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Apollo is one of the most important Greek city gods in Ionia. There is hardly any polis in which Apollo is not attested through the literary and epigraphical sources (RE I 2, 1896, 82–83 s.v. Apollo; Parke 1985; Fontenrose 1988), but only five sanctuaries are partly excavated. These are the Apollo sanctuary of Kato Phana (Kourouniotes 1915; 1916; Lamb 1934/35; Beaumont 2004) and the so-called harbour sanctuary in Emporio (Boardman 1967; for the identification of Apollo as the main god of the sanctuary cf. Boardman 1967, 63, 183, pl. 70; Graf 1985, 54–56; Despinis 2004, 286–94), both on the island of Chios; the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios in Miletos (Kawerau 1914; Herda 2005; 2006; 2011) and the city’s extra-urban oracle at Didyma (Knackfuss 1941; Tuchelt 1973; 2000; Furtwängler 2013; Bumke, Breder and Kaiser 2015); as well as the god’s sanctuary at Klaros, another oracular shrine (Macridy-Bey and Picard 1915; Robert 1954; 1960; La Genièvre 1992; 1998; La Genièvre and Jolivet 2003; Şahin and Debord 2011; Şahin 2014). Each of these sanctuaries had specific characteristics which are reflected in their material culture. To go into all of these matters in detail would be beyond the scope of this article; thus, the discussion will be focused on the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros.

Ritual activity at Klaros is prominently evidenced by series of votives which were deposited at four successive altars in the sanctuary of Apollo. Owing to the precise location of the finds, the archaeological contexts of Klaros provide useful information for considering the general role of votive offerings in Ionian sanctuaries of Apollo. The archaeological evidence of pre-Hellenistic Klaros is, therefore, taken as a starting point for the discussion of the votive spectrum in order to clarify the various types and quantities present. The aim of this article is hence twofold: first, to provide a brief general background for a challenging interpretation of the material record of sanctuaries; second, to re-examine the characteristic types of votive offerings from Klaros with the purpose of defining their function. In this framework, the frequency with which these objects are attested will help us to gain an idea about the nature of the total assemblage, as well as the different purposes of these objects and the activities in which they might have been used.

Sacrifices, praise and dedications: media of ritual communication

The act of offering, either in the form of sacrifice or as a dedicatory or votive practice, constitutes one of the two primary ritual acts in ancient Greek cult (Patera 2012; Jim 2014). The other primary form is praise, which is expressed through hymns and prayers (Versnel 1981; Pulleyn 1997; Scheer 2001). All three (sacrifices, dedications and prayers) are strongly interrelated, and were intended to establish a reciprocal relationship between people and the divine (Mauss 1966, 143–279; Van Straten 1981, 65–151). Ritual, therefore, describes a series of symbolic actions that are performed according to a prescribed order, in which behaviour is guided and restricted by traditions, rules and repetitions (Bell 1997; Bremmer 1998; Kyriakidis 2007, 289–94; Verhoeven
2011, 118). As a form of communication, ritual is socially effective and is related to interactions within the human society itself, but it is also effective in strengthening relations with the gods (Burkert 2011, 108). Since the direct observation of rituals is a privilege restricted to the participants and the empirical social sciences, this article focuses on the interpretation of the archaeological record as a testimony of formalised ritual action.

Whereas several features of ancient Greek rituals, e.g. prayer, dance, music etc., are scarcely traceable in the archaeological record, the validity of the more permanent material offerings as a source of insights into specific ritual activities cannot be underestimated (Mylonopoulos 2006). Nonetheless, it has to be stressed that not every object discovered in a sanctuary was necessarily a votive offering; ritual paraphernalia and other items of more secular use – if not themselves votive offerings – played an important role as well. Because of the potentially multiple functions objects may have fulfilled, the interpretation of individual objects still proves challenging. The process of reconstructing elements of ancient ritual from material remains depends in large part on the ways offerings, once defined, might have been used in the ritual setting. Perhaps the most obvious ritual use of a votive offering is the instance of objects with dedicatory inscriptions: in such a case, the function of the object is to a certain extent clear (Burzachechi 1962; Lazzarini 1976; Day 2010; see also Johnston this volume). In Ionia, ritual activity is evidenced by series of votives which were deposited at successive altars in the sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros.

The sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros: a case study

This small, extra-urban sanctuary is located 3km from the Aegean coast of Asia Minor and belonged to the polis of Kolophon (13km to the north) (Fig. 1). The identification of Klaros is based on the literary record (Homeric Hymns 3, 40; Pseudo-Skylax 98), as well as the epigraphical sources, including many inscriptions that have been found in the temenos (Robert and Robert 1989). The earliest known inscriptions are dedicatory, giving Apollo’s name and pointing to him as the main god at the sanctuary from the mid-6th century BC onwards (Lejeune 1998). As at three of the other four excavated Apollo sanctuaries in Ionia (Chios, Kato Phana: Graf 1985, 52 with fn. 25; Chios, Emporio, harbour sanctuary: Graf 1985, 54; Didyma: Bumke 2006), Apollo at Klaros was not worshipped alone, but accompanied by his sister Artemis (Sezgin 2008; Dewailly 2014).

Kolophon started producing series of silver and bronze coins at the beginning of the 5th century BC, showing the image of Apollo on the obverse, and his favourite musical instrument, the lyre, on the reverse (Babelon 1910, 1110, pl. 153). From the early 2nd century AD until the late Roman period, the reverse of the city’s Imperial coinage always carried the image of the Apollonic triad, referencing the late Hellenistic cult images parts of which were found in situ inside the cella of the Hellenistic temple. The colossal statue fragments belong to a statuary group representing the seated Apollo (‘type kitharodos’) in the centre, flanked by the standing statues of his sister Artemis and his mother Leto (Flashar 1992; 1998; Marcadé 1994; 1998; Bourbon and Marcadé 1995).

The Hellenistic–Roman layout of the sanctuary is partly visible today. The main entrance to the south consists of a propylon and leads directly to the sacred road (Étienne and Varène 2004), which is lined on both sides with honorific monuments (Ferrary and Verger 1999); the sacred road coming from the polis of Notion leads to the Doric temple of Apollo and its associated altar.
(Moretti 2014, 36–49). Immediately to the north, there is a smaller temenos of Artemis (Sezgin 2008; Dewailly 2014). Excavation results and the published ground plan, however, indicate that the spatial organisation of the sanctuary in the Hellenistic–Roman periods does not correspond to its layout in earlier times. The modified direction of the sacred road within the temenos in the Hellenistic period, along with the different orientation of the earlier architectural remains, suggests that the main entrance to the sanctuary in the pre-Hellenistic periods was most probably situated in the north, facing towards Kolophon (Rubinstein 2014).

![Sanctuary of Apollo at Klaros](http://www.britishmuseum.org/pdf/Kowalleck_24.pdf)

Fig. 1: Plan of the Apollo sanctuary at Klaros. © Ireen Kowalleck, after La Genière 1998, pl. 1.

**The altar zone of the Apollo sanctuary at Klaros and its votive deposits**

The core of the sanctuary is formed by four successive altars that have been revealed by excavations in the area to the east of the Hellenistic–Roman temple (La Genière 1992; 1998; La Genière and Jolivet 2003).¹

¹ Excavations at Klaros started at the beginning of the 20th century under the directorship of T. Macridy and C. Picard (Macridy-Bey and Picard 1915), but it was not until 1988 that systematic excavation in the area adjacent to the monumental Hellenistic–Roman altar began under the directorship of J. de La Genière and the Academy of Science in Paris (1988–97). Excavations have been continued under the new directorship of N. Şahin (Ege University, Izmir) since 2001. Among the finds from the more recent excavations, only a small selection has been published (Şahin 2014). The focus of this article is
The latest altar dates to the Hellenistic–Roman periods. It was built at the beginning of the 3rd century BC and remained in use until the abandonment of the sanctuary in Late Antiquity. It was axially oriented towards the east front of the simultaneously built temple and housed a (then) newly established oracle in its underground galleries (Parke 1985, 126; Moretti et al. 2014). In the area between the temple and the altar a facility for a hekatomb was installed in the late Hellenistic period. It is an installation consisting of four parallel rows of marble blocks, with bronze rings for the tethering of one hundred sacrificial animals (La Genière 1998, 247–49; Ferrary and Verger 1999, 825; La Genière 2003, 181–95; Ohnesorg 2005, 230). Underneath the foundations of the hekatomb, the complex structures of three earlier altars stemming from different building phases came to light. The first one, a rectangular altar (6 × 15m), was built in the mid-6th century BC (La Genière 1998, 241; Şahin and Debord 2011, 199, fig. 19) and remained in use until the late 4th or early 3rd century BC, when construction works for the new monumental temple and altar began.

The rectangular altar overlays an earlier ‘semi-circular’ altar of the 7th century BC, 6.30m in diameter (Şahin and Debord 2011, 172–74, 183, pl. 7,2, 196, fig. 13), which finds its closest parallel in the contemporary ‘semi-circular’ platform-like structure at the Apollo sanctuary on Despotiko (Kourayos and Ohnesorg 2012, 148–50). A further example of a platform-like structure, but smaller and of oval shape, is known from the area of the temple of Athena in Mileto (Mallwitz 1959–60, 79–85 fig. 2; cf. Rupp 1983, 102; Hägg 1983, 191). Such platforms have naturally been linked with cultic activities and interpreted as altars, but they are not yet fully understood (Hägg 1983, 191; Kourayos and Ohnesorg 2012, 149–50). In particular their unusual shape needs further discussion, since in both cases – Klaros and Despotiko – the respective ground plans were published at a stage before excavation was completed. It is at this point not clear whether these semi-circular platforms were independent altars or just the (better-preserved) part of an as-yet-uncovered bigger circular or oval altar. In Klaros, the ‘semi-circular’ altar itself partly overlays and incorporates a pre-existing circular structure measuring about 3.70m in diameter, which is thus the earliest known altar of the sanctuary (Şahin and Debord 2011, 171, 194–95, figs 9–11). Round altars could be (sometimes) hollow cylinders, walled rock altars, or simple platforms used as ash altars (Şahin 1972, 16–35; Ohnesorg 2005, 230–31; 241–43). In general, there is not much evidence for round altars in the archaeological record of the Greek world, especially of comparable date (Rupp 1983, 101–7). But examples of the Geometric period are attested in the Apollo sanctuary at Eretria in Euboea (Huber 2003), and, in Ionia, in a circular structure located in front of the Apollo temple at Didyma. The Didymaian circular structure has recently been identified by Alexander Herda as the altar of the Archaic sanctuary, which was in use until Late Antiquity, when the oracle of Didyma fell silent (Tuchelt 1991, 18–21; Herda 2006, 356–70; Weber 2015, 29–42).

Up to now, no other building or architectural structure that is contemporary to the cylindrical and the semi-circular altar has been found in the Klarian temenos. As the semi-circular altar lies over most parts of its predecessor, associated findings from both altars cannot be clearly separated from each other and the whole assemblage has been treated as one deposit (‘sondage 1k, strata 7’: cf. La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 109, fig. 29). Therefore, the material record of the
deposit suggests a beginning of ritual activities in the Proto-Geometric period, but provides no exact date for the construction of one or other of the altars at Klaros. Furthermore, the wide chronological range and the heterogeneous composition of the deposit indicate that the assemblage represents votive debris that had been swept away from the altar and its surrounding area at irregular intervals in earlier periods, and was presumably refilled and deposited under a layer of pebbles when the semi-circular altar was finally levelled and incorporated into the new rectangular altar of Apollo in the mid-6th century BC.

In the emplecton of the semi-circular altar, a filling ('strata 7c-d') consisting of a dense concentration of ash and burnt animal bones, along with several bronze knives and spits, was uncovered (Jolivet and Robert 2003, 102–6, 116, fig. 36.5–7; Verger 2003, 173–77, fig. 57.1–2; Verger 2010). It is likely that the knives and spits were associated with the sacrificial ceremonies carried out at the altar and can be understood as ritual implements, rather than votives. On top of this ash layer, a nest-like deposit of votive offerings came to light (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 101–9, fig. 29, 173–74, 182–84 pl. 26.3, 200–03) (Fig. 2), in which about sixty diagnostic sherds have been recorded (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 110–18, figs 30–38). The finds from this deposit are chronologically diverse. The earliest pottery finds date to the Proto-Geometric period (six sherds have been described by Zunal 2014, but a few more pieces are already known from earlier publications; cf. La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 118, fig. 32.6, 119, fig. 33.9–10, 115, fig. 35.4, 117, fig. 37.1–4, 118, fig. 38.2) and seem to confirm the early foundation of Klaros, as it is attested by Strabo and Pausanias (Strabo 14, 1, 27; Pausanias 7, 3, 1). Among them are even a few earlier fragments from the Sub Helladic III period (SH III) (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 112, fig. 32.4–5, 113, fig. 33.11). Most of the other finds date to later periods, but none is later than 670/650 BC (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 112, fig. 32.2) which provides a terminus post quem for the construction of the semi-circular altar. The pottery types are those available on the local market, in particular vessel shapes intended for the consumption of liquids. The range of vessel types is limited, comprising a few craters and dinoi, along with many drinking vessels, such as cups and kotylai. A few larger containers served as storage vessels for supplies. Though no cooking pots were found, the quantity of shapes for mixing and drinking might be linked to feasting activities (Dietler 2011), including ritual drinking after the sacrificial ceremonies.
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In addition to the pottery, the same deposit comprises eighty-six fragments of different types of votives. The largest group are terracotta objects, while other artefacts made of metal, amber, stone or ivory/bone are represented in smaller quantities.

Among the bulk of terracotta fragments, the most important category consists of sixty bulls and bovine animals of the Geometric and early Archaic periods (La Genière 1996, 264, fig. 2; 1998, 237, 258, pl. 2.1; Dewailly 2001, 368, 370, fig. 4). Other animals, such as four horses and two birds, are rare and this also holds true for the four fragments of human figurines (La Genière 1998, 238, pl. 2.2; Dewailly 2001, 368, 371, fig. 5). Only one fragment of a male rider, one male head (La Genière 1996, 264, fig. 3) and two more fragments of male legs are attested. For the popular terracotta chariots, two wheels serve as evidence (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, pl. 25.2).

The range of terracotta figurines finds many parallels in other Greek sanctuaries from the east Aegean islands and the coastline of Asia Minor, such as the Heraion on Samos (Jarosch 1994, pl. 1, no. 371, pl. 5), but also in other parts of the Greek mainland, such as Olympia (Heilmeyer 1972). As the same types of offerings were widely distributed across the Mediterranean, it has been argued that there is no link between the dedicated object and receiving deity (Simon 1986, 419). The idea that the bulls and bovine animal figurines can be considered as an indicator of the ‘real’ sacrificial animal, even divided by typical sexual characteristics (male animals as gifts for gods, female sacrificial animals for goddesses) today finds wide acceptance. These small-scale models, produced in local clay or in metal, might have served as a substitute in ritual (Alroth 1988, 203). Without any doubt, horses were highly precious and associated with the ideals of ancient Greek aristocracy. Their role as sacrificial animals was minor and, therefore, it appears that horse figurines, as well as rider figurines and chariots (Heilmeyer 1981), represent this aristocratic lifestyle. Evidence for an equivalent chariot figurine in bronze is attested by one single fragment of one bronze wheel.

When taking into account all votives from the deposit, the low number of metal finds is striking; metallic votives comprise in total only twelve bronze and iron fragments of jewellery, dress ornaments, vessels, a small bronze wheel and a single arrow head (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 116, fig. 36). Rare exceptions of higher material value are the silver vessel attachment shaped as a falcon’s head (La Genière and Jolivet 2003, 116, fig. 36.4), and a bronze amulet decorated with gold representing Sobek, the Egyptian crocodile god (Museum Selcuk, no. 11/74/92; La Genière 1998, 389, 397, fig. C1–2; Jolivet and Robert 2003, 105, pl. 26.2) (Fig. 3). The god appears here in the form of a standing, crocodile-headed man wearing a plumed headdress with a horned sun disc. At the back of the head is a loop for suspension so that the small statuette could be worn as an amulet. The base of the statuette is missing. The deliberate damage of (bronze) votives is well attested in Greek sanctuaries (Linders 1989–90; Frielinghaus 2006; Lindenlauf 2006; Kyrieleis 2006, 97), and it is likely that the Sobek statuette and its base were deliberately detached from each other at a certain point in time; the statuette might represent a pars pro toto of an item that was dedicated as fully intact, but was deliberately damaged during the process of (re-)depositing.
The amulet is of high quality, and a unique find among known *aegyptiaca* that have been found in East Greek sanctuaries. Only one other comparable bronze amulet, in this case resembling the god Atum, is known from excavations at Enkomi on Cyprus and today kept in the Louvre (Caubet, Karageorghis and Yon 1981, pl. 82; Caubet, Hermary and Karageorghis 1992, pl. 82). The amulet found at Enkomi is classified as an ‘*amulette égyptisante*’, and, owing to the manufacturing technique of bronze decorated with gold (‘*bronze damasquinée*’), is attributed to the production of Levantine artisans in the Nile Valley of Dynasty 21. The same attribution and dating may hold true for the Sobek amulet as well. There are multiple possible ways in which objects such as the Sobek amulet came into wider circulation in the Mediterranean networks, including redistribution through looting, gift exchange and trade (Villing 2017, 567–74). Therefore, the circumstances under which the Sobek amulet was dedicated at Klaros will remain unknown. However, the Sobek amulet is the only example of *aegyptiaca* found so far in Klaros, and, along with the single find of a seal of the ‘lyre-player group’ and a Lydian electrum coin (Şahin and Debord 2011, pl. 6, 2–3), reflects on a small scale the integration of Klaros in the broader cultural networks of the Mediterranean. In a recent study on cultural contacts and cultural exchange, Christoph Ulf has discussed various forms of contact zones and forms of receptivity by providing many examples from the Greek world (Ulf 2009, 105–15). The role of Greek sanctuaries in the eastern Aegean as zones of contact is widely accepted among scholars. Yet the appearance of votives from a number of different, faraway areas, such as Egypt, Babylonia or Assyria, cannot be seen as an exclusive marker for the regional and supra-regional significance of a sanctuary. Ionian city sanctuaries, such as the Hera sanctuary on Samos, have produced rich evidence for ‘exotic’ votives in the 8th and 7th centuries BC (Ebbinghaus 2006; Kyrieleis 2009), in particular Phoenician, Egyptian and Cypriot items, equally high in number.
as, and of comparable range to, those at the Panhellenic shrines in the 8th century BC. The pattern of dedications is not yet fully understood, and it is, as Catherine Morgan has pointed out, essential 'to trace from case to case the place and mode of production of each category of votive' (Morgan 1993, 24). In many cases, including Klaros, scientific analyses of the material remains in general, and in particular of the pottery and terracotta figurines, is still open to research. Other factors, such as 'the nature of the dedicators, including their social position and relationship to the communities in power over the sanctuaries' (Morgan 1993, 24), as well as geopolitical factors and local political circumstances, are hard to assess from material culture alone.

Whether it was Greeks or non-Greeks who dedicated such foreign items or objects modelled on foreign prototypes is in many ways of secondary importance. Much of the wealth invested in Ionian sanctuaries, including the precious exotic votives, was won via trade and piracy, for which the eastern Aegean was renowned. The role of Greeks, in particular Ionians, as trading partners, pirates, and mercenaries is prominently attested by Herodotus (Herodotus 2, 152–54), but the archaeological evidence is patchy. Increasing trade with Egypt in the late 7th century BC led to the foundation of the trading settlement of Naukratis in the Nile Delta with the involvement of Miletos and Samos together with other Greek cities, where the Samians established a branch of the Heraion and the Milesians established a sanctuary of Apollo (Herodotus 2, 178; cf. Möller 2000, 94–99, 101, 176–77; Villing et al. 2013–19). The production, distribution and consumption of aegyptiaca in the eastern Aegean is part of a bigger picture of trade and interaction in the Mediterranean world, which operated not only via direct contact with Egypt but involved various agents, including Phoenicians and also East Greeks in and across partly overlapping networks (Villing 2017, 567–69). Kolophon was renowned in antiquity for its powerful cavalry (Polyaenus, Strategemata 7, 2, 2; Strabo 14, 1, 28) and some members of these elite soldiers – stemming from a variety of family backgrounds (Vittmann 2003, 197–203; Agut-Labordère 2012) – served the Egyptian pharaohs of Dynasty 26 as mercenaries. A graffito on one of the legs of the colossal rock-cut statues at Abu Simbel mentions, among the inscriptions left by other Greek soldiers from Rhodes and Ionia, a certain Pa(m)bis the Kolophonian, who visited the temple during his service for Psamtek II (Jeffrey 1990, 340–44; Möller 2000, 166–70; Wachter 2001, 214–19, esp. 215 and 218). It cannot be judged to what extent these mercenaries or any other agents in the Mediterranean networks gained knowledge and understanding of Egyptian culture and adopted it for their own identities. But epigraphic evidence proves in two cases at least that individuals returning home from Egypt made dedications of Egyptian-style block sculptures in East Greek sanctuaries. The first one is that of a certain Pedon, who probably spent his career under Psamtek I. Near Priene, Pedon dedicated an Egyptian block statue of basalt representing him as an Egyptian and bearing a Greek votive inscription of biographical character (Masson and Yoyotte 1988; Ampolo and Bresciani 1988; Pernigotti 1999, 90–93; Kyrieleis 1996, 109–10; Haider 2001, 200–1; Vittmann 2003, 203–6; Parlasca 2004, 3–4, pl. 1b; SEG 54, 2004, 695, no. 1884; Agut-Labordère 2012; Schulz 2012, 5; Keesling 2017, 116–17 fig. 34). The second case is that of an Egyptian basalt statue with a Greek inscription, representing Smyrdes as a seated official of the mid-6th century BC, which was found in the Athena sanctuary at Kamiros on Rhodes (Jacopi 1932, 287–88 no. 1, fig. 11; Kourou 2004). A further Egyptian stone figure with Greek inscription dedicated by the same individual, Smyrdes, is known from the sanctuary of Zeus Atabyrios on Rhodes (Kourou 2004). Dedications like these three small stone figures are special cases that should not conceal the fact that the bulk of the Egyptian and Egyptianising
items in the Eastern Greek sanctuaries were smaller finds, such as faience amulets, scarabs or fragments of alabaster vessels (Webb 1978; 2016). From the Klaros deposits no faience finds are attested so far, but this may be due to the fragile character of the material itself, which would not survive in the soil layers of Klaros containing ground water.

It has been observed so far that most of these items were found in sanctuaries of goddesses (e.g. the Athena sanctuary at Lindos on Rhodes: Blinkenberg 1931, and the Aphrodite sanctuary on Zeytintep at Miletos: Hölbl 2014a). However, this observation clouds to a certain extent the fact that in many sanctuaries of male gods in the eastern Aegean, a high number of imported items from different areas, including imports from Egypt and their imitations, are as regularly attested as in other sanctuaries of the Greek world in the 8th–6th centuries BC. This fact can be highlighted by various examples provided by the material records of the Idaean cave of Zeus on Crete (Matthäus 2000) or the Apollo sanctuary at Emeçik, near Knidos (Berges and Tuna 2000, 203–04, fig. 16). For Ionia, this is evidenced by finds from the Apollo sanctuary at Kato Phana (Kourouniotes 1915, 79, fig. 15; 1916, 207, fig. 27.1–4; Lamb 1934/35, 155–56, 163–64, pls 32, 37–74) as well as the so-called ‘harbour sanctuary’ at Emporio, both on the island of Chios (Boardman 1967, 241–42, figs 579–84, 586–87, 590–95). Recent investigations have also produced the first, rich evidence for the sanctuary of Didyma, the famous oracular shrine of Apollo. The sanctuary’s international connections in the Archaic period are well attested in the literary sources, including the dedication by Pharaoh Nekau of his linen garment after his victory at Meggido, c. 609 BC (Herodotus 2, 159), but the archaeological evidence was absent for a long time. Helga Bumke has now pointed out that a series of imports from Egypt were recorded in the excavation diaries of H. Knackfuss. In the year 1911, Knackfuss examined the southwest area next to the Apollo temple, where he found several faience amulets, faience vessels, alabaster fragments, and a rare Egyptian bronze statuette of Bes (Bumke 2002). More evidence of imported small finds from Egypt have emerged during new excavations on ‘Taxiarchis’, a small hill located 200m northwest of the Apollo temple of Didyma. All finds here were deposited in an ash layer, mixed with pottery and other fragments of votive offerings. No associated architectural structure was found. For this reason, the interpretation of this deposit is challenging and offers more questions than possible answers at the moment (Bumke 2008, 87–104).

Bronze imports from Egypt, such as the Bes statuette at Didyma, or the Sobek amulet at Klaros, are attested on Samos in larger quantities (cf. Jantzen 1972; Bumke 2012). These particular bronze artefacts are all related to the Egyptian ritual sphere. Their presence in the Greek sanctuaries, among the imagery of the Greek gods to which they were dedicated, requires explanation. Günther Hölbl suggests that there was a certain correlation between the original Egyptian meanings of these objects and their reception in Greek cult (Hölbl 2014b). As the god of water and vegetation, Sobek was worshipped as a fertility god (Kockelmann 2017, 132–55); to some extent, this might fit Apollo as well, but fertility is not one of his major attributes. Relating Sobek as a god of water with the mantic aspects of Apollo is tempting, but the oracle at Klaros is not attested before the Hellenistic period (Buresch 1889, 32; Merkelbach 1996; Talamo 2003; Busine 2014; Moretti et al. 2014, 49), and even the existence of a sacred spring, mentioned in later literary sources, is not secure. A further, more plausible interpretation of the presence of a Sobek amulet at Klaros can be argued from the complex religious connections that aligned Sobek with Horus, who was identified in the interpretatio graeca as Apollo (Kockelmann 2017, 86, fn. 210). Nonetheless, it has to be taken into account that at Klaros, as in most of the Ionian Apollo

sanctuaries, Artemis was also worshipped – a further possible recipient for gifts of this kind. The only clear fact that can be stated about the Sobek amulet is that the character of the item itself shifted its meaning through the act of dedication from an amulet with apotropaic character to a votive offering.

During the 6th century BC, the sanctuary at Klaros underwent fundamental architectural changes and saw the simultaneous building of the Archaic marble temple of Apollo (Şahin and Debord 2011, 174–75; Moretti 2011, 299–301; Moretti 2014, 34) and the neighbouring, but much smaller, temple and altar of Artemis (Sezgin 2008; Dewailly 2014, 87 with different dating). From the beginning of this period, the range of votive offerings experienced a shift; terracotta figurines remained the most popular dedications, while other types of small finds almost completely disappeared. Furthermore, the first monumental votives, korai and kouroi, but mostly kouroi, were erected. Concerning the dominant group of terracottas, which are outnumbered only by the ubiquitous pottery, it has to be stressed that from the last quarter of the 6th century until the late 4th century BC, human terracotta figurines were dedicated almost exclusively (Fig. 4). Around 400 figurines are recorded in total, and around 300 figurines represent the same type (Dewailly 2000, 343): a standing male figure draped in himation, with or without a musical instrument in his left hand. In total, four variants can be distinguished (Dewailly 2001, 372, fig. 6, 373, fig. 7). The largest group in terms of quantity of specimens is represented by two variants of figurines of a young man, dressed in a long chiton and himation with a tortoiseshell lyre (Dewailly 2000,
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Terracotta figurines of young men with himation and lyre or kithara are not numerous among the terracotta figurines from Ionia and east Doric sanctuaries or anywhere else in the Greek world. Solitary comparable figurines, with himation and tortoiseshell lyre, are known from the bothros in Theangela (Işik 1980, 197 nos 43–44, pl. 7 with fn. 631 and references for a few more, but differing, pieces from Lindos, Kos and Halikarnassos). The same holds true for the later type with himation and kithara (and polos) (Theangela: Işik 1980, 198; Athena sanctuary of Lindos: Blinkenberg 1931, nos 2917–19).

It is not possible to determine whether these figures represent the god Apollo or his worshippers, reflecting Apollonian ideals. It is, however, of importance that these stereotypical figurines were ritual markers representing a feature that was significant for Klaros and therefore frequently repeated. As far as we can tell at this point, there are no comparable types of male terracotta figurines with lyre or kithara, as found in Klaros, in any other of the Ionia Apollo sanctuaries. This raises the question of whether these male terracotta figurines were produced mainly for the Klarian sanctuary, but there is currently no evidence for a workshop, either at the sanctuary or at the polis of Kolophon. The biggest concentration of c. 250 figurines from the 6th and 5th centuries BC at Klaros was found in a layer together with ash and animal bones, next to the western side of the rectangular altar (Dewailly 2000, 343), while some sixty further figurines were found deposited separately in a small pit east of the foundations of the later Hellenistic–Roman altar (Dewailly 2000, 345) (Fig. 4).

Because of the high concentration of finds in more or less the same area, it can be assumed that most terracotta figures were originally placed in the vicinity of the rectangular altar as the centre of ritual activity. Comparable accumulations of terracottas in an altar district are well-known for Hagia Irini on Cyprus (Gjerstadt 1935, 799 fig. 277) and the Heraion of Samos (Jarosch 1994, 1). In rare cases, there is even evidence of figurines placed on the altar itself (cf. Kommos, altar c: Alroth 1988, 202). A further example comes from Klaros, where a male figurine was standing in situ on the krepis of the rectangular altar (La Genière 1998, figs 5–6, pl. 3); more figurines may have stood on the krepis of the altar. It can be concluded that the offering of a terracotta figurine involved a procedure that was complementary to the sacrificial ceremonies and was integrated in ritual. The spatial proximity of the accumulated figurines to the altar (Alroth 1988, 202–03), which must have significantly impeded the sacrifices, hardly finds any other explanation.

Concerning the spatial organisation of the temenos, it is interesting to note that the male terracotta figurines were found exclusively next to the altar and in the area which is dedicated to Apollo, as opposed to the female terracotta figurines that were exclusively deposited in the vicinity of Artemis. The female figurines are not as numerous as the male figurines for Apollo, but display a greater diversity of types (Dewailly 2000, 344–45, figs 243–45; 2001, 375–76, figs 8–9; 2014, 85, fig. 1; 91–93, figs 9–11). Whereas no male terracotta figurine is recorded after the late 5th/beginning of the 4th century BC, dedications of female figurines continued at the Artemis temenos until the Hellenistic period (Dewailly 2001, 378–80, figs 10–12; 2014, 94–98). Pits in which both male and female figurines were deposited together are not known yet.

Gender segregation can also be observed for the erection of votive statues. In his first year

as priest, Timonax made a twin dedication to Apollo and Artemis: for Apollo, he dedicated a kouros (Pécasse 2004, 47–55 no. 5, pl. 8 no. 1, 9 no. 1, 10 nos 1–2), and as a counterpart, a kore for Artemis (Pécasse 2004, 21–25 no. 1, pl. 1 nos 1–2). The maiden statue for Artemis was found next to the Archaic altar of the goddess; the original position of the kouros is not known, but it can be assumed – according to the position of the kore – that it was originally located next to the altar of Apollo. This kouros, and four other kouroi, which are only preserved in fragments, seem to have been significant for the sanctuary in many respects. They were kept over centuries and were re-erected in the late Hellenistic period among the honorific monuments for local and Roman magistrates, and for the governors of the newly established province of Asia (Ferrary and Verger 1999, 826; Dewailly and Verger 2004, 18–19, fig. 18; Bumke 2009; Kowalleck 2014; Ferrary 2014, 191–92) (Fig. 5). From the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods onwards, Klaros tried to establish itself as an oracle in competition with Didyma (Chaniotis 1997), the most prominent oracle site of Asia Minor (Tuchelt 1970; Günther 1971; Parke 1985, 1–111; Fontenrose 1988). This implies not only changes in the organisational structure of the sanctuary, but also a substantial shift in the ritual offering practice that had stayed almost unchanged over centuries. This remains a topic for further research.

Conclusion

In conclusion, with four successive altars and linked votive deposits, the finds from the altar zone of the Apollo sanctuary at Klaros form the most coherent archaeological evidence published
so far for ritual offering practice in the pre-Hellenistic period in Ionia. Through their precise archaeological contexts, the objects from Klaros provide useful information for considering their role in ritual through different periods, and may shed light on other not so well understood sanctuaries of Apollo in Ionia. The main aim of this article was, therefore, to compile a data set of the respective Klarian deposits and finds from numerous excavation reports and monographs in order to provide information about the overall quantities and distribution of votive types through different periods according to their archaeological context. Comparisons with the other four excavated Ionian Apollo sanctuaries prove challenging, as the surviving material evidence is random and forms only a small and partial sample of the original range of votives, which may differ substantially from sanctuary to sanctuary in proportion and availability. This difficulty is compounded by the incomplete publication of the excavated finds. This is the case for the data from Phanai, Miletos and Didyma. In particular at Didyma, the most important oracular sanctuary in western Asia Minor, the published evidence provides only selective coverage of the finds, governed principally by considerations of artistic and architectural quality rather than by concern for the whole assemblage. Because of the potential gaps, comparing absolute numbers is not possible. Instead, I focused on the individual site of Klaros and highlighted parallels from other Apollo sanctuaries. The aim was to gain an idea about the nature of the total assemblage and find out whether a specific pattern of dedications could be detected.

The wide distribution of similar votive types in Greek sanctuaries across the Mediterranean seems to contradict the view that there is a link between the offering and receiving deity (Simon 1986). However, besides many similarities in the ritual practice and choice of votive types that the Apollo sanctuary at Klaros had in common with the East Greek city sanctuaries and other shrines across the Mediterranean, the material evidence from Klaros demonstrates specific local aspects and patterns of dedications, including a link with the Dorian/Carian region, from the 6th century BC onwards. This applies in particular to the unparalleled high concentration of male terracotta figurines with chiton, himation and lyre or, later on, kithara that were dedicated and deposited in the vicinity of the rectangular altar. Their small size allowed dedicators to carry them in one hand. The iconography of these terracotta figures resembles that of the god Apollo, but it is not clear whether the terracotta figurines represent the god or his worshippers. According to the available data, no other Ionian or east Dorian sanctuary of Apollo has yielded comparable terracotta figurines in such high quantities. As ritual markers reflecting a feature that was of particular significance for Klaros, the figurines were necessarily stereotypical and repetitive, and stayed unchanged in type from the 6th to the 4th century BC. Even later on, the same feature is reflected again in the Hellenistic cult statue of Apollo as *kitharodos*.

The Klarian sanctuary not only provides insights into the characteristic votive offerings for Apollo over centuries, but also – in direct comparison – for his cult companion Artemis who was worshipped simultaneously in the same sanctuary, albeit in a separate temenos. It is interesting to note that from the 6th to the 4th century BC female terracotta figurines are the most popular votive offering for Artemis as well, but they are not as numerous as the male figurines for Apollo and they display a greater diversity of types. The dedication of diversified types may indicate a wider range of concerns, especially with regard to roles of the ‘female’ world.

Concerning the spatial organisation of the temenos and the placement of votives, strict gender segregation can be observed as well: kouroi and male terracotta figurines are limited to the sector of Apollo, while korai and female terracotta figurines were exclusively deposited in the vicinity of
Artemis. Deposits with female and male figurines or statues deposited together are not known yet. While terracotta figurines continued to be the primary gift for Artemis until the Hellenistic period, the dedication of the male figurines seems to have diminished already in the late Classical period, when the building of the new oracular temple was begun.

Finally, a word of caution: even the compiled evidence from Klaros, after three decades of intense fieldwork in a spatially limited area such as the altar zone, represents only a small and partial sample of data that is liable to change, and future finds could alter the conclusions I have drawn here. Though methodologically challenging, quantitative analyses may offer a path for determining specific dedicatory patterns, and assist with the difficult interpretation of the existing data on votive offerings. For Klaros, new insights into the ritual dynamics are to be expected from the publication of the excavations south of the altar of Apollo and the investigations of the Archaic temple of Apollo, of which a number of highly promising aspects, including new votive material, has been recently published in two separate preliminary reports (Şahin 2014; Moretti 2014).
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