued by the same Antiochus, where the cult of the king and his wife Laodicea is regulated and promoted; for her, the king established also a special priestly female order. Through a strict logic, the Author goes on, arguing that if in Laodicea there was a social structure such as that in Magnesia on the Meander river, then Greek gods could have been even there. At Nihavand, among other things, to the six columns visible at the beginning of the last century, and interpreted by Ghirshman as belonging to a building from

Hellenistic time, they were then added a round altar with a slight relief engraved (Fig. 44) and some small bronze figurines.

Even lesser are the news about the discovery of these last objects: it is not possible to determine in which year they were found (presumably between 1947 and 1952) and if they were brought to light at the same or at different times. It is also unknown either how they were found, or if they were a fortuitous discovery; if they were either made for the stele and the round altar, or if they were the result of donations or, more likely, sold by local people who kept them. The absence of an adequate documentation of the context and the mode of their discovery, so as the impossibility to reconstruct their context make the analysis and study of the finds even more complex and problematic. The bronzes of Nihavand belong, therefore, to that class of objects that, being out of context, make the scholars study and understand them with greater difficulties. Thus, we cannot but wait for the results of the new digs that the Iranians are conducting at Nihavand (p. 80).

Among the examples of religious architecture in a possible dynastic context there is a typology of tower building, represented on the first group of the *Frātārākā* coins and that was put in relation to the Zindan-i Sulayman (Pasar-gade) or the Ka'aba-i Zardusht (Naqsh-i Rostam) of Achaemenid period. It was probably built during the royal ceremonies of investiture and, with Artaxerxes, was transformed into the two temples of war-gods mentioned by Plutarchus. Actually, as a matter of fact, while we know the Seleucid tendency to adopt traits of Mesopotamian religion, we do not know almost anything regarding the Seleucid attitude versus the Mazdean religion (p. 81).

Moreover, at Bisutun there might have been a place of an open air worship in the Iranian tradition. It is a sacred enclosure at the foot of the rock reliefs, at whose entrance there is the famous Heracles' relief, dated to 148 BC, that is associated with the cult of Herakles as rider and hunter, which Tacitus writes about (*Annales*, 12, 13).

The second lesson ends with few notes on the buildings of Takht-i Sangin and Kuh-i Khwaga and on a famous reference of a passage of Dioscurides. While in the first cases Callieri remains still skeptical on the attribution of a sacred character to the building in Tajikistan, in the second, however, the Author considers the building in Sistan as the first in which it is possible to recognize a fire temple, still remaining the prejudices and doubts about the real chronology. Conversely, the passage of Dioscorides¹⁰ is used as an opportunity to demonstrate, in some way, the existence of a fire cult still in the Hellenistic time. The final notations are devoted to the references to the never found Dionysus' temple in Kermanshah, the building with columns at Khurhah, the

¹⁰ The passage in *Palatine Anthology* (Pontani 1977: VII, nos. 162, 81-82, n. p. 510), is a pray by a dead slave named or better surnamed Euphrates to his owner, asking to not burn or wash his body, because he was a Persian.

tower at Nurabad and the building of Kangavar, all of them wrongly considered religious buildings of the Hellenistic period. Nonetheless, in the light of new observations and studies, today they are interpreted as civil constructions, in many cases attributed to a much later period.

With regard to the third lesson, *L'apport hellénistique à la production artistique et artisanale du Fārs, des Achéménides aux Sassanides* (pp. 87-114), the Author faces some technical and stylistic aspects of various finds, mainly architectural elements, but also objects, whose attribution balances between a post-Achaemenid and a Hellenistic, if not, in some cases, post-Hellenistic period.

All the observations of Callieri are always punctual and attentive to individual art-historical details; however, they are dotted by critical reflections that confirm a framework of substantial uncertainty about where to place the different finds. We refer, in particular, to the very beginning of this part, where the great uncertainty about the role of the Hellenism in the material culture of Iran is emphasized, and where more below, the Author defines more exactly what he means for «Hellenism in arts and crafts production»: the presence of a courtly language of a Mediterranean cultural *koiné*, i.e. a stylistic concept that is naturalistic in the figurative elements and illusionistic in representing the space (p. 87). I have to say that these three aspects, the 'noble or dignified', the 'naturalistic' and the 'illusionistic', so dear to our western cultural tradition, and originating from the Greek-Roman rationalism, are precisely the elements that, fortunately or unfortunately, cannot be easily found in the ancient and not Hellenic cultures. In the same way, we may realize that these aspects are or would be precisely those that must be identified in order to quietly speak about an Hellenistic cultural contribution within the Iranian plateau. However, at the same time, it is just the political, elitist origin of those aspects to make them elusive in the plateau, either because they were essentially absent there or, more probably, because they disappeared after the short interval of the Hellenistic period. More or less the same occurred in the case of the Achaemenid period for the Greek-Ionic impact, which is mostly recognizable in later times.

The list of the finds begins with Ionic capitals and bases, a simplified bell-type and a schematic Achaemenid items, all of them found in the small island of Ikaros – present Failaka – in front of Kuwait. Nevertheless, even in this case, while admitting that the Achaemenid architectural documentation in Fars is much greater, the Author recognizes that the rest of the documentation of similar items in a different style does not present those characters of secure origin and archaeological context (p. 87).¹¹ Then he describes the case of the

¹¹ The echo of this break away from earlier ideologies and methods came only in the 80s (cf. Carandini 1975; 1979) and the chances of restoring a sense of continuity still seem remote. Maurizio Taddei ('L'approccio archeologico allo studio della storia dell'Arte', unpublished paper presented at the *Seminario di studi sul tema Metodi e Tecniche dell'Archeologia*, Napoli 19-21 Nov. 1979) had some interesting remarks to make on the subject, legitimately defending

bases of columns of Tall-i Zahak around Fasa, where the material found seems to be related to the Achaemenid period and beyond. Two of these bases (Fig. 51), in gray stone bell-type, similar to those of the Hall of Hundred Columns of Persepolis, can be traced back to the Achaemenid style; the other two (Fig. 52) with more rounded profile are interpretable as local artifacts, always of the Achaemenid age. Two other bases (Fig. 52, 1-2) seem to be post-Achaemenid and others (Fig. 52, 3-5) appear to reproduce elements of the Achaemenid tradition, characterizing the Islamic architecture of the Buyid period in Fars of 10th century. Other three bases, throated reversed in profile at Darabgird (Figs. 54, 55), present the same features, and are by the Author related more to the Sasanian than to the Hellenistic period. The descriptions of these bases deals with technical and typological aspects, from the more truncated-cone bell-shaped, to the more rounded, and especially to those decorative aspects, as the triangular reverse elements or petals, all designed to prove their greater or lesser relevance in regard to the Hellenism. It is rather interesting, however, that many of the decorations that some scholars as, for example, Herzfeld, attributed to the Hellenistic period, are more probably referable to the Sasanian age; it is the case of the frame fragments discovered at Istakhr, as well as of the elaborated Corinth-type capitals (Fig. 56). Then the Author returns to the four bases with three steps located in room n. 5 of the ‘temple’ of *Frātārākā*, one of which presents a sign on the horizontal face of the *anathyrosis*¹² prepared for a circular element, perhaps a *torus*¹³ or a column.

The presence of a *torus* would, thus, suggest rather a basic Achaemenid type and could be related to the bases of the columns of the Court of Propylaea with the *peristyle* of Aï-Khanum (p. 91). Moreover, there are examples in Bac-

the complete independence of the historian of ancient art from the historian of the material culture who is also concerned with the economic implications. The great quantity of objects that had not come from excavations, all used to reconstruct the art history of the ancient Near East, may run the risk to represent the screen behind which some scholars passed off fakes as authentic pieces, giving wide circulation to the distorting elements of history. The complicated network of connections between the forger, the dealer and the collector can be under accusation for the first time, without sparing the organization and management of institutes responsible for the protection and conservation of works of art.

¹² Anathyrosis is the technical term for how the ancients frequently dressed the joints of stone blocks. Since the blocks were set directly against each other without the use of mortar, the joint had to be exact. In order to reduce the amount of time required to form such a joint, the joining face of the stone was finished and smoothed only in a narrow contact band on the sides and top, while the interior of the face was recessed. The contact band looks somewhat like a doorframe, and the term – it was coined by the ancients – is allusive. *Thyra* (θύρα) is a Greek word for ‘door’, and so ‘door framing’ is *anathyrosis*. This technique was frequently employed in the construction of walls, including *ashlar* construction, and might be used between the drums of columns as well. Close examination of where this technique was applied to a stone can help to reveal its place within a structure or whether other stones were joined to it.

¹³ A large convex molding, semicircular in cross section, located at the base of a classical column.

tria, which could confirm or make it plausible the hypothesis that the traces of the *anathyrosis* belong to a *torus*.

Other comparisons can be made with the finds of Achaemenid style capitals at Tomb-i Bot in the Lamerd district in southern Fars. By virtue of some schematic and unrefined aspects, these finds were considered post-Achaemenid, even if their typology always follows the Achaemenid tradition. Other bases (Fig. 62, 1, 2, 4) come always from Tall-i Zahak, as well as from Bayza in central Fars (Fig. 63); the latter present slightly different forms of *torus*, reminiscent of the Khurhah (in the Markazi region) bases with low plinth and two steps. The origin of this very rounded *torus* is brought up and widespread over the 'Hellenized Orient' up to Bactria; it appears as the latest architectural development of a very elegant Achaemenid origin, while becoming widely popular in use. The only base of column representing the real Hellenic tradition was found in a harbor construction at Rishahr (Fig. 64), near Bushahr, in the Persian Gulf. The base is part of a semi-worked pedestal of a well-known type in the Mediterranean Sea and is chronologically located between the Roman age and the late Antiquity. The ceramic material found around it is dated back to the Seleucid and proto-Parthian time. Other examples given by Callieri are the simplified Ionic pseudo-archaic columns with particularly salient volutes represented on the rock-tomb of Da' o Dukhtar (Fig. 65). Generally dated to the post Achaemenid time, the columns representations have some similarities with those of the Court of *Propylaea* with the *peristyle* of Ai-Khanum. This type would be especially significant if the rock-tomb of Da' o Dukhtar would have belonged to a person of a high level of society, whereas the Hellenistic style might have been used as a new tradition in front of the old Achaemenid. Moving on, Callieri dwells about minute objects, among which some vessels in silver, bronze or glass and some small bronze statuary and bijouterie, almost always coming from illegal excavations (p. 98). If most of the evidence comes from North Iran, Caucasus and Central Asia, the only site of the plateau that has a certain number of significant objects is, as already mentioned, Nihavand (see below).

The most important category of objects from typological, morphological and technical points of view are the weapons. Among these we must mention the three-barbed iron socketed arrowheads, derived from the Scythian culture, very much widespread over the Achaemenid time and that were found, in several different trial-trenches, in a post-Achaemenid context at Tall-i Takht in Pasargadae and at Tang-i Bulaghi. Among them there are those reported as found in Khurvin. They are pyramidal-shaped and in iron, typical of the Hellenistic world, widespread over a large area from Macedonia (Olinthus) and Central Asia (Bactriana) and dated to 348 BC.

The large amount of weapons found at Tall-i Takht, among which some iron spear and bronze javelin heads, is particularly interesting and, for that, there are comparisons with analogous finds in Takht-i Sangin and Ai-Khanum,

as well as with the bars in lead in the shape of spatulas that were found at Tang-i Bulaghi; they are of uncertain function but similar to those found at Aï-Khanum, in Egypt and at Taxila in Pakistan.

The whole production would still be without a reliable chronology, if the chronological collocation of the ceramic production sometime would have not helped the scholars; for the Hellenistic period the pottery is fairly little known, except for the most recent Italian excavations at Tall-i Takht (Fig. 66).

The Persian culture has shown a particular tendency to appreciate the Greek Art, as the case of the so-called Penelope statue suggests. In addition to the actual import of products, there were also some workshops of local craftsmen, who seem to have worked according to the new mode and style. In fact, the high technical level of the Hellenistic production implies the existence of highly specialized ateliers, so as of contacts with the court circles, in the Mediterranean as in the Middle East. According to the Author, the scarce presence of an Hellenistic artistic production on the Iranian plateau may be due to the poor knowledge that its inhabitants had about the cultural and political noble Hellenistic character; a 'royal affair', as said by Melikian-Chirvani (1998). Therefore, there would have been cultural motivations to prevent the continuity of such a specialized production correlated to an élite commitments. According to the Author the elusive presence of Hellenism was simply due to the role played by the very short duration of the Greek-Macedonian-Persian élite's dominion, combined with the rather difficult adoption of foreign parameters, such as the naturalism and the illusionism of the Iranian culture, refractory to a very different Weltanschauung (p. 102). In my opinion, as far as the ethnic origin of the clients is concerned, this hypothesis seems scarcely founded, considering that *e.g.* in *Longobardia Minor*, with the duchy centre of Benevento in southern Italy in the 6th century AD, it took, seemingly, only few hundreds of true German people to transform the political system in the kingdom of so called Minor Lombardy. Similarly, it would seem a bit simplistic to think that the lack of sculptural finds depends only on the fact that the majority of them were probably in perishable material like bronze!

Among the few examples of Hellenistic sculpture, Callieri mentions a fragment of foot from the temple of *Frātārākā*, a head from Tall-i Zahak (Fig. 67), comparable to that from Shami (Fig. 68), and another one near Fasa, a base of small statue from Burazjan, a statue base from Firuzabad, a masculine statue from Malyan region and a male bust from Tomb-i Bot. The statue of Tall-i Zahak is related by the Author to a female religious iconography including the Malamir torso, whereas he interprets as a religious, or a fire altar a fragment of a small statue from Tall-i Khandaq, at 6 kilometers north of Burazjan, nearby the Dalaki river, that was found in a building. It consists of a white marble apparently typical of that coming from the Greek islands and representing a male figure (Figs. 69, 70, 71) with a rather complex morphological articulation, where we can distinguish: the lower part of the trunk, the

point of attachment of the thighs and genitals and the thumb of the left hand resting on the abdomen at the tip height. It is a character in profile facing to the right side of the base; two reeds with five holes each lie on the ground. The iconography seems that of Pan, but some elements (among which the Pan's flute) remind the Sileni and, in particular, Marsyas; the place of the location would be in the vicinity of what was considered Antiochia of Persis, whose population seems to have originally come from the Meander valley, the place of the Marsyas' legend.

The extreme naturalism of the figure would bring us back to the Lysippus' school, as the Alexander's sarcophagus, as well as the use of *chiaroscuro* refers back to the time of the Roman Empire and, in particular, to the Flavian age. As a comparison, the Author cites a marble statue base (Fig. 72) and a limestone head from Qal'a-yi Now (Fig. 73) in the vicinity of Firuzabad with moustache and beard and a hat of a mitra-type. This head leads us to the masculine bust from Tomb-i Bot and perhaps dates back to a post-Hellenistic period.

For the sake of completeness the statuary list continues with: a masculine head from Hamadan, perhaps the portrait of Mithridates II; three fragments of a large limestone basin decorated with Sileni's and satyrs's heads coming from what is interpreted as the Nebris of Dionysius¹⁴ in Dinavar nearby Kirmanshah, which is made in a very naturalistic style and attributed to the 3rd century; another head from a private collection in Berlin, apparently coming from the same region and probably part of the same tank; four other fragments, always from a private collection and a Greek fragmentary epitaph, perhaps the beginning of an epigram. There are, then, the famous statuettes from Nihavand, whose history is quite uncertain. To sum up Ghirshman (1952) shows the photos of four bronze statuettes (priest of Isis (?); Athena; female figure; Isis-Fortuna) accidentally found in the same area where the stele of Antiochus III (Fig. 43) was found; then the statuettes became five (Ghirshman 1962): the bronze statue of a priest of Isis, that has not yet been re-published, but the picture of an Apollo and that of a Zeus playing a lyre are added to the three subjects already published in 1952. Ghirshman dates these objects back to the Hellenistic phase of the city, together with the stele of Antiochus III and the circular altar; these are the elements that, associated with the oral evidence, would confirm the presence of six columns placed in the same area of the other finds discovery and that led the French archaeologist to speculate

¹⁴ *Nebris* is a fawn skin, similar to an aegis, originally worn as clothing for hunters and then attributed to Dionysus (Euripides, *Bacchae* 99, 125, 157, 790; Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1209; Dionysius the Periegeta 702, 946; Rufus Festus Avienus 1, 129), and subsequently adopted by his followers in processions and ceremonies that were held in his honor during the liturgical celebrations the Dionysia. In the works of ancient art, one sees it not only worn by maenads and Bacchae males, but also figures of Pan and Satyrs. It is commonly worn in the same way of the aegis, or goatskin, tying the two front legs over the right shoulder so that the body of the skin covering the left side of the wearer (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VI, 593).

about the existence of an Hellenistic temple in Laodicea. This hypothesis is confirmed only by the text of the stele (Fig. 43), which was explicitly ordered to expose the edict in the most important sanctuary of the city. Moreover the hill on which the Seleucid centre stood was fully occupied by modern buildings, making it impossible, even today, any attempt of archaeological excavations. Always from the current Nihavand comes what Ghirshman defines a 'special treasure' (Parthian Treasure, or Treasure of Karen), consisting of two small golden objects. However, these finds were not reported either in Robert's article (1950), or in Ghirshman's edition (1952). If you accept the chronology proposed by Ghirshman (2nd century BC-2nd century AD), you have to think that at the end of the Seleucid occupation, Laodicea had an enduring housing settlement of Parthian Age. Yet, more recent studies argue in favor of dating the end of the Seleucid occupation to the 3rd-2nd or the 1st century BC, or to the Roman Empire (Boucher 1976, 1979; Invernizzi 1999, 2000). Particularly significant is the importance of a rock-relief in Bisutun on the main road between Ecbatana and Seleucia on the Tigris; on the relief it is depicted a figure of Herakles Kallinikos (Fig. 74), lying on a lion's skin and the figure is accompanied by a Greek inscription of 148 BC and a summary in Aramaic. Beyond the existence of a temple dedicated to Hercules, the inscription is a kind of votive offering for the victory of *Kleomenes*, the Seleucid governor of the 'upper satrapies', whose father bears the Macedonian name of Pantauchos; the style remains fully Hellenistic even if perhaps drawn from a previous relief of Elamite period. The presence of a rock-relief would be particularly significant in the context of a sanctuary in Media. Nonetheless, although going back to the Iranian tradition, even in Fars the relief of Qir-Karzin presents Hellenistic stylistic influences as well. However, the dynamics of the western iconography spread, especially in the religious field, are quite complex and always evolves along the axis of interpretation of the relationships between interaction and integration of the Greek culture on the background of Iranian culture as well.

Interesting for Callieri is the hypothesis suggested by Melikian-Chirvani and widely shared indeed, that the iconography of Herakles found a great fortune in Iran, where it was used for the representation of what could be easily considered a royal figure. The inscription at Karaftu,¹⁵ to north of Kurdistan,

¹⁵ Karaftu guests one of the biggest, spectacular and scenic natural caves of Iran, which has undergone changes due to the hundreds of years of human habitation in the region. The cave, located 72 kilometres east of Saqqez, is in Kurdistan province. Located at a high altitude, the cave is made of limestone and strategically, connects the ancient road from Syria and Iraq to Afghanistan via Iran, on one of the paths of the Silk Road. Many sites in the immediate surroundings of this rocky mountain have been found to be connected via various tunnels and corridors through the rocks. The Karaftu cave is considered one of Iran's natural marvels. Located near the town of Divandarreh in the province of western Kurdistan, it is a natural lime covered cave. Studies show in the Mesozoic era, the cave was under water and it started to surface late in the era. It was used by man in different eras who tailored to suit their needs. Karaftu is dug into the mountain, built with rock architecture in four storeys. Many Orientalists

has been interpreted as belonging to a sanctuary dedicated to Herakles, or as an inhabited rock-area, perhaps the house of an officer commanding a small militia intended to control the northern border of Media. As the Author summarily argues, this might be the testimony of the large spread of Herakles' iconography over the Iranian plateau, which had a long tradition of knights, but not hunters. In the third lecture's conclusion, the Author makes reference to the iconography present on the prestigious coinage of the rulers of Fars. It is evident that the Persian dynasty used a typical instrument of the Hellenistic tradition, the coinage, to reaffirm its power. In fact, both the recto and the verso of these coins are in line with the Greek tradition, with the king, in profile, facing right and his head covered with a Persian *bashlik* with a *tiara* presenting two variants: in the first the *tiara* dropped on the king's front and an ear-cover pulled back; in the second it dropped on the *bashlik* with a visor, and an ear-covers pulled down; the king has moustache and beard. Both for its technology and quality this monetary tradition testifies a time of great creativity in the Hellenistic tradition. In conclusion, the Author emphasizes the impact of the Hellenistic tradition that is much more visible in the craftsmanship minor production than in sculpture and decorative arts.

In regard to the fourth lecture (*Le Fārs sous les règnes des souverains locaux: les témoignages archéologiques et épigraphiques*, pp. 115-46) Callieri seems to be aware that his efforts in reconstructing an archaeological picture of the post-Achaemenid age may offer a new contribution to the advancement of the studies (p. 116).

As far as the political historical level of the period is concerned, we are obliged to consider that the Hellenistic epoch is known only in a very fragmentary way, whereas the archaeological discoveries of Ai-Khanum in Bactriana and others in Central Asia have revealed the great importance of the period. Nonetheless, nothing about the Persian horizon of the city is known. Yet, great scholars as Briant or Wiesehöfer (1966) tried to highlight the so-called 'dark-ages' of the period, as Alram did for the numismatics. The aim of the Author's is mainly addressed to a transitional period, when the political power passed

such as de Morgan, Rawlinson, etc. visited the cave and drew its plan. There is a tablet written in Greek above the portal of a room in the third floor. That's why it has been mentioned as the Hercules temple. The tablet reads: «therein resides Hercules and no evil can penetrate it». The Karaftu cave is 750 meters in length with a large number of subways. The existence of man in the cave means that it was subject to manipulations, with many rooms and hallways cut into the mountain. There are abstract paintings of animals, humans and plants which are mostly of a ritualistic nature. In 2000, boring pits were dug in the cave as the archaeological studies revealed remains from various era which indicated that man inhabited it in the pre-historic era. In addition, pottery pieces and relics found in the cave suggest it was inhabited in the Arsacid, Sasanid and Islamic eras. Over the last few years, the local cultural heritage department has made modifications in the cave to prepare it to receive visitors. An archaeological research center has also been set up in its vicinity. Karaftu was first explored by a Russian orientalist Khanikov in 1917.

from the Greek-Macedonians to the local Iranians. However, even in this case, the direct testimonies are very few and, among them, Callieri includes also the archaeological evidences of the local aristocracy. Speaking about the defence of the Macedonian satrap Peukestas by the Persian nobility in 315 BC, when Antigonos ordered a purge of the Eumènes' partisans, the quotation of a pass of Diodorus Siculus (XIX, 48, 5) appears as a clear evidence of the new socio-political situation occurred among the locals and the Greek-Macedonians; only two year before, in fact, the situation appeared much more honourable for the Persians (p. 50). About this issue, once again the Author emphasizes the lack of sources (p. 116) even if, a little below, at the same page, he mentions the Aramaic inscription (Fig. 77) present on the façade of the Darius's tomb at Naqsh-e Rostam, on which it appears the name *slwk* (Seleukos). Yet, some scholars (Henning 1958: 24; Herzfeld 1926: 244; Wiesehöfer 1994: 90-91) considered it of uncertain chronology and attribution; according to Frye (1982: 90; 1984: 158-59), instead, it is quite difficult to image Greeks interested to a monument of Achaemenid age. It seems quite interesting also the episode quoted by Polyenus (VII, 39) and related to the massacre, ordered by the Seleucid *strategos* Seiles, of a military group of 3000 men in revolt in the Randa village. The revolt was against the sovereign Oborzos (Polyenus, VII, 40), who has to be identified with Wahubarz, the sovereign attested by numismatics (Stiehl 1959: 376; Alram 1986: 167).

Then Callieri goes to the analysis of the titling of the local dynasty of Fars, present on the coins; even if the titling refers only to the rule of a kind of governors (*prtrk' ZY' LHY'*), it testifies the existence of a certain autonomy of the Iranians from the Seleucides (p. 117). As a matter of fact in the first phase of the *Frātārākā* coins issue (the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 2nd century BC) the local sovereigns were still representative of the Seleucides, whereas in the second (the middle of the 2nd century BC), they seem to have reached their own independence.

Anyhow, the most important source for the history of the dynasty of Fars certainly remains the numismatics (topic in which Callieri frankly says not to be an expert, as I myself am not) (p. 118). Yet, generally speaking, we can state that this coinage initially developed with some original characters, which later disappeared, with the assimilation of the Arsacid characters (p. 127).

Within the four or five iconographic and epigraphic groups in which the related tradition of studies has organized the amount of coins found, the first has been dated back to the beginning of the 3rd century BC. The series presents, on the *verso*, the portrait of a sovereign in profile toward to the right, with a diadem and the Persian *bashliq* and, on the *recto*, with the first emissions of Baydad (Fig. 78), a figure seen on three quarter, sitting on a throne and wearing the *bashliq*. We may recognize the sovereign in the character with a long lance in the right hand, the lance top touching the foot of a banner. The banner, located on the right, on a long stick, is square shaped and, like a

St. Andrew's cross, is divided in four triangles. Starting from the king Vadfradad II, the standard is crowned by a bird-like figure, eagle or hawk.

The figure of king Baydad (Fig. 79) was mainly utilized with variants up to the 2nd century. The iconography comprehends, on the left, a masculine figure, certainly the sovereign, wearing a long dress and the *bashliq*; he faces to a tower-like structure with a gate; it is an entablature on the top of which there are three small rectangular elements with the images of two horns (or a monument or an altar) on each of them. The hypothesis more followed by Callieri (1998) and by Potts (2007) is that the construction represented is not a stepped altar with base to be compared with the altars in shape of a tower of the Achaemenid seals. The constructions are sometime crowned by battlements stepped as those in the coins Vadfradad I, whose more convincing comparisons are with the Assyrian altars.

To tell the truth, the altars appear in the very last period of the coinage of the sovereigns of Fars and in the Sasanian time; from this point of view, the possibility of their similarity with the fire altars on the Achaemenid reliefs is not very much reliable because the local sovereigns would have been used to represent the same altars as those represented not very far from their possible location. At the same time the tower-like structures present characteristics (including the gates) that are more architectural than those of ritual furnishings. Rather intriguing is the quotation of a pictorial monument of Kushan period, representing a similar structure. It was discovered in Xinjiang published by Marshak (2006: Figs. 1, 6). Equally intriguing is the quotation of the scene in terracotta on the superior layers of the Persepolis treasury; it represents an horseman in front of a construction that is very similar to that of the architectural features present on the second series of the Fars coinage and traditionally attributed to the post Achaemenid age but now to the Parthian Age (Wiesehöfer 1994). The results of the Italian Archaeological and restoration activity at Persepolis clearly evidenced the presence of such horned crown on the parapet of the Persepolis terrace (Fig. 80) (Tilia 1969; 1972: 61, 243-53). It is evident that this form of parapet should have already existed during the post-Achaemenid age and might have been used as a model for the local sovereigns' coinage. Examples of this type of architectural crowns widespread very much over Fars, as they did at Persepolis, Da' o Dukhtar, Taq-i Girre and Taq-i Bustan, even if from the Achaemenid to Sasanian time, that is for almost one thousand years: a time span long enough to let us draw typological and morphological conclusions. In fact the crowning steps are a very long and ancient system of artistic representation, which, according to some scholars, indicated the sky, whereas to others, the mountains or something else; yet in any case, they do not seem to be directly connected to the different types of fire-altars of crowned architectural features, being, as it is known, an artistic medi-

um.¹⁶ In relation to the ancient Near East, among the typological analysis of monuments as the *ziqurrats* in Mesopotamia or the Ka'ba-i Zardusht at Naqsh-e Rostam and Zindan-i Sulayman at Pasargade, there were attempts to compare the crowning steps to the model of construction represented on the *Frātārākā* coins. From different points of view, some scholars have shared this hypothesis, whereas others have not; yet, Tilia excluded the possibility that there were any crowning on the top of those tower. At the same time, the symbolic value of the figures present on the coins let some scholars (Jakubiak 2005: 100-102) to interpret them as Zoroastrian temples or as expression of ideological value and as representation of initiation rituals as well (Panaino 2003: 269-70). As far as the standard is concerned, it is a memory of the Achaemenids, as the eagle or falcon figures identified by Shahbazi (1984; 1996: 312) as *vāragna* of the Iranian tradition. De Jong (2003) gives a quite different and interesting interpretation of the standard considering it as a religious symbol, most probably used by a particular temple, which the *Frātārākā* would have been the guardians of. Apart from other considerations of the Author about the interpretation of this first series of the *Frātārākā* coins as more Seleucid (Wiesehöfer 1966: 36) or more Achaemenid, it is clear that they represent the king in front of a monument that, as in the Iranian tradition, might be connected with initiation practices. On the *verso* there are other elements, as the winged disc framing the bust of a divinity (perhaps Ahura Mazda) and a *Nike* crowning the sovereign in the Vadfradad I coins. The iconography of this first series of coins was also utilized in various other supports, like *bullae* (Fig. 81).

On the second series of coins, issued between 140 and the end of the 2nd century BC, the outline of the building is more schematic (Fig. 82), and the technical quality decreases, while the king Darayan is called *shāh*, or *MLK* in the Aramaic legend.

The iconographies of the third series, dating back to the 1st century BC, are practically assimilated to the Arsacid issue: on the *recto* there is the figure of the sovereign wearing the *tiara* and turned to the left; on the *verso* the sovereign is not any more represented in front of a building but in front of a fire altar (Alram 1986: 163, 171), thus possibly imitating the scenes of the rock-

¹⁶ Here is in my opinion one of the most important and crucial aspect of methodological approaches to the Archaeology of historical time. Historical-artistic and stylistic-iconographic analysis have given rise to lengthy discussions and the matter under discussion has essentially referred to the possible validity of those interpretations in which the relationship between the iconographies and their ethnic or the real referents was considered to be direct: in other words if it was justified to consider the things represented as having been or not the same as those actually existing in that period with all the details. For some time there has been an effort to establish, on the basis of the parallel drawn between the epigraphic document and the iconographic monument (which had already been supported in the 1950s, to tell the truth, for other empires of the ancient East; cf. Moscati 1961, 1978, 1979), also an equivalence between iconographic monument and the actual historical reality.

reliefs of the royal tombs of the Achaemenid. In this series the patronymic is associated with the name of the King and of his title (Fig. 83).

In the fourth series of coins, issued starting from the 1st century BC, we can find the royal bust turned to the left with the same variants of the Arsacid coins. On the verso we can see different figures: the sovereign in profile turned to the left, or the sovereign in front of a Tyche statue, with a *triskeles*¹⁷ (Fig. 84), round diadem, or different abstract signs; the patronymic disappears and the text on the verso is identical to that of the recto. There is, then, the last series related to the last two sovereigns, whose busts are unfortunately not identifiable (Fig. 85). The use of coinage by the *Frātārākā* 'dynasty' is quite an interesting phenomenon because they resorted to a typical Greek instrument to emphasize their own autonomy; of course, the coins were only representative and most probably they did not have any validity in the economic exchanges. According to Callieri the presence of coins in Iran and Central Asia constitutes somehow a Greek outcome (a result of the Greek political-cultural expansion) (p. 127) and the use of such a high level of technical specialization in coinage issue was certainly due to long lasting experienced workshops. At the same time, it is just this situation to make us locate the coinage of Fars inside the Hellenistic tradition of production. This probably is another crucial point of the general discussion on the concrete possibility the area had to realize such a specific production. Alram (1986: 164) thinks that the centre of production was Istakhr even if the archaeological knowledge of the city is very far from being appreciable. We cannot exclude the possibility that other centers were involved in such a production, as Susa, Seleucia of Eulaios, or Antiochia of Persis etc. This hypothesis, which finds convincing aspects in silver coins, has not been considered in the literature for the gold and bronze coins; most scholars, but not all of them, interpreted them as either modern forgeries or antique fakes. It is once more evident that the real, crucial issue is that related to the debate about the interaction versus integration of the two communities, each of which sometimes seems to prevail, sometimes to succumb. To conclude whereas the use of coinage remains substantially Greek, the iconographies and the epigraphic appear to be Iranian, especially as far as specific Aramaic names and denominations are concerned, like *prtrk* 'ZY 'LHY', *frataraka ī bayān* (p. 128). This expression, difficult to translate and variously interpreted (Wiesehöfer 1994: 136; 2002; Callieri 1998; Chaumont 1959: 179; Humbach 1988: 102; Skjærvo 1997: 102; Panaino 2003: 283; De Jong 2003; Grenet 2003b: 72), refers to something connected to the King and Gods, or sovereigns. At this point, the Author dwells particularly on the

¹⁷ A *triskelion* or *triskeles* is an iconography constituted by a motif of three interlocked spirals, or three bent human legs. Both words are from Greek, meaning «three-legged» (from prefix *tri-* and *skelos* «leg»). Although it appears in many places and periods, it is especially characteristic of the Celtic art of the La Tène culture of the European Iron Age.

word *bayan* and, as a conclusion, argues that it could not be but a new use started by the sovereigns of Fars which will be taken up later by the Sasanians (see the case of Bishapur for example).¹⁸

About a possible cult of the ‘ancestors’, the Author focuses on the relief of Daskyleion in Phrygia, that Gropp (1969: 166) considered as a Zoroastrian ritual of the *bay* in honor of the dead, certainly a step to the cult of a dead king. Even if an ancestors ‘cult’ does not imply a divinization so as a discussion about the Old Persian *artavan* (Panaino 2003: 269), that, as the Author says, is not his field of research (p. 130), it is quite interesting the quotation of Briant (1984: 110 and n. 32), who attributes to each Achaemenid clan a particular cult on the basis of the Plutarchus expression *theoi genethlioi kai basileioi* (*Alexandros*, 31, 12). To sum up, Callieri shares the interpretation of an initiation related to the towers of Naqsh-e Rostam and Pasargade and does not have anything against the funerary character of monuments that, in the early period of the Zoroastrianism, were not so exclusive about the prohibition of burying the deceased men.

Apart from the Fars coinage, the Author (p. 131) mentions two other categories of documentation related to the Fars dynasty: a silver cup (Skjærvo 1997) and the wall graffiti uncovered at Persepolis (Callieri 2006). In the first case the cup, whose shape and form have not been concretely analyzed and studied, bears an inscription in middle Persian, that has been transliterated.¹⁹ As far as the graffiti are concerned, some of the iconographies present there recall some of the figures on the coins. As it is known, the graffiti are depicted on some of the windows frames of the *Tachara* or *Harem* of Darius at Persepolis (Fig. 87) (Calmeyer 1976: fig. 3) that represent isolated personages and also some more complicated figures to be compared with some rock-reliefs of Sasanian age. The Author had already dealt with such figures in one of his articles (Callieri 2006) and, at the time of the present volume publication, a young Iranian scholar (Razmjou) was in charge of publishing the figure with more details. The identification of such figures, in profile and turned to the left (Fig. 88), with some of those represented in the coins of Fars’ is not any more convincing, although the personages represented bear the same headgear, one of which with seven points (Fig. 89). The *tiara* they bear are certainly of a sovereign-type and were found with some variants from the first half of the 1st century BC to the 1st quarter of the 3rd century AD. Besides the different pro-

¹⁸ The mostly accepted meaning of the name would derive from the Middle Persian Bay-Shapur «Lord Šāpūr» (Sundermann 1986: 294-95), found on *bullae* (Byšpwhr; Herzfeld 1938: 418), on a seal (Byš'pwhr; Gignoux 1978: 15f.), in the 5th-century Middle Persian inscription of Iqlid (probably Byhšpwhl; Frye 1970: 155), and in the Coptic Manichean homilies (Bašabahör; Sundermann 1986: 294).

¹⁹ «May I be happiness to King Ardaxšahr, our brother a descendant of Dārāyān, son of King Dārāyā! This ‘hammered’ (bowl in) gold-and-silver (weights) 50 staters. It belongs to Prince Dārāyān II» (Skjærvo 1997: 93).

posals of interpretations of the single personage and of the existence of this particular type of documentation, we have to consider the particular importance of Persepolis still at the time of the sovereigns of Fars' (Frye 1975: 238), so as the special relationship between them and the Sasanians, that appears (that we can observe) in the site (p. 133), also, in particular, on an inscription in Pahlavi. The Author's reflections on this very special category of documentation and on the possible existence of Persepolis after the famous, although discussed, fire occurred on its remains, give him the opportunity to make a very crucial and extremely important consideration about the archaeology of the post-Achaemenid age in Fars, which I prefer to quote in full:

... méthodologiquement les fouilles des années 30 du siècle dernier sont discutables; elles n'ont en effet presque pas pris en compte les couches couvrant les ruines plus imposantes de l'époque achéménide, et plus ont partout détruit les niveaux d'occupation post-achéménide, et plus encore elles n'ont pas illustré les architectures en briques crues. L'ensemble d'une telle documentation aurait permis d'établir la séquence correcte des structures architectonique, des graffiti et des inscriptions, entre la période pré-sassanide et l'époque islamique (p. 134).

I think that nothing better than these words express the bitterness of an archaeologist's point of view in front of the incredible amount of data irretrievable lost and most likely never recoverable because of the incredible methodological mistakes made by an entire generation of past archaeologists. We hope that the next generation will never have to face a similar situation!

Most of the archaeological documentation of post-Achaemenid age in Persepolis is concentrated in the south-west corner of the terrace (Fig. 80) and, in particular, is related to the inscriptions realized by Shabuhr Saganshah in the 4th century AD. In the area, where there are the remains of H and G Palaces, there would be traces of a post-Achaemenid age; among these, a *podium*, larger than that used in the preceding periods, is limited by a supporting wall made of re-used architectonic and sculptured materials (pp. 134-35). Once more here Callieri is obliged to say that, in the lack of any stratigraphy and pottery sequence, it is impossible to have more precise chronology of these remains; thus, it remains unknown the chronological and historical relationship between the graffiti located on some of the Harem's windows frames and the remains found in the area of those Palaces. Even the evidences of Strabo (XV, 3, 3), very much emphasized (p. 134), does not seem to be sufficiently convincing; here it seems to be confirmed the hypothesis that Istakhr would have been founded during the time of the sovereigns of Fars' sovereigns. Similarly, the mention in the Sasanian literary books²⁰ of the pre-Sasanid *Stakhr* city, where the enemy of Ardashir I, the Arsacid Ardawan used to live, may derive

²⁰ As the *Kārnāmag Ardaxšir Pābagān* (Grenet 2003a) and *Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr* (Daryaei 2002: 41).

from an Iranian tradition, which associated the foundation of the pre-Sasanid *Stakhr* city to that of the last Arsacid king, his enemy.

Callieri pays a particular attention also to the issue of the foundation of Istakhr city and its living time, including the events of a Juzhir of the family Bazranjin, who lived at Bayza (pp. 137, 138). Yet, we cannot completely share the Author's opinion about the complicated issue of dating one site or another to the Achaemenid or post-Achaemenid age only on the basis of the construction techniques (p. 138) of some remains found there. Although convincing on more than one aspect, it seems to me that this opinion finds its own limit in that a site is not represented by an architectural feature only, even if we cannot exclude that it may be characterized also by such a feature. And what is more, the same definition of 'Achaemenid' appears here in the Author's words, only related to the architectural dynastic remains and not to the more general and extensive archaeological characterization of a context, as *e.g.* in the case of Tomb-i Bot (Askari Chaverdi 1999-2000: fig. 1, 2), of Qadamgah, of rock-tombs of Akhur-i Rustam; in the first case, at Tomb-i Bot, there are three capitals of Achaemenid type with volutes with protomes beef (Figs. 93, 94) and stylized petals (Fig. 95, p. 141). The Author (p. 139) goes further back to a stylistic definition of 'Achaemenid' in terms of a major or minor similarity to the 'classic' way of being 'Achaemenid'. Callieri had already dealt with this set of information above (Figs. 96, 97) (p. 139) and his entire discussion (p. 139) makes part of a full architectural and stylistic debate in order to define what has to be meant by 'Achaemenid'. Instead, the monument of Qadamgah (Fig. 98) is the subject of a very interesting in-depth analysis of its nature. Originally considered an unfinished rock-tomb of Achaemenid time, now the monument is most rightly interpreted (Bessac 2007; Boucharlat 2006: 454) as completed and bearing some cuts to be once filled with lost plates; it is in front of a water sources, thus suggesting a cultic use.

The famous rock-tomb of Da' o Dukhtar in the Mamasani region probably belonged to the aristocracy of Fars or, in any case, to a person of an high social level; and the Hellenistic style might have been used as a new tradition against the old Achaemenid. There they are represented (also) some Ionic pseudo-archaic columns, with particularly salient volutes (Fig. 65), that are generally dated to the post-Achaemenid time as they have similarities with the columns of the *Propylaea* of the Court with *peristyle* of Ai-Khanum. The hypotheses of Von Gall (1966: 38), very far from those of Herzfeld and Stein, seem to be more convincing. I do wish that, after half a century of attribution of such rock-tombs to the Medes, now we would not run the risk to lose one half century more to attribute some of them to the Hellenistic period. We do not know either the commitment or the owner, and the traces of architectural remains of Hellenistic style cannot, by themselves, be seriously taken into account as veritable proofs for a concrete dating or an extension of the Frataraka power in south Fars. Going back to the reliefs of the Temple of Frataraka and

his masculine figure with long priestly dress and with the Zoroastrian *barsom* in his right hand (Fig. 99), and the comparisons with the relief of Kil-i Dawud not far from Dukkan-i Dawud in Media, the Author can say that their style is similar in Media and in Persia and that the iconography resembles the coin effigies of Fars. The last example taken from the Author is the isolated stone rock-relief around Qir (Fig. 100) that represents a bower in profile turned to the right shooting an arrow-head. Though with some Achaemenid stylistic characteristic this relief (Huff 1984: 246-47) has been considered to belong to the 2nd century and representing a noble of the area expressing the proper synthesis between the Iranian and the Greek cultural Heritage. In conclusion the Author (p. 146) emphasizes that in one century from the end of the Achaemenid power and the coming of that of the sovereigns of Fars, the local aristocrats, though open to different cultural contributions, keep their own Iranian identity anticipating, in a way, the political independence of the later times.

To sum up we should thank very much the Author for having devoted such long extended papers to the Hellenistic time in Fars and to the quality of the conceptions and thoughts expressed. Much has been made by him and much more should be done in the future; with these contributions in any way, nothing will be, in this topic, as before!

Bruno Genito
 Università di Napoli "L'Orientale"
 bruno.genito@gmail.com

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. McC. (1965) *Land behind Baghdad: A History of Settlement of the Diyala Plains*. Chicago.
- Alizadeh, A. (1997) Preliminary Report on Archaeological Surveys in Upper Kur River Basin and Northeastern Marvdasht, Fars Province. *Archaeological Reports of Iran* 1, 67-88.
- (2003) Some Observations Based on the Nomadic Character of Fars Prehistoric Cultural Development, in N.F. Miller, K. Abdi (eds.), *Yeki bud, ye bi nabud. Essays in the Archaeology of Iran in Honor of William M. Sumner* (Cotsen Institute of Archaeology. Monograph series 48), 83-97. Los Angeles.
- Alram, M. (1986) Nomina propria iranica in nummis. *Materialgrundlagen zu den iranischen Personennamen auf antiken Münzen* (Iranisches Personennamenbuch IV). Wien.
- Askari Chaverdi, A. (1999-2000) Fârs pas az Dâriuš-e sevvom: nowyâftehâ-i az yek mohavvate-ye bâstâni dar Lâmerd-e Fârs. *Iranian Journal of Archaeology and History* 13, 2/14, 1, Ser. 26-27, 1378 (1999/2000), 66-71.
- Ball, W., J.-C. Gardin (1982) *Archaeological Gazetteer of Afghanistan = Catalogue des sites archéologiques d'Afghanistan*. Paris.
- Bernard, P. (1974) Trois notes d'archéologie iranienne. *Journal Asiatique* 262, 279-97.
- Bessac, J.-C. (2007) Étude technique et interprétations du monument rupestre de Qadamgah (Fars). *Iran* 42, 185-206.
- Boucharlat, R. (2006) Le destin des résidences et sites perses d'Iran dans la seconde moitié du IV^e siècle avant J.-C., in P. Briant, F. Joannès (éds.), *La transition entre l'empire achémé-*

- nide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350-300 av. J.-C.), *Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par la Chaire d'histoire et civilisation du monde achéménide et de l'empire d'Alexandre, et le Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides* (GDR 2538 CNRS), 22-23 novembre 2004 (Persika 9), 443-70. Paris.
- Boucher, S. (1976) *Recherches sur les bronzes figurés de Gaule pré-romaine et romaine* (Bibliothèques des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 228). Rome.
- (1979) Des bronzes hellénistiques aux bronzes romains. Quelques problèmes, in Cl. Bérard, P. Ducrey (éds.), *Bronze hellénistiques et romains. Tradition et renouveau, Actes du Ve Colloque International sur les bronzes antiques, Lausanne, 8-13 mai 1978* (Cahiers d'archéologie romande 17), 95-102. Lausanne.
- Briant, P. (1982) *Rois, tributs et paysans. Études sur les formations tributaires du Moyen-Orient ancien* (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 269). Paris.
- (1984) La Perse avant l'Empire (un état de la question). *Iranica Antiqua* 19, 71-118.
- Briant, P., R. Bouchardat eds. (2005) *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches* (Persika 6). Paris.
- Briant P., F. Joannès eds. (2006) *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques (vers 350-300 av. J.-C.), Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par la Chaire d'histoire et civilisation du monde achéménide et de l'empire d'Alexandre, et le Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides* (GDR 2538 CNRS), 22-23 novembre 2004 (Persika 9). Paris.
- Callieri, P. (1998) A proposito di un'iconografia monetale dei dinasti del Fārs post-achemenide. *Ocnus* 6, 25-38.
- (2006) At the Roots of the Sasanian Royal Imagery: The Persepolis Graffiti, in M. Compareti, P. Raffetta, G. Scarcia (eds.), *Ērān und Anērān. Studies Presented to Boris Il'ič Maršak on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, 129-48. Venezia.
- Calmeyer, P. (1976) Zur Genese altiranischer Motive. V. Synarchie. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran N.F.* 9, 63-95.
- Cameron, G. (1948) *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (Oriental Institute Publications 65). Chicago.
- Carandini, A. (1975) *Archeologia e Cultura Materiale. Lavori senza gloria nell'antichità classica* (Dissensi 63). Bari.
- (1979) *Archeologia e Cultura Materiale. Dai "lavori senza gloria" nell'antichità a una politica dei Beni Culturali* (Dissensi 95). Bari.
- Cattani, M., B. Genito (1998) The Pottery Chronological Seriation of the Murghab Delta from the End of the Bronze Age to the Achaemenid Period: a Preliminary Note, in A. Gubaev, G. Koshelenko, M. Tosi (eds.), *The Archaeological Map of the Murghab Delta. Preliminary Reports 1990-95* (Reports and Memoirs, Series Minor III, ISIAO), 75-87. Roma.
- Chaumont, M.-L. (1959) Pāpak, Roi de Staxr, et sa cour. *Journal Asiatique* 247, 175-91.
- Clarke, D.L. (1968) *Analytical Archaeology*. Meuthen.
- Daryaei, T. ed. (2002) *Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr. A Middle Persian Text on Late Antique Geography, Epic, and History*. Costa Mesa.
- De Jong, A. (2003) Vexillologica sacra: searching the cultic banner, in C.G. Cereti, M. Maggi, E. Provasi (eds.), *Religious Themes and Texts in Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the occasion of his 65th birthday on the 6th December 2002* (Beiträge zur Iranistik 24), 191-202. Wiesbaden.
- Franzese, F., B. Genito (2012) Towards an Archaeological Map of Fārs. Work, Methods and Strategies: Preliminary Aspects, in G. Basello, A.V. Rossi (eds.), *Dariosh Studies II. Persepolis and its Settlements: Territorial System and Ideology in the Achaemenid State* (Series Minor 78), 313-38. Napoli.
- Frye, R.N. (1970) Funerary Inscriptions in Pahlavi from Fars, in M. Boyce, I. Gershevitch (eds.), *W.B. Henning Memorial Volume*, 152-56. London.

- (1975) The Rise of the Sasanians and the Uppsala school, in *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg I* (Acta Iranica 4), 237-41. Leiden – Teheran – Liège.
- (1982) The “Aramaic” Inscription on the Tomb of Darius. *Iranica Antiqua* 17, 85-90.
- (1984) *The History of Ancient Iran* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3,7). München.
- Gall, H. von (1966) Zu den “medischen” Felsgräbern in Nordwestiran und Iraqī Kurdistan. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1, 19-43.
- Genito, B. (2010) The Western Scythian Identity: a Territorial and Archaeological “Puzzle”, in C.G. Cereti (ed.), with the assistance of Ch. Barbati, M. De Chiara, G. Terribili, *Iranian Identities in the Course of History, Proceedings of the Conference held in Rome 21-24 September 2005* (Orientalia Romana 9), 119-44. Roma.
- (in press) *Manuale di Archeologia dell'Iran Antico: Materiali e Problemi. I Periodi Medo e Achemenide* (IX-IV secolo a.C.). Roma.
- Gignoux, Ph. (1978) *Catalogue des sceaux, camées et bulles sasanides de la Bibliothèque Nationale et du Musée du Louvre II: Les sceaux et bulles inscrits*. Paris.
- Ghirshman, R. (1952) *Iran*. London.
- (1962) *Arte Persiana. Parti e Sassanidi*. Milano.
- Gotch, P. (1968) A Survey of the Persepolis Plain and Shiraz Area. *Iran* 6, 168-70.
- (1969) The Persepolis Plain and Shiraz: Field Survey 2. *Iran* 7, 190-92.
- Grenet, F. (2003a) *Kārnāmag Ardaxšir Pābagān*. La geste d’Ardashir fils de Pābag. [Jessains].
- (2003b) Review of Panaino (2003), *Abstracta Iranica* 26, 71-72.
- Gropp, G. (1969) Die Funktion des Feuertempels der Zoroastrier. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* N.F. 2, 147-75.
- Gubaev, A., G. Koshelenko, M. Tosi (1998) *The Archaeological Map of the Murghab Delta: Preliminary Reports, 1990-95*. Rome.
- Haerinck, E. (1989) The Achaemenid (Iron Age IV) Period in Gilan, Iran, in L. De Meyer, E. Haerinck (eds.), *Archaeologica Iranica et Orientalis. Miscellanea in honorem Louis Vanden Berghe*, 455-74. Gent.
- Hansman, J. (1985) The Great Gods of Elymais, in *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce* (Acta Iranica 24), 229-46. Leiden.
- Henning, M.B. (1958) Mitteliranisch, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik, I.4.1. Linguistik*, 20-130. Leiden – Köln.
- Herzfeld, E. (1926) Reiseberichte. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 80, 225-84.
- (1931) Die Magna Charta von Susa. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 3, 29-45. Berlin.
- (1938) Achaemenid Coinage and Sasanian Mint-Names, in *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress 1936*, 413-26. London.
- (1941) *Iran in the Ancient East*. New York.
- Huff, D. (1984) Das Felsrelief von Qir. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 17, 221-47.
- Humbach, H. (1988) Herrscher, Gott und Gottessohn in Iran und angrenzenden Ländern, in D. Zeller (ed.), *Menschwerdung Gottes - Vergöttlichung von Menschen*, 91-144. Freiburg – Göttingen.
- Invernizzi, A. (1999) *Sculture in metallo da Nisa. Cultura greca e cultura iranica in Parthia* (Acta Iranica 21). Leiden.
- (2000) Die Kunst der Partherzeit, in M. Seipel (ed.), *2000 Jahre Persische Kunst*. Wien.
- Jakubiak, K. (2005) Persis coins propaganda and ideology in the Early Parthian period, in P. Bieliński, M. Stepniowski (eds.), *Aux pays d'Allat. Mélanges offerts à Michal Gawlibowski*, 99-112. Warszawa.
- Kent, R.G. (1933) The Record of Darius's Palace at Susa. *Journal of American Oriental Society* 53, 1-8.
- (1950) *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (American Oriental Series 33). New Haven.

- Leriche, P. (1977) Problèmes de la guerre en Iran et en Asie Centrale dans l'Empire Perse et à l'époque hellénistique, in J. Deshayes (éd.), *Le Plateau Iranien et l'Asie Centrale des origines à la conquête islamique. Leurs relations à la lumière des documents archéologiques, Paris 22-24 mars 1976*, 297-312. Paris.
- Lyonnet, B. (1997) Étude typologique, Étude comparative, Les limites de l'Étude comparative, in J.-Cl. Gardin (éd.), *Prospections archéologiques en Bactriane orientale (1974-1978)*, 2. *Céramiques et peuplement du Chalcolithique à la Conquête arabe* (Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique Française en Asie Centrale 8), 31-32. Paris.
- Marquart, J. (1901) *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*. Berlin.
- (1905) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran II*. (Philologus. Supplementband X, Heft 1). Leipzig.
- Marshak, B.I. (2006) Une peinture kouchane sur toile (suivi d'une note additionnelle par F. Grenet). *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 150/2, 947-63.
- Maurer Trinkaus, K. (1983) Pre-Islamic Settlement and Land Use in Damghan, Northeast Iran. *Iranica Antiqua* 18, 119-44.
- Melikian-Chirvani, A.S. (1998) Rostam and Herakles, a Family Resemblance, in O. Bopearachchi, C. Altman Bromberg, E. Grenet (eds.), *Alexander's Legacy in the East. Studies in Honor of Paul Bernard* (Bulletin of the Asia Institute N.S. 12), 171-99. Bloomfield Hills, Mich.
- Miroschedji, P. (1981) Prospections archéologiques au Khuzistan en 1977. *Cahiers de la délégation archéologique française en Iran* 12, 169-82.
- Moscati, S. (1961) *Origini della narrativa storica nell'arte del Vicino Oriente antico* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie, ser. 8, 10/2). Roma.
- (1978) *Il Volto del Potere. Arte Imperialistica nell'antichità*. Roma.
- (1979) *Antichi imperi d'Oriente*. Roma.
- MRT (1966-1998) = *Magyarország regészeti topográfiaja* (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia regészeti kutatóintézetének kiadványai). Budapest.
- Panaino, A. (2003) The *Bayān* of the Fratarakas: Gods or "Divine" Kings?, in C.G. Cereti, M. Maggi, E. Provasi (eds.), *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia. Studies in honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the occasion of his 69th birthday on 6th December 2002* (Beiträge zur Iranistik 24), 265-88. Wiesbaden.
- Pontani, F.M. ed. (1977) *Antologia Palatina*. Torino.
- Potts, D. (2007) Foundation Houses, Fire Altars and the Frataraka: Interpreting the Iconography of Some Post-Achaemenid Persian Coins. *Iranica Antiqua* 42, 271-300.
- Rapin, C. (1998) L'incompréhensible Asie centrale de la carte de Ptolémée. Propositions pour un décodage, in O. Bopearachchi, C. Altman Bromberg, E. Grenet (eds.), *Alexander's Legacy in the East. Studies in Honor of Paul Bernard* (Bulletin of the Asia Institute N.S. 12), 201-25. Bloomfield Hills (Mich.).
- Robert, L. (1950) Addenda au Tome VII. Inscription honorifique à Laodicée d'Iran (Nehavend). *Hellenica* 8, 73-75.
- (1975) Une nouvelle inscription grecque de Sardes. Règlement de l'autorité perse relatif à un culte de Zeus. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 119/2, 306-30.
- (1978) Malédiction funéraire grecques III. Une malédiction funéraire dans la plaine de Karayük. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 122/2, 277-86.
- Shahbazi, A.S. (1984) On *Vāragna*, the Royal Falcon. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 134/2, 314-17.
- (1996) Derafs-e Kāviān. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 7, 315-16.
- Skjærvo, P.O. (1997) The Joy of the Cup: A Pre-Sasanian Middle Persian Inscription on a Silver Bowl. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* N.S. 11, 93-104.
- Stiehl, R. (1959) Chronologie der Frataraka, in F. Altheim (ed.), *Geschichte der Hunnen* 1, 375-79. Berlin.

- Stolper, M.W. (1994) Les textes cunéiformes de Suse, in *La Cité Royale de Suse*, 271-72. Paris.
- Sumner, W.M. (1986) Achaemenid Settlement in the Persepolis Plain. *American Journal of Archaeology* 90/1, 3-31.
- Sundermann, W. (1986) Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer 2. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13/2, 239-317.
- Tilia, A.B. (1969) Reconstruction of the Parapet on the Terrace Wall at Persepolis. South and West of Palace H. *East and West* 19/1-2, 9-43.
- (1972) *Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and Other Sites of Fars*. I (IsMEO Reports and Memoirs XVI). Roma.
- Wenke, R.J. (1976) Imperial Investments and Agricultural Developments in Parthian and Sasanian Khuzestan: 150 B.C. to A.D. 640. *Mesopotamia* 15-16, 31-221.
- Wiesehöfer, J. (1994) *Die 'dunklen Jahrhunderte' der Persis* (Zetemata 90). München.
- (1996) Discordia et Defectio. Dynamis kai Pithanourgia. Die frühen Seleukiden und Iran, in B. Funck (ed.), *Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung in den Staaten des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Akten des internationalen Hellenismus-Kolloquiums, 9 - 14. März 1994 in Berlin*, 29-56. Tübingen.
- (2002) Συνοικήσις und ἀπορία χρημάτων. Antiochos IV. und die Heiligtümer der Elymais, in N. Ehrhardt, L.-M. Günther (hrsg.), *Widerstand - Anpassung - Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag*, 109-20. Wiesbaden.
- (2005) *Iraniens, Grecs et Romains* (Conférences d'études iraniennes Ehsan et Latifeh Yarshater 2; *Studia Iranica*, Cahier 32). Paris.
- Young, T.C. (1967) The Iranian Migration into Zagros. *Iran* 5, 11-34.
- (1978) The Comparative Stratigraphy of Second and First Millennium Khuzistan. *Paleorient* 4, 237-46.
- (1985) Early Iron Age Revisited: Preliminary Suggestions for the Re-Analysis of Old Constructs, in J.-L. Huot, M. Yon, Y. Calvet (éds.), *De l'Indus aux Balkans, Recueil à la mémoire de Jean Deshayes*, 361-78. Paris.

SUMMARY

The article reviews a book with the title *L'archéologie du Fārs à l'époque Hellénistique. Quatre leçons au Collège de France 8, 15, 22 et 29 Mars 2007* (Éd. De Boccard, Paris 2007) containing the written versions of four lectures held by Pierfrancesco Callieri at the Collège de France in 2007. The article is critically dealing with the crucial and problematic aspect of the archaeology of Hellenistic time and of the Late Iron Age (LIA) in Fars, Iran. The issue emphasizes the difficult combination in the archaeology of the historical time of two classes of the related documentary materials, the historical and the archaeological, for their very different nature from each other. The topic is historically very complex and archaeologically difficult to be identified; nonetheless, it allows the Author to write a sort of a modern 'state of art' of the Hellenistic period in Iran, and to the reviewer to outline the main critical aspects to be faced with in a modern and up to date archaeological approach to the issues addressed: the archaeological evidence of the cultural relationships between the Iranians and the Greeks in the Iranian plateau.

Keywords: Archaeology, Iran, Fars, Hellenistic time

Stampa: Tipolito: Istituto Salesiano Pio XI – Via Umbertide, 11 – 00181 Roma – tel. 067827819 – fax 067848333
Finito di stampare: Aprile 2014