

Zeuxias' Monetary Deposits at the Sanctuary of Olympia

[AXON 461]

Jeremy Pacheco Ascuy
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Abstract This bronze plaque, found in 1879, contains two monetary deposits made by an individual named Zeuxias at the sanctuary of Olympia in the second half of the fifth century BC. It constitutes one of the few preserved documents of this type, making it a valuable testimony of banking activities at Panhellenic sanctuaries. Due to the fragmentary status of the text, a comparison with other analogous inscriptions and literary testimonies is here offered, with the aim of casting some light on the reason behind the deposit, and the formulaic language used.

Keywords Olympia. Greek sanctuaries. Ancient Greek economy. Banking. Monetary deposits.



Peer review

Submitted 2024-06-03
Accepted 2024-09-01
Published 2024-11-04

Open access

© 2024 Pacheco Ascuy |  4.0



Citation Pacheco Ascuy, J. (2024). "Zeuxias' Monetary Deposits at the Sanctuary of Olympia". *Axon*, 8, [1-18].

Object type Tablet; bronze, gilded; 10 × 5 × 0,2 cm. Fragmentary, intact on the upper and lower sides; the upper left corner and the right side are lost; the lower left corner is fully preserved. All along the rear side there are geometrical ornaments. Traces of a hole for a hanging nail can be seen on the upper left side, interpreted by Dittenberger as a trace of the tablet's primary use as a tripod ornament.

Chronology Ca. 450/449-ca. 425/424 BC

Type of inscription Inventory (?).

Findspot and circumstances Found west of the south-west corner of the Echo Stoa. Greece, Elis, Olympia, on 12th March 1879.

Preservation place Greece, Olimpia, Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Ολυμπίας, inv. no. 569.

Script

- Structure: prose.
- Layout: the text does not have interpunction signs and the letters mostly present an irregular ductus.
- Execution technique: engraved, deeply engraved.
- Alphabet colour: red.
- Regional alphabet: Elis.
- Special letters: *A alpha*; *F digamma*; *I zeta*; + *ksi*; *Ϟ rho*; *Ϸ sigma* always sinistrorsum; *V ypsilon*.
- Letter size: 0.5-0.8 cm.
- Arrangement: left-to-right.

Language North-Western Greek (Elis)

l. 4 F[ικατι] = att. εἴκοσι.

Lemma Kirchhoff 1879, 159, no. 307, with facs. of A. Furtwängler; Daniel 1881, 256, no. 6 [Roehl 1883, 32 no. 11; *SGDI* I.4a no. 1162; *LSAG* 219, 221 no. 18, 408, pl. 43; van Effenterre, Ruzé, *Nomima* II no. 160; *SEG* XLV, 2264]; **Minon, I.dial. éléennes I no. 21, pl. XVIII**. Cf. Meister 1889, 27-8; Roehl 1907; *SEG* XLV, 2264; Roehl, *IGA*; *I.Olympia*.

Text

[Z]ευξίαι κα' τὸν π[όλεμον?] -- -[τετ-]
[α]ράκοντα κέκατ[ὸν] δαρχμάς] -- -.
Zeuxia[i] κα' τὸν π[όλεμον?] -- -[τ-]
ρεῖς μᾶς καὶ F[ικατι] δαρχμάς] -- -.

Apparatus 1 [Z]ευξίαι ed. pr. | κατὸν π[όλεμον] Meister | [παρακατέθεμεν] Meister | [παρελάβομεν] || 1-2 [τετ/α]ράκοντα Meister | [τετ/α]ράκοντα | [τεσσ/α]ράκοντα κήκατ[ὸν] ed. pr., Roehl | [τεσσ/α ?]ράκοντα κήκατ[ὸν] δαρχμάς] Blass | [τεσσ/α]

ῥάκοντα κέκατ[ὸν] Jeffery || 3-4 [τέσσα]/ρες or [τ]/ρῆς ed. pr. | [τ]/ρῆς Meister, Jeffery | [τέτο]/ρες Blass | Φί[κατι δαρχμάς ?] ed. pr., Blass | Φί[κατι -] or Φ[εξήκοντα δαρχμάς ?] Roehl.

Translation In favor of Zeuxias during [wartime?], one hundred and forty [drachmae]. In favor of Zeuxias during [wartime?], three minae and twenty [drachmae].

Links

Digital edition of IvO's reading on the Packard Humanities Institute site: <https://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/213818?&bookid=224&location=1690>.

Digital edition of Minon's reading on the Packard Humanities Institute site: <https://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/343702>.

Comment

1 The Inscription: Support, Text, and Context

The epigraphic corpus of the Panhellenic sanctuary of Olympia contains a wide variety of documents. It was one of the most important and far-reaching centres of the Greek cultural space, where the epigraphic habit was widespread.¹ Notably, a bronze plaque containing two monetary deposits made by an individual named Zeuxias towards the end of the fifth century BC is of interest for the economic involvement of the sanctuary. This document is unparalleled in the overall epigraphic documentation of the sanctuary, as no other similar texts have been found. The inscription was discovered to the west of the Echo Stoa by the German excavation team on the 12th of March 1879.² The preservation state of the inscription is precari-

¹ This contribution forms part of the i+D+I research project *Onomástica y contactos lingüísticos en griego antiguo* (PID2020-114162GB-I00), funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. This research has received the support of a fellowship from the “la Caixa” Foundation (ID 100010434), LCF/BQ/DR21/11880007. I would like to thank Paloma Guijarro Ruano and the two anonymous reviewers from Axon for their valuable comments and suggestions, which have improved the initial draft of this contribution. Any persisting errors are the sole responsibility of the author.

² The German excavations, led by the archaeologist Ernst Curtius and developed in six campaigns between 1875 and 1881, brought to light most of the epigraphic material of the sanctuary, published periodically in different issues of the German journal *Archäologische Zeitung* and later compiled in 1896 by Dittenberger and Purgold in *I.Olympia*. Archaeological practices in the sanctuary's site remained in German hands during the twentieth century, especially under the figures of Emil Künze and Alfred Mallwitz. Most of the inscriptions found after the publication of *I.Olympia* have been recently published by Siewert and Tauber (2013) in *I.Olympia Suppl*. Nevertheless, the epigraphic corpus of Olympia keeps on enriching thanks to the publication of new documents (cf. e.g. Hallof 2019; 2021; Siewert 2021). German excavations were not the first

ous; a little fragment on the upper left corner and the entirety of the right side are missing, resulting in the loss of the ending of the four lines of the inscription.

The inscription showcases an advanced (late) phase of the local Elean alphabet.³ Minon (*I.dial. éléennes*, 150) states that, out of the three distinctive signs present in the inscription, that is <α>, <μ> and <π>, all three of them show the most recent *ductus* (type 2).⁴ Following palaeographical criteria, Jeffery dates the inscription to 450-425 BC, accepted by Minon and adopted by us. It is, therefore, one of the last preserved inscriptions using the epichoric Elean alphabet, before the generalised use of the reformed alphabet of Milesian influence.⁵

Due to its fragmentary status, several restitutions have been proposed by modern scholars considering the nature of the text. First, Meister⁶ proposed the restitution of the substantive πόλεμον in the clause καὶ τὸν π[όλεμον] 'during the war' (ll. 1 and 3). He further suggests that the war referred to is the Peloponnesian War, which is a plausible hypothesis if the lower spectre of the dating of the inscription is accepted (ca. 425 BC), but in no case assured. Still at ll. 1 and 3 the sense of the sentence requires the restitution of a transitive verb to match the accusative plural μνᾶς 'minae'. Meister, in the light of the noun παρακαθήκᾱ (att.-ion. παρακαταθήκη) 'deposit' found in the contemporaneous deposits of Xouthias (cf. *infra*), suggests the verb παρακατέθεμεν 'we have relied [on deposit], we have deposited'.⁷ Al-

to have been carried in the site of Olympia. Several decades before, in 1829, in the context of the French scientific-military Expedition of Morée, Léon-Jean-Joseph Dubois and Abel Blouet carried out some excavations that resulted in the retrieval, among others, of the Temple of Olympian Zeus (cf. Blouet et al. 1831, 56-72).

3 For the list of the signs of the archaic Elean alphabet and their types according to their chronological evolution, see Jeffery 1961, 206; Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 276. The Elean alphabet is very similar to the alphabets of Arcadia and Laconia, from which it differs only in one and two signs respectively: from the first in the use of three-stroke <σ>, from the second in lunar <γ> and <φ> (cf. Jeffery 1961, 216-7). Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 274-9 establishes the chronology and the graphical types of the epichoric Elean alphabet, based on Jeffery 1961, 206.

4 Minon (*I.dial. éléennes*, 276) establishes nine distinctive signs: <α>, <ε>, <λ>, <μ>, <ν>, <π>, <ρ>, <υ> and <ψ> (phonetic value /k^h/ in 'red' alphabets). These nine signs are the most represented and whose *ductus* evolves over time, allowing the establishment of a relative chronology of Elean inscriptions.

5 The Milesian alphabet, adopted by Athens in 403/402 BC during Euclides' archonship, quickly expanded to most of the Greek regions and ended up imposing over the local varieties. In the particular case of Elis, traces of the influence of the Milesian alphabet are seen as early as the last quarter of the fifth century BC, culminating in the complete loss of local distinctive features mid-fourth century BC (cf. Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 255-73). The study of similar processes in the Peloponnese, especially in the Argolis, has been carried out exceptionally by Minon (2014).

6 Meister 1889, 27-8.

7 Minon (*I.dial. éléennes*, 151 fn. 677) rejects Meister's proposal because the verb *fait contresens*.

ternatively, Dittenberger⁸ proposes the form παρελάβομεν 'we have received'. Both [τετα]ράκοντα and [τεσα]ράκοντα (ll. 1-2) are valid for the restitution of the numeral 'forty', with the simple notation of the dental plosive or the geminate sibilant respectively.⁹ As for the remaining numeral, both [τ]ρῆς and [τέτο]ρες (l. 4) could be restored; Meister's reading [τ]ρῆς is accepted by Dittenberger and Purgold, while Blass, adducing spacing issues, defends the reading [τέτο]ρες. Finally, all editors agree in restituting δαρχμάς (instead of δραχμάς), as it is the attested variant in Elean,¹⁰ with vocalism -a- and progressive syllabification.¹¹

To determine the origin of the text, that is, which entity, private or official, it emanates from, due attention must be paid to several aspects: (1) the variety of the Greek alphabet used, (2) the support - the inscribed object itself - and (3) the dialectal features. The source of the document is not a negligible matter when dealing with the epigraphical corpus of a site of the likes of Olympia, a Panhellenic sanctuary frequented by Greeks coming from all over the Hellenic cultural world and beyond. All sorts of votive offerings, dedications and monuments were commissioned and set up by visitors of the sanctuary as a mean to display wealth, power and individual and community identity. As a result of the Panhellenic reach of Olympia, inscriptions exhibit a wide variety of epichoric alphabets and dialects, one of the mechanisms employed to highlight individuality and set up ethnic and communitarian boundaries vis-à-vis other visitors.¹² The use of foreign (non-Elean) epichoric alphabets and dialects coexists with the Elean alphabet and dialect, which is mainly used by the local administration of the sanctuary, structurally dependent on the city of Elis.¹³ Therefore, decrees, treaties, laws, agonistic regulations and other kinds of official documents issued by the city of Elis or the administration of the sanctuary are written, as expected, in the Elean alphabet and dialect. The use of the Elean alphabet reinforces the local character of the inscription and its status as an official document issued by the sanctuary's authorities. Regarding the official nature of the document, it is important to note a peculiarity of the text's sup-

8 *I.Olympia* 39.

9 See Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 152.

10 Cf. Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 3.

11 See Buck 1955, 45; Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 299-300.

12 This situation is observed in other panhellenic sanctuaries too, mainly Delphi, where inscriptions employing the alphabet and/or the dialect of the dedicator are abundant (cf. Jacquemin 1999). In some inscriptions of Olympia and Delphi even two alphabets and/or dialects are used in the same inscription. On 'digraphic' inscriptions see Buck 1913; Luraghi 2010, 77-86.

13 See Zoubaki 2001.

port itself: the bronze plaque contains geometrical patterns on the reverse side. This certifies its previous use as a metallic ornament, later repurposed for the inscription of the text.¹⁴ Indeed, our text is far from an isolated case, since several inscribed bronze plaques found at Olympia display the same 'recycling' situation: bronze pieces re-used as writing support for documents issued by the administration of the sanctuary. This typology is well represented by Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 3 (525-500 BC), Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 7 (500-475 BC), Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 9 (500-475 BC), Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 13 (ca. 475 BC), and the recently published law concerning the work of the soil (*BrU* no. 10 = Siewert 2021). This is the strongest evidence of its local character.

Regarding linguistic characterisation, the presence of dialectal features that can be attributed univocally to the Elean dialect or, in turn, to other dialectal varieties must be considered. The text contains a few relevant linguistic features, but none of them can be identified as exclusively Elean as opposed to the other Dorian dialects of the Peloponnese or NW dialects.¹⁵ A notable dialectal form is l. 4 $\text{ϕ}[\kappa\alpha\tau\iota]$ (att.-ion. εἴκοσι) 'twenty', which is common to Dorian dialects, Boeotian and Thessalian.¹⁶ It certainly preserves initial *wau* (noted with <ϕ>¹⁷ and presumably lacks word-ending Oriental assibilation -σι < -τι,¹⁸ even though it is deprived of probatory character due to its fragmentary status.¹⁸ Another linguistic specificity is found in $[\tau]\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ (τρεις), or $[\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron]\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, instead of the expected $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (< **trins*) or $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\varsigma$ (< **tetorŋs*): it is a case of the extension of the athematic ending from nominative plural to accusative plural, a widely attested phenomenon in early Elean inscriptions (cf. ὁμόσαντες Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 22; πλείονερ Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 34; ἄνδρες *BrU* no. 10 [= Siew-

14 These motifs are characteristic of the ornamented legs of tripod cauldrons of Olympia dating from the Late Geometric (ca. 700 BC). See Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 18 with references.

15 The Elean dialect has been a source of great controversy, already from antiquity, due to linguistic features hardly linkable to other dialectal varieties. This situation led to the consideration of the Eleans as βαρβαρόφωνοι, as illustrated by Hesychius (cf. s.v. "βαρβαρόφωνοι"): βαρβαρόφωνοι Ἠλεῖοι καὶ οἱ Κάρεις, ὡς τραχύφωνοι καὶ ἀσαφεῖ τὴν φωνὴν ἔχοντες 'speaking a barbarian tongue: the Eleans and the Carians, who have a rough and hardly intelligible speech'. From the dawn of Greek dialectological studies, the genetic classifications and dialectal position of Elean have been much-disputed subjects; see Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 283-5 for a summary of the different attempts of dialectal classification of the Elean dialect. Thanks to the work of Méndez Dosuna (1980; 1985, 306-27; 2007; 2014) and Minon (*I.dial. éléennes*, 283-598; 2014), we consider the Elean dialect as a Dorian dialect close to the Northwestern group, especially Locrian (cf. Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 626-30).

16 Buck 1955, 96.

17 Buck 1955, 47-8; Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 359-60.

18 Buck 1955, 57-8; Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 329.

ert 2021]).¹⁹ However, the extension of the ending from the nominative plural to the accusative is trivial and of little dialectal interest, as evidenced by Méndez Dosuna,²⁰ since it occurs in other ancient dialects and will eventually be generalised into the entire linguistic domain of Ancient Greek, including the development of Modern Greek. In any case, confusion between the nominative and accusative of the numeral 'three' occurred early on in other dialects just as it did in Elean.²¹ The accusative τρις is attested as nominative in Boeotian, Delphic, Heracleian and, perhaps, Attic;²² the nominative τρεῖς (< *τρεγες) was extended to accusative in standard Attic.²³ Lastly, the preservation of the second element of the long diphthong -αι in the dative Ζευξίαι is well attested in earlier and contemporary Elean inscriptions: τᾱρετᾱι (Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 19, 475-450 BC), τᾱι ζεκαμναῖαι (Minon, *I.dial. éléennes* no. 20, 475-450 BC). This speaks against the possibility of a Laconian redaction of the text since the monophthongisation of -αι resulting from the loss of the second element in absolute word ending (/a:/ < /a:j/) was already taking place at a very early date in Laconian.²⁴ The linguistic undifferentiation that hinders the accurate determination of the employed dialect as Elean also operates in reverse: there are no distinct traits of a potentially non-Elean dialect of the individual Zeuxias. With enough aspects pointing towards the official character of the text, it is now necessary to delve into the nature of such a unique type of document: monetary deposits.

2 The Nature of the Text: Monetary Deposits

Monetary deposits are a rare occurrence in the vast and typologically rich Greek epigraphic corpus, making our text and its scarce parallels very valuable sources of information. The most relevant comparand is the "bronze of Xouthias", a bronze plaque containing two deposits by an individual named Xouthias (Ξουθίας) at the Tegean

19 See Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 378.

20 Méndez Dosuna 1985, 465-72.

21 See Wackernagel 1903, 368; Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 378; and, especially, Méndez Dosuna 1985, 465.

22 See Schwyzler 1939, 589; Buck 1955, 114. It seems that in Attic an ancient nominative τρις too is attested in a decree (*IG I³* 232, 510-480 BC), resulting from the extension of the accusative to the nominative (cf. Threatte, *Grammar*, 416-7). If the form is correctly interpreted, both processes would be attested in Attic: nominative τρεῖς → accusative; accusative τρις → nominative.

23 See Schwyzler 1939, 589; Buck 1955, 114; Threatte, *Grammar*, 416-7.

24 See Striano Corrochano 1989, 61-2.

temple of Athena Alea.²⁵ The document is remarkably well preserved and serves as a comprehensive typological model for comparison with our text due to its substantial length. References to the bronze of Xouthias and commentaries of textual passages will be numerous throughout the upcoming discussion. Therefore, the complete text is offered hereunder, according to the edition of *IPArk* no.1:

Ξουθίαι τοῖ Φιλαχαιῶ διακάτι- αι μναί· : αἱ κ' αὐτὸς <i>λίκξ</i> , ἀνελέσ- θῶ : αἱ δέ κ' ἀποθάνει, τῶν τέκνων ἔμεν, :(?), ἐπεὶ κα πέντε φέτεα <i>λεβόντι</i> :(?), αἱ δέ κα με̄ γενεὰ λε- ίπεται, τῶν ἐπιδικατῶν ἔμεν· διαγνόμεν δέ : τὸς Τεγεάτα[ς] καὶ τὸν θεθμόν.	A.1
Ξουθίαι παρκαθέκα τοῖ Φιλαχα- ιῶ τετρακάτιαι μναί ἀργυρίῳ. εἰ μ- έν κα ζοῖ, αὐτὸς ἀνελέσθῳ· αἱ δέ κ- α με̄ ζοῖ, τοὶ υἱοὶ ἀνελόσθῳ τοὶ γνέ- σιοι, ἐπεὶ κα ἐβάσωντι πέντε φέτε- α· εἰ δέ κα με̄ ζῶντι, ταὶ θυγατέρες ἀνελόσθῳ ταὶ γνέσισαι· εἰ δέ κα με̄ ζῶντι, τοὶ νόθοι ἀνελόσθῳ· εἰ δέ κα με̄ νόθοι ζῶντι, τοὶ ἄσιστα πόθικ- ες ἀνελόσθῳ· εἰ δέ κ' ἀνφιλέγοντι, τ>- οὶ Τεγεᾶται διαγνόντῳ καὶ τὸν θεθμόν.	B.9 10 15 20

A In favour of Xouthias, son of Philachaios, two hundred minae. If he comes in person, let him withdraw it. If he were to die, let it belong to his children five years after they had attained puberty. If he were to leave no descendance, let it belong to those to whom property is adjudged. The Tegeans will decide according to the legislation.

B In favour of Xouthias, son of Philachaios, deposit of four hundred silver minae. If he is alive, he himself shall withdraw it. If he is not alive, his legitimate sons shall withdraw it, five years after they had attained puberty. If they were not alive, his legitimate daughters shall withdraw it. If they were not alive, his illegitimate sons shall withdraw it. If the illegitimate sons were not to be alive, the closest relatives shall withdraw it. If they

25 *IPArk* no. 1, Tegea, fifth century BC. The temple of Athena Alea seems to have functioned as a sort of bank or deposit of funds under Lacedaemonian control, according to Posidonius *apud* Ath. VI 233 (*FGrHist* 87, 48). See Bogaert 1968, 98-9.

answered back, the Tegeans shall decide according to the legislation.

Although there is a lack of epigraphical testimonies, it should not be overlooked that monetary deposits were a common practice in Greek sanctuaries. However, the lack of sources hinders the identification of a specific textual structure or formulae for deposits. Therefore, the understanding of this type of document relies not only on limited epigraphic sources but also on literary sources. In the first instance, it is important to note that, *contra* Jeffery,²⁶ we are not dealing with a war contribution. As already pointed out by Minon,²⁷ if the restitution κα' τὸν π[όλεμον] is accepted, it must be understood as a time complement introduced by the preposition κατ(ά) (cf. κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον 'during wartime' Hdt. 7.137). If it were a purpose complement, the expected syntagm would be ποτ'(ι) τὸν πόλεμον 'for the war', attested in a Laconian inscription that collects war donations and contributions.²⁸ In this regard, the dative singular of the personal name Ζευξίαι leaves little room for doubt as to his condition of recipient/beneficiary. However, it is unclear whether the recipient is the same individual who deposited the sum or if there is another party involved in the transaction.

The text does not explicitly state that the depositor was Zeuxias himself, "qui aurait mis ainsi une partie de sa fortune en sécurité", as worded by Minon.²⁹ To clarify this point, it is necessary to recall what is known about the role of sanctuaries in banking activity from epigraphical and literary sources. The bronze of Xouthias also contains the personal name Ξουθίαι in dative singular, leading van Effenterre and Ruzé³⁰ to postulate an ambiguity in the identity of the depositor. Looking at literary sources, we can refer to a text that sheds light, from a banker's perspective, on the procedure of monetary deposits made by an individual to be withdrawn by another person. The text in question is the *Contra Callippum* of Ps.-Demosthenes, where the following procedure is described (*C. Callippum* 4):

εἰώθασι δὲ πάντες οἱ τραπεζῖται, ὅταν τις ἀργύριον τιθεὶς ιδιώτης ἀποδοῦναί τῳ προστάτῃ, πρῶτον τοῦ θέντος τοῦνομα γράφειν καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦ ἀργυρίου, ἔπειτα παραγράφειν ἔφ' δεῖνι ἀποδοῦναι δεῖ, καὶ ἂν μὲν γιγνώσκωσι τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ἂν δέη ἀποδοῦναι, τοσοῦτο μόνον ποιεῖν, γράψαι ᾧ δεῖ ἀποδοῦναι,

²⁶ Jeffery 1961, 219.

²⁷ Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 152.

²⁸ *IG* V.1 1, 428-421 BC.

²⁹ Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 151.

³⁰ *Nomima* II, 216.

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ γιγνώσκωσι, καὶ τούτου τούνομα προσπαραγράφειν ὃς ἂν μέλλῃ συστήσειν καὶ δεῖξειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν ἂν δέῃ κομίσασθαι τὸ ἀργύριον.

It is the custom of all bankers, when a private person deposits money and directs that it be paid to a given person, to write down first the name of the person making the deposit and the amount deposited, and then to write on the margin “to be paid to so-and-so”; and if they know the face of the person to whom payment is to be made, they do merely this, write down whom they are to pay; but, if they do not know it, it is their custom to write on the margin the name also of him who is to introduce and point out the person who is to receive the money.³¹

Although transmitted as part of the Demosthenean corpus, the discourse is to be attributed certainly to the Acharnian orator Apollodorus,³² son of Pasion. Apollodorus' extensive knowledge of banking practices can be traced back to his father, Pasion, who was one of the most prominent bankers (τραπεζίτης) in Athens during the fourth century BC and one of the wealthiest men of his time.³³ Based on the available information, Pasion's bank operated with a high volume of clients and significant sums of money, constituting one of the axes of circulating capital. Apollodorus himself states in the *prolegomena* of the trial (*C. Callippum* 3) that Lycon of Heraclea was a customer of his father's bank (τῇ τραπεζῇ τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐχρήτη) and had deposited on it a sum of sixteen minae and forty drachmae to be paid to Cephisiades of Scyros, a partner of his. Thus, Apollodorus' first-hand account provides the most accurate and detailed source on private deposits and related banking practices.

The description of the procedure is straightforward, and divergences in the formula with Zeuxias' and Xouthias' deposits are immediately observed. In our inscription, rather succinct compared to Xouthias', the dative Ζευξιάι (*bis*) fulfils the role of the beneficiary/recipient of the deposit (τῷ δεῖνι). The deposited sum is also noted, in the first instance one hundred and forty drachmae and, in the second deposit, three minae and twenty drachmae. However, the name of the depositor is not specified, which, according to Apollodorus' account, would have appeared in the nominative case. Therefore, two possible explanations arise: (1) the depositor is another person, perhaps

³¹ English translation by A.T. Murray (1939).

³² See Trevett 1992.

³³ Erxleben 1973; Bogaert 1986.

a payer or a contractor, and their name has been omitted;³⁴ (2) the depositor and the recipient are the same person. In Xouthias' deposits, the text only mentions the name of the recipient in the dative and the deposited sum, without indicating the identity of the depositor: (l. 1) Ξουθίαι τῶι Φιλαχαΐῳ διακάτιαι μναῖ; (l. 9) Ξουθίαι παρκαθέκα τῶι Φιλαχαΐῳ τζετρακάτιαι μναῖ ἄργυρίῳ. In this regard, the absence of a patronymic or ethnic indication for the idionym Zeuxias is striking, as it would serve to better identify the individual at the moment of the withdrawal. The most economical explanation is to assume that Zeuxias was both the depositor and the recipient, as this aligns with what is known about depositary practices in sanctuaries. Sanctuaries offered moral and material security and were not involved in the circulation of capital, unlike private banks such as Pasion's. Instead, they limited themselves to the highly valued task of preservation. In most cases, individuals made deposits, whatever the reason, to withdraw them back after a set amount of time. Therefore, the same person plays both the depositor and recipient roles, and the formula differs from the one used for private banking monetary deposits. Once the nature of the text is clear, an already anticipated aspect must be comprehended: the role of the sanctuary as a guarantor in banking activities.

3 The Role of the Sanctuary as Guarantor

It was not uncommon for a sanctuary such as Olympia to be chosen as a secure location to deposit sums of money.³⁵ Sanctuaries, whether Panhellenic or not, played a key role in the economy of Ancient Greece by being involved in all sorts of banking activities, notably loans to both public entities and private individuals.³⁶ As for deposits, the earliest documented economic activity in Greek sanctuaries,³⁷ the situation is more convoluted.³⁸ Sanctuary deposits functioned differently than private banking deposits, as they were not used for capital circulation. Sanctuaries were chosen as guarantors due to the "mor-

³⁴ This possibility is considered, *dubitanter*, by van Effenterre and Ruzé (*Nomima* II, 216) for Xouthias' deposit based on the absence of a personal name in nominative.

³⁵ See Bogaert 1968, 281-8.

³⁶ Generally, see Bogaert 1968, 279-304; Linders 1992b; Chankowski 2005; 2007, 96-8. Among the sanctuaries that accepted deposits, the sacred bank of the Artemision of Ephesus was particularly renowned. It received a high volume of deposits and was deemed one of the safest banks by the ancient Greeks. See Bogaert 1968, 245-54 and the account of Dio Chrysostom (31.54-5). On the general aspects of banking in the Ancient Greek society, see Gabrielsen 2005; Schaps 2022.

³⁷ Bogaert 1968, 281.

³⁸ On sanctuary deposits see Bogaert 1968, 281-8; Sassu 2014.

al and material security” that they offered over the *polis*.³⁹ Moral because of the special status of sanctuaries in international conflicts and inter-state relations as an inviolable and ‘neutral’ entity; material because sanctuaries were known to have strong chambers and high-security areas where monetary sums and votive offerings were kept and guarded, such as the treasure chambers that hosted sums of money and votive offerings from different *poleis*.⁴⁰ There were, in addition, sanctuaries that only functioned as recipients and guarantors of deposits and *chremata*, without getting involved in other kinds of banking activities, as is the case of Olympia and Delphi.⁴¹ In fact, our text is the sole evidence of banking activity at the sanctuary of Olympia, where no other inscriptions related to this matter have been retrieved. This statement is also true for other Greek sanctuaries, where the lack of monetary deposit inscriptions is total. Therefore, due to the significant lack of supporting epigraphical evidence, a good part of our knowledge of private deposits in sanctuaries must be based on literary testimonies. Xenophon reports in *Anabasis* (5.3.6-7) the fate of the loot share taken in the incursion to Trapezous, which was to be consecrated to Apollo and Artemis:

τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἐφεσίας, ὅτ' ἀπήει σὺν Ἀγησιλάῳ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας τὴν εἰς Βοιωτοὺς ὁδόν, καταλείπει παρὰ Μεγαβύζῳ τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος νεωκόρῳ, ὅτι αὐτὸς κινδυνεύσων ἐδόκει ἰέναι, καὶ ἐπέστειλεν, ἦν μὲν αὐτὸς σωθῆναι, αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι· ἦν δέ τι πάθῃ, ἀναθεῖναι ποιησάμενον τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ὅ τι οἴοιτο χαριεῖσθαι τῇ θεῷ. ἐπειδὴ δ' ἔφευγεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, κατοικοῦντος ἤδη αὐτοῦ ἐν Σκιλλοῦντι ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἰκισθέντος παρὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν ἀφικνεῖται Μεγάβυζος εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν θεωρήσων καὶ ἀποδίδωσι τὴν παρακαταθήκην αὐτῷ.

The share which belonged to Artemis of the Ephesians he left behind, at the time when he was returning from Asia with Agesilaus to take part in the campaign against Boeotia, in charge of Megabyzus, the sacristan of Artemis, for the reason that his own journey seemed likely to be a dangerous one; and his instructions were that in case he should escape with his life, the money was

39 Bogaert 1968, 284.

40 In Delos, for example, the existence of a ‘sacred chest’ for sanctuary funds and a ‘public chest’ for public funds is well attested. See Hollinshead 1999, 208-10; Linders 1992a, 71.

41 See Chankowski 2005, 70-1. The sanctuary of Olympia was involved in other economic activities, mostly related to the administration of the sanctuary (see Taita 2014). On the financial activity at Delphi see Lefèvre 1998, 258-9; Picard 2005. A very fragmentary document dealing with the regulation of deposits and similar activities is preserved at Delphi (*CID* IV 2, ca. 380 B.C.; cf. Lefèvre 1994).

to be returned to him, but in case any ill should befall him, Megabyzus was to cause to be made and dedicated to Artemis whatever offering he thought would please the goddess. In the time of Xenophon's exile and while he was living at Scillus, near Olympia, where he had been established as a colonist by the Lacedaemonians, Megabyzus came to Olympia to attend the games and returned to him the deposit.⁴²

In addition to providing evidence for financial activity at the Artemision of Ephesus (cf. *supra*), Xenophon's account offers a valuable first-hand testimony of private deposits in sanctuaries. It serves as an exceptional parallel where the same individual acts as both the depositor and the recipient, the same situation that we postulate for Zeuxias' and Xouthias' deposits. Furthermore, it is of utmost relevance regarding the mechanisms that may eventually be activated in case of a problem at the time of the withdrawal. Contrary to what we would expect, these clauses are absent from Zeuxias' deposits but are extensively described in Xouthias' bronze. Regarding Xenophon's case, he only presents two possibilities when depositing the designated amount: if he is alive, the sum will be given back to him; instead, if he is unable to withdraw the money for any reason, it will be allocated to an offering to the goddess. On the other hand, Xouthias' deposits provide a much more comprehensive and relevant account of the legal aspects that could impact the withdrawal process (ll. 3-8):

αἱ κ' αὐτὸς ἥικῃ, ἀνελέσθῃ : αἱ δέ κ' ἀποθάνῃ, τὸν τέκνον ἔμην, :(?)
ἐπεὶ κα πέντε φέτεα ἡβῶντι :(?) αἱ δέ κα μὲ γενεᾷ λείπεται, τὸν
ἐπιδικατὸν ἔμην· διαγνόμεν δὲ : τῶς Τεγεάτα[ς] κα τὸν θεθμόν.

As we can see, the clauses established at the time when the deposit was made take into account the possibility that the recipient, Xouthias, could eventually die and be unable to withdraw the deposit. In such an event, legal ownership of the sum is assigned to his biological heirs or, if none exist, to designated legal heirs. It is interesting to note how the administration of the sanctuary of Athena Alea is under the jurisdiction of the *polis* of the Tegeans, as is the case of Olympia and Elis. Xouthias' bronze, exactly like Zeuxias', comprises a second deposit that was made at a later date. The legal clauses regarding the withdrawal process of the second deposit have substantially changed from the first deposit (ll. 10-20):

εἰ μὲν κα ζόῃ, αὐτὸς ἀνελέσθῃ· αἱ δέ κα μὲ ζόῃ, τοὶ υἱοὶ ἀνελόσθῃ τοὶ
γνῆσιοι, ἐπεὶ κα ἐβάσωντι πέντε φέτεα· εἰ δέ κα μὲ ζῶντι, ταὶ θυγατέρες

⁴² English translation by O.J. Todd (1922).

ἀνελόσθῳ ταὶ γνέσται· εἰ δέ κα μὲ ζῶντι, τοὶ νόθοι ἀνελόσθῳ· εἰ δέ κα μὲ νόθοι ζῶντι, τοὶ ῥ᾿ ἄσιστα πόθικες ἀνελόσθῳ· εἰ δέ κ' ἀνφιλέγοντι, τ>οὶ Τεγεᾶται διαγνόντῳ καὶ τὸν θεθμόν.

The differences in the formulation and eventual clauses regarding the right to deposit are significant. It is unclear whether these divergences are due to a general remake of the formula used in the sanctuary or a change in Xouthias' personal situation, which necessitated an update regarding the prior deposit. Did Xouthias' family increase, now also including daughters and illegitimate sons? Solid arguments supporting one option over the other are absent. Considering the significant amount of money deposited by Xouthias (four hundred minae), it is reasonable to assume that he had a large estate. Nevertheless, the clauses of this second deposit remain fundamentally unchanged from the first, indicating that its nature has not been altered. In Xenophon's case, the subsequent legal owner of the deposit is not mentioned since the deposit consisted of the tithe that was already to be consecrated to the divinity, whether by Xenophon himself or by the authorities of the sanctuary. Fortunately, Xenophon survived the Boeotian expedition and, after receiving the money back from Megabyzus, he bought land and built a shrine to Artemis, fulfilling the expected consecration to the goddess.⁴³

Regarding Zeuxias' deposits, at least a simple formula indicating the eventual line of legal owners of the deposit would have been expected. It is clear, without wishing to compare both individuals' wealth, that the sum deposited by Zeuxias at Olympia is substantially smaller than Xouthias' deposit of four hundred minae. Zeuxias' deposits may be intended to be short-term deposits of a moderate sum of money. This would account for the absence of legal clauses regarding the ownership of the deposit in case of Zeuxias' death, as the money was intended to be withdrawn shortly after the deposit was made. Xouthias' deposit would be, in turn, a long-term deposit, which requires a clear statement of said legal clauses. The hypothesis of a long-term deposit is supported by the fact that the second deposit (face B of the inscription) appears to replace the previous one, rendering it obsolete and resulting in the addition of a new, updated sum (200 minae) to the already deposited amount.⁴⁴ These clauses, as already pointed out by specialists,⁴⁵ are very similar to those found in testamentary documents, which could further explain their absence from Zeuxias' deposits and validate the short-term deposit hypothesis.

⁴³ Xen. *An.* 5 3.8-13.

⁴⁴ See *IPArk*, 6-11.

⁴⁵ Bogaert 1968, 98-9; van Effenterre, Ruzé, *Nomima* II, 216-18.

No additional information on Zeuxias is available.⁴⁶ The anthroponym Ζευξίας is a shortening with the suffix -ίας of a compound with a first element Ζευξί(ι)ο (Ζευξίππος *vel sim.*).⁴⁷ It is documented in Argolis (2×), Arcadia (3×) and Kamarina (1×; cf. *LGPN* III.A s.v. Ζευξίας). Zeuxias was likely an individual from the Peloponnese, for whom the sanctuary of Olympia represents a nearby landmark site.

In conclusion, Zeuxias' deposits serve as a testimony to the financial activity of Panhellenic sanctuaries. This is the only document of its kind preserved in the sanctuary of Olympia, confirming that its banking activities were limited to the safeguarding of monetary deposits and *chremata*. Our inscription is suitable for comparison with other important contemporary epigraphic records, notably Xouthias' deposits, and literary excerpts that describe the functioning of deposits. This comparison helps to identify the nature of Zeuxias' deposits' nature, which appear to be short-term deposits without testamentary clauses.

Bibliography

- Bechtel, *Personennamen*** = Bechtel, F. (1917). *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle. <https://archive.org/details/diehistorischenp00bechuoft>.
- CID IV** = Lefèvre, F. (2002). *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes IV. Documents amphictioniques. Avec une Note d'architecture par D. Laroche et de Notes d'onomastique par O. Masson*. Athènes; Paris.
- van Effenterre, Ruzé, *Nomima II*** = van Effenterre, H.; Ruzé, F. (1995). *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*, vol. II. Rome.
- FGrHist** = Jacoby, F. (Hrsg.) (1923-58). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, I-III C2. Berlin; Leiden.
- IG V.1** = Kolbe, W. (ed.) (1913). *Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol V, pars 1, Inscriptiones Laconiae et Messeniae*. Berlin.
- I.Olympia** = Dittenberger, W.; Purgold, K. (1896). *Die Inschriften von Olympia*. Berlin Olympia. *Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung* 5. <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/curtius1896a>.
- I.Olympia Suppl.** = Siewert, P.; Taeuber, H. (2013). *Neue Inschriften von Olympia. Die ab 1896 veröffentlichten Texte*. Wien. Tyche Sonderband 7. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/33871>.
- IPark** = Thür, G.; Taeuber, H. (1994). *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien (IPark)*. Wien. SB Akad. Wien 607.

⁴⁶ See Zoubaki 2005, 175.

⁴⁷ Cf. Minon, *I.dial. éléennes*, 151; Bechtel, *Personennamen*, 185 (Ζευξίας) and the online database *LGPN-Ling* s.v. "Ζευξίας" (<https://lgpn-ling.huma-num.fr/index.html?filter=ζευξιας&filterBy=name>).

- LGPN III.A** = Fraser, P.M.; Matthews, E. (1997). *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. 3, part A, *The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia*. Oxford.
- LSAG** = Jeffery, L.H. (1961). *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. A Study of the Origin of Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* Oxford.
- Minon, I.dial. éléennes I** = Minon, S. (2007). *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VIe-IIIe siècle avant J.-C.)*. Vol. I, *Textes*. Genève. Genève Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 38.
- Roehl, IGA** = Roehl, H. (1882). *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae praeter Atticas in Attica repertas*. Berolini. <https://archive.org/details/in-scriptionesgra00deut/mode/2up>.
- SGDI I.4a** = Blass, F. (ed.) (1884). *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. Bd. I, *Kypros. Aeolien. Thessalien. Böotien. Elis. Arkadien. Pamphylien*. 4. hft, *Die elischen inschriften (nos. 1147-1180)*. Göttingen. https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_oZRFAAAAMAAJ.
- Threatte, Grammar II** = Threatte, L.L. (1996). *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Vol. II, *Morphology*. Berlin; New York.
- Zoumbaki, Elis und Olympia** = Zoumbaki, S.B. (2001). *Elis und Olympia in der Kaiserzeit. Das Leben einer Gesellschaft zwischen Stadt und Heiligtum auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. Athens. Meletemata 32.
- Blouet, A.; Ravoisié, A.; Poirot, A.; Trezel, F.; De Gournay, F. (1831). *Expédition scientifique de Morée*, vol. I. Paris.
- Bogaert, R. (1968). *Banques et banquiers dans les cités grecques*. Leiden.
- Bogaert, R. (1986). "La banque à Athènes au IVe siècle avant J.-C. Etat de la question". *MH*, 43(1), 19-49.
- Buck, C.D. (1913). "The Interstate Use of the Greek Dialects". *CPh*, 8, 133-59.
- Buck, C.D. (1955). *The Greek Dialects. Grammar. Selected Inscriptions. Glossary*. Chicago.
- Chankowski, V. (2005). "Techniques financières, influences, performances dans les activités bancaires des sanctuaires grecs". *Topoi (Lyon)*, 12-13(1), 69-93.
- Chankowski, V. (2007). "Les places financières dans le monde grec classique et hellénistique des cités". *Pallas*, 74, 93-112.
- Daniel, C. (1881). "Die Inschriften des elischen Dialekts". Bezenberger, A. (Hrsg.), *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, VI*. Göttingen, 241-72. <https://archive.org/details/beitrgeszurkund06gtuoft>.
- Erleben, E. (1973). "Das Kapital der Bank des Pasion und das Privatvermögen des Trapeziten". *Klio*, 55, 117-34.
- Gabrielsen, V. (2005). "Banking and Credit Operations in Hellenistic Times". Archibald, Z.H.; Davies, J.K.; Gabrielsen, V. (eds), *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies, 323-31 BC*. Oxford, 136-64.
- Halof, K. (2019). "Alte und neue Inschriften aus Olympia II". *Chiron*, 49, 173-186.
- Halof, K. (2021). "Alte und neue Inschriften aus Olympia III". *Chiron*, 51, 99-122.
- Hollinshead, M.B. (1999). "'Adyton,' 'Opisthodomos,' and the Inner Room of the Greek Temple". *Hesperia*, 68(2), 189-218.
- Jacquemin, A. (1999). "Le rédacteur et le lapicide: 'Barbouillage dialectal' et repentirs dans les inscriptions de Delphes". Khoury, R.G. (Hrsg.), *Urkunden und Urkundenformulare im Klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen*. Heidelberg, 71-81.
- Kirchhoff, A. (1879). "Inschriften aus Olympia". *AZ*, 37, 153-64. (<https://archive.org/details/archaeologische37deut/mode/2up>).

- Lefèvre, F. (1994). "Un document amphictionique inédit du IV^e siècle". BCH, 118(1), 99-112.
- Lefèvre, F. (1998). *L'amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions*. Athens, Paris.
- Linders, T. (1992a). "The Delian Temple Accounts. Some Observations". OAth, 19, 69-73.
- Linders, T. (1992b). "Sacred Finances: Some Observations". Linders, T.; Alroth, B. (eds), *Economic of Cult in the Ancient Greek World, Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990*. Uppsala, 9-13.
- Luraghi, N. (2010). "The Local Scripts from Nature to Culture". ClAnt, 29(1), 68-91.
- Meister, R. (1889). *Die griechischen dialekte II*. Göttingen.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1980). "Clasificación dialectal y cronología relativa: el dialecto eleo". SPhS, 4, 181-201.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1985). *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*. Salamanca.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (2007). "The Doric Dialects". Christidis, A. Ph. (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, 444-59.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (2014). "Northwest Greek". Giannakis, G.K. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden, Boston, 518-24.
- Minon, S. (2013). "Les mutations des alphabets péloponnésiens au contact de l'alphabet attique ionisé (ca 450-350 av. J.-C.)". Minon, S. (éd.), *Diffusion de l'attique et expansion des koinai dans le Péloponnèse et en Grèce centrale*. Genève, 29-55.
- Minon, S. (2014). "Elean (and Olympia)". Giannakis, G.K. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden, Boston, 535-42.
- Picard, O. (2005). "Les XPHMATA d'Apollon et les débuts de la monnaie à Delphes". Topoi (Lyon), 12-13(1), 55-68.
- Roehl, H. (1883). *Imagines inscriptionum Graecarum antiquissimarum in usum scholarum*. Berolini. <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.9/517678>.
- Roehl, H. (1907). *Imagines inscriptionum Graecarum antiquissimarum in usum scholarum. Ed tertia*. Berolini. <https://archive.org/details/imaginesinscript00roeh>.
- Sassu, R. (2014). "Alcune osservazioni sui chremata preservati nei santuari greci di epoca arcaica e classica". Thiasos, 3(1), 3-15.
- Schaps, D.M. (2022). "Money, Credit, and Banking". von Reden, S. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Ancient Greek Economy*. Cambridge.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik. I, Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Siewert, P. (2021). "Spätarchaisches Gesetz über Landwirtschaft aus Olympia (BrU 10)". Tyche, 36, 149-162.
- Striano Corrochano, A. (1989). *El dialecto laconio. Gramática y estudio dialectal. Tesis doctoral inédita*. Madrid.
- Taita, J. (2014). "Quando Zeus deve far quadrare il bilancio. Osservazioni sul tesoro del santuario di Olimpia". Harter-Uibopuu, K.; Kruse, Th. (Hrsgg), *Sport und Recht in der Antike*. Wien, 107-45. Wiener Kolloquien zur Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 2. https://www.verlagholzhausen.at/fileadmin/buch.verlagholzhausen.at/Ebooks/PUB_203_Sport_und_Recht_in_der_Antike.pdf.
- Trevett, J. (1992). *Apollodoros the Son of Pasion*. Oxford.
- Wackernagel, J. (1903). "Zur griechischen Nominalflexion". IF, 14, 367-75.
- Zoumbaki, S.B. (Hrsg.) (2005). *Prosopographie der Eleer. Bis zum 1. Jh. v. Chr.* Athen. MEΛETHMATA 40.

