ANABASIS 5 (2014)

STUDIA CLASSICA ET ORIENTALIA

Marek Jan Olbrycht (Poland)

THE DIADEM IN THE ACHAEMENID AND HELLENISTIC PERIODS[1]

Keywords: diadem, Achaemenid iconography, Hellenistic royalty, Alexander III, royal attributes

The book under review is the proceedings volume of papers delivered at the 2009 Münster colloquium entitled *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher*. It comprises two parts: the first contains nine articles on potential pre-Hellenistic prototypes of the diadem; and the second part presents seven articles on the diadem as an attribute of power in the Hellenistic period. Terminological issues relating to diadems and functionally and/or formally analogous headbands are addressed in an introduction ('Einleitung'), which also gives an account of the research conducted on the subject hitherto. The term most frequently used in this volume (with most articles in German) is *Binde* ('headband'). The designation 'diadem' did not come into widespread use to denote headbands treated as an attribute of royal power until the Hellenistic period. This volume addresses an issue which is crucial for the understanding of the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods – attributes of royal power, the Achaemenid, Macedonian and Greek legacy, and the nature of royal power.

The milestone in research on the diadem is the work of H.-W. Ritter, encapsulated in his book *Diadem und Königsherrschaft* (1965). In a well-documented and balanced discourse Ritter argues that the origins of the Hellenistic diadem went back to Alexander's coronation attribute, which in turn had been adopted from the Achaemenids. A counterargument was put forward by R.R.R. Smith in

---

[1] This is a review article of: Achim Lichtenberger, Katharina Martin, H.-Helge Nieswandt, Dieter Salzmann (eds.), *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher. Übernahme, Transformation oder Neuschöpfung eines Herrschaftszeichens?* (Reihe *Euros*: Vol. 1), Bonn: Habelt-Verlag 2012; VIII, 468 pp., with numerous illustrations, ISBN 978-3-7749-3671-3.

Hellenistic Royal Portraits (1988, pp. 34–38), tracing the diadem back to the headband of Dionysios. However, Smith does not go into the origins of the diadem as extensively as Ritter, and his arguments are not so well backed up by documentary evidence. Another significant contribution to work on the origins of the diadem was made by A. Alföldi in the paper ʽDiadem und Kranz' (in Alföldi 1985, pp. 105–131), who sees it as going back to the headbands worn by contestants in the Greek agonistic games. Alföldi's standpoint is that Alexander was a champion of Hellenism ('Vorkämpfer des Hellenismus', p. 127) while subjugating Western Asia.

The first group of articles discusses the regalia used by the kings and princes of Western Asia prior to Alexander. The article by the archaeologist M. Novák (pp. 9–34) is the fundamental contribution here, showing the tradition of regalia in Mesopotamia, chiefly Assyria. The kings of Assyria wore diadems and tiaras reminiscent of the cylindrical *polos* crown (p. 22, ill. 15–16). In Assyria the diadem was given precedence over the tiara. Quite naturally, the Assyrian tradition had an impact on the royal attributes of the Medes and Persians.

A. von Lieven (pp. 35–54) argues that the headband used by the pharaohs of Egypt since the Old Kingdom had the function of a royal attribute. The headbands of Egyptian rulers were usually made of gold and decorated with the Uraeus. A gold headband of this type occasionally occurs in the Ptolemaic iconography instead of a typical diadem made of fabric.

The Achaemenid use of the diadem is a particularly controversial issue. J. Wiesehöfer (pp. 55–62) gives a brief analysis of the Persian diadem in the written sources. In Persia a diadem encircled the king's tall tiara (*tiara orthe*), while the "royal kindred" (*syngeneis*) also availed themselves of this attribute (*semeion*: Xen. *Kyr*. 8.3.13), but they were not permitted to wear the *tiara orthe*. The passage in Xenophon is probably the earliest Greek record of the diadem prior to Alexander. The tiara is often mentioned in the records on its own, and in the opinion of Wiesehöfer it was a more important attribute than the diadem (p. 56), which would run counter to the Assyrian tradition.

Nonetheless, the diadem appears to have been an important component of the Achaemenid regalia, usually worn in combination with tiaras. Curtius 6.6.4 claims that Alexander wore ʽa purple head-band interwoven with white, like the one Darius had once had, and he assumed Persian dress'. Achaemenid rulers used crowns of various types depending on the occasion. Similarly, in many of the medieval kingdoms a distinction was made between crowns worn at ceremonies of feudal homage and ancestral crowns. There could well have been analogous (and other) distinctions between the crowns used in Persia under the Achaemenids: since these monarchs had two different types of official robes, the Persian-Elamite apparel, and the Median costume, they must have had at least

two different types of tiaras, alongside their diadem.[2] The term *tiara* referred to several different types of royal crowns. Hekataios writes that *kyrbasia* is another term for the tiara, a kind of hat (*pilos*: *BNJ* 264 F18). Herodotos claims that the Persians go to battle wearing trousers and a *kyrbasia* hat (5.49). In another description he mentions Saka in pointed *kyrbasia* hats (7.64). Other records refer on many occasions to the *kyrbasia* as the Achaemenid crown. The conclusion to be drawn from all these references is that the *kyrbasia* was a soft hat, probably made of felt. In fact the king of Persia wore a specific type of *kyrbasia* – the stiffed *tiara orthe.*

Apart from the word *tiara* ancient authors also used the term *kidaris/kitaris* to denote the Achaemenid crown,[3] often in combination with the designation *orthe* ('upright').[4] Strabo (11.13.9) uses three different terms, *tiara, kitaris,* and *pilos*, for the Persian royal paraphernalia as adopted from the Medes, but he does not mention a diadem. Curtius (3.3.19) applies the phrase *cidaris regium insigne* for an atribute supplemented with a white and blue band. Herodotos (7.90.1) refers to the Cyprian crown as a *kitaris* worn with a band known as a *mitra*, but the term *kitaris* is actually emended.[5] In *Itin. Alex.* 64 and Hesychios s.v. *kitaris* this headdress is identified as the royal headgear. It was the American Orientalist Olmstead who pointed out that the term *kidaris*/*kitaris* derives from the Semitic languages including the Hebrew *keter*.[6] It seems that the Persian cylindrical crown (often topped with crenellations), known from the reliefs and coinage, should be identified as the *kidaris*/*kitaris*, and hence this is the type of crown referred to in the written records, contrary to the opinion of Wiesehöfer (pp. 59–60, following Tuplin 2007, 79f.).

H.-H. Nieswandt's article analyses the headbands/diadems on the satrapal coins of the Achaemenid period (pp. 63–159), presenting what is effectively a richly illustrated monograph. Nieswandt identifies 12 variants of the tiara and diadem on the coinage. The diadems on satrapal coins had fairly short headbands, unlike the diadems of Hellenistic rulers. Nieswandt indicates a portrayal on a mounted figure from Alexander's Sarcophagus as an early example of the use of the diadem in the Hellenistic age, and quite rightly observes that Alexander adopted the Persian diadem, endowing it with the status of a special royal attribute.[7]

[2] On the Median and Persian clothing, see Bittner 1987; Calmeyer 1988; Shahbazi 1992. On the Achaemenid tiaras, see Calmeyer 1976; 1993; Tuplin 2007.

[3] Ktesias 688 F 15(50); Curt. 3.3.19; Nik. Dam. 90 F 66(45).

[4] *Kidaris orthe*: Plut. *Artox*. 26, 28; *Mor*. 340C; *Them*. 29; Arr. *An*. 6.29.3.

[5] See the discussion in Ritter 1965, 170–172.

[6] Olmstead 1948, 282.

[7] Recently new studies have been published on the coinage in the Achaemenid empire, see, e.g., Bodzek 2011.

A. Lichtenberger's paper is an attempt to answer the key question whether the diadem was used in Macedonia prior to Alexander III. He is of the opinion that the late written sources on the diadem from the Roman period should be treated with caution – by analogy with the situation in art – due to their excessive dependence on contemporary developments. The caution is necessary, however, this is not a good analogy. Unlike the situation in the arts, in the tradition of the written records authors tended to reproduce earlier works, and usually the overlay of contemporary references is more readily identifiable. In the arts, apart from the copies of Hellenistic works, the tendency to represent attributes which were the most important and best known at the time was much stronger than in the historical writings. That is why a medallion from Tarsos dating back to the Roman period and showing Philip II in a diadem is of no use for a study on the Hellenistic period. The Romans considered the diadem an attribute across the board for Macedonian rulers, for instance Philip V and Antiochos III.

The passages quoted by Lichtenberger (Plut. *Ant*. 54.8; Eustathios, *Ad Odyss*. 1.122, Herod. 1.3.1–3) refer to the diadem compounded with the *kausia* hat. The *kausia* was a traditional headdress in pre-Hellenistic Macedonia.[8] It is depicted on the Gnosis Mosaic from Pella. There was also the *petasos* hat, which had ribands tied under the chin. Sometimes the ribands were not tied, and hung down loosely around the neck, as shown on the coins of Alexander I (p. 168, ill. 10). The *petasos* also appears on the coinage of later kings of Macedonia, though usually without the ribands. Sometimes there is a band on a *kausia* depicted in an artwork (e.g. a sculpture from Kalymnos, p. 174, ill. 29). On some of the coins from the times of Philip II there is a young rider wearing the victor's band; on others the rider is bearded, sometimes with a headband (pp. 169–173). Even if this bearded rider were to represent Philip, which is unlikely, the headband need not be a diadem, but a sportsman's headband, in other words signifying the ascription of the attribute of an Olympic champion to the monarch. Lichtenberger had good grounds to conclude that in Macedonia the diadem was not an attribute of royal power before Alexander.

S. Lehmann's article refers back to the Alföldi's tradition, in which the diadem is derived from the practices of agonistic sportsmanship. Lehmann observes that the terms *tainia (taenia)*, *diadem*, and *stemma* were used to denote the headbands worn in Greece during sports competition and in religious contexts. The Charioteer of Delphi (ca. 470 B.C.) wears the *tainia*, the headband of victory (p. 184, ill. 1a-c). Another example is Diadumenos (p. 187, ill. 3). Alongside the *tainia,* the wreath was another symbol of sports victory. Lehmann examines the meaning of the diadem in and after Alexander's times (p. 182), and claims that there are no representations of Alexander in a diadem, hence it was not Alexan-

[8] Janssen 2007, 43–45.

der who introduced the diadem, but the Diadochi. However, this argument is not persuading, as striking changes in Alexander's royal ideology, and their impact on the ‘power of images’ or iconographic sphere, are difficult to grasp in terms of chronology, contrary to his political and military achievements. Thus for a long time Alexander did not make many substantial novelties in the iconography of his coinage, which therefore does not reflect the dynamic rate of change in his status as the ruler of Macedonia and Western Asia. Likewise the king’s title did not appear on Alexander’s coins until his last issues, although no-one has any doubts as to his monarchical status (cf. p. 195). Lehmann highlights the significance of the so-called Daochos Monument from the temple of Apollo at Dephi. Daochos, a Thessalian prince, put up a monument in Delphi (dated by the author to the early 3rd century) for his father Agias (pp. 196–197). For Lehmann this monument marks a turning-point in the evolution of the post-Alexander royal ideology, but such an ascription is over-exaggerated, since this was a family of provincial lords from Thessaly of no great significance in the rivalries between the Diadochi. Moreover, the dating of the monument remains debatable. Lehmann scrutinizes images showing figures wearing headbands which were strictly connected with sports competitions included the statues of Ptolemaic agonists, or their portrayals on their coinage. Ptolemaic chariots won numerous victories at the Olympic games, which were then commemorated in the iconography of some of the artworks commissioned by the Lagids. In general, the *tainia*, wreath, or sometimes even just a palm branch, were the attributes of agonistic champions, and while in Hellenistic times they made their way into the royal iconography (as Lehmann rightly underscores), we can hardly say that the origins of the diadem go back to the *tainia*. Lehmann is clearly focused on the Greek cultural sphere, but seems to ignore the fact that Alexander found himself in the lands of Iranian habitation and the Oriental world and its cultural milieu, where he had to establish his image as a monarch of Asia, while Greece was relegated to the peripheries of his political interests. Alexander’s career took him a long way beyond the framework of the Greek world, and the context of the Greek agonistic sports was incommensurate with the realities of Iran and Western Asia in Alexander’s situation. Outside the world of the Greeks the concept was not *allgemeinverständlich*, as Lehmann would have it. I can hardly agree with his conclusion on the origin of the diadem, although he presents his arguments assiduously and makes a clear distinction between facts and interpretations. Moreover, he rightly emphasises the importance of agonistic symbols in Hellenistic iconography.

K.M. Meyer looks at Dionysios’ headband as a potential prototype for the diadem. His point of departure is Diodoros 4.4.4. and a similar passage in Pliny, *NH* 7.191, describing Dionysios vel Liber Pater as the inventors of the *regnum*

insigne, viz. the diadem, and the initiator of the triumphal procession. But Meyer fails to scrutinize the passage quoted from Diodoros, who refers to 'some writers of myths' as the authors he had used. In other words Diodoros does not treat the invention of the diadem within a historical context. But it is precisely Dionysios' headband which is often regarded as the prototype of the diadem.[9] Meyer examines the headbands that occur in the iconography of Dionysios, who usually appears with a wreath, and only rarely with a headband. As of the 5th century the headband is a frequent feature in the vase painting. On the coinage the predominant detail is the wreath, with the headband on coins from Naxos, and only sporadically on other issues. In general other deities apart from Dionysios did not have the headband as an attribute. The first headbands on the coinage minted by the Diadochi appeared around 317–316 B.C., on posthumous images of Alexander minted by Ptolemy I (p. 220). However, we can hardly assume that Ptolemy invented the diadem – the principal royal attribute – for the portrait of Alexander when he was still just the satrap of Egypt. Ptolemy himself appeared in a diadem as of approximately 305/4 B.C., when he took the title of king. Posthumously, Alexander is shown in a diadem on coins struck by Lysimachos as well. In Meyer's opinion the origins of the diadem may be traced back to the headband of Dionysios. The fundamental problem and flaw in this proposal is that Alexander was not a new Dionysios for the Iranians or other Asian peoples – the concept would not have gained recognition in Asia. The historical context appears again crucial for any understanding of the origin of the diadem as a royal attribute under Alexander and his successors.

T. Schreiber writes on headbands in everyday use in Greece (pp. 233–247). This problem was addressed earlier by A. Krug, who identified 14 different types of headbands.[10] Krug's observations make up the basic core for Schreiber's deliberations. Headbands were worn in various situations, e.g. underneath a helmet, as may be seen on the famous Exekias Vase in the figure of Achilles. A similar headband is on the Riace Warrior A. Schreiber suggests that Diadumenos is in fact wearing a utility headband, not a victor's *tainia*. K. Martin has contributed two articles to the volume. In the first (pp. 249–278) she discusses headbands as depicted on selected coins and in artworks, with special attention to heroes and hero-like figures.

K. Dahmen examines Alexander's use of the diadem in his inspiring study (pp. 281–292). He observes that the sculptures of Alexander show him without a diadem. This may be explained by the fact that most of the representations of Alexander were done (or at least initiated) before the Battle of Gaugamela; this was the time when his classical images were made (e.g. the Granikos monument

[9] Smith 1988, 37–38; Alföldi 1985, 120–125 (to some degree).
[10] Krug 1968.

by Lysippos), and when he did not use the diadem. These were the images which were reproduced later. For a long time Alexander did not use the title *basileus* on his coins, but just his name. Dahmen is convinced that this changed towards the end of his reign, when the inscription *Basileos Alexandrou* appeared on his coinage (p. 283).[11] Some scholars claim that the title *basileus* appeared on coins even after Alexander's death.[12] Dahmen links a group of coins issued probably as of 331/330 or around 325/4, and bearing the title *basileus,* to the minting house of Babylon. Unfortunately the dating has not been fully determined. Dahmen is of the opinion that Alexander's helmet as depicted on his 'Indian' decadrachms is Greek. Two bands may be observed on Alexander's headdress on the decadrachms. W. B. Kaiser claimed they were parts of a diadem[13]. In Dahmen's opinion these two bands issue from two points on the helmet and do not constitute a diadem. Still it seems that these ribbons can be part of a diadem, perhaps not very skilfully delineated, but nevertheless a diadem. Decadrachms were the king's special issues for selected dignitaries and as such were particularly significant coins, on which every detail was important. There can be no question of arbitrarily chosen attributes or a utility headband[14]. In line with the general opinion, Dahmen considers the posthumous images of Alexander on coins issued by Ptolemy as his first portrayals with a headband, dated according to him to ca. 314/313 B.C. (pp. 286–287). But he claims that this headband is a *mitra*, not a diadem. Seleukos and Agathokles made imitations of these images of Alexander, but without a diadem. According to Dahmen Alexander wears a *mitra* on Ptolemy's bronzes, but a true diadem only appears on Lysimachos' issues after 297 B.C. (pp. 287–8). Dahmen associates the monarch's headband – in his terminology a *mitra* – with the cult of Dionysios. He seems to have applied the term *mitra* too loosely in the technical sense, which has had an effect in his conclusions regarding the origins of the diadem.

The historian M. Haake examines the use of the diadem and the title *basileus* in the Hellenistic period (pp. 293–313). Some preliminaries and conclusions that he draws are fairly categorical, for instance that there were no legal and state (*staatsrechtlich*) aspects associated with the diadem (p. 294). However, in its role as the chief attribute of royal power, in Hellenistic times the diadem did in fact serve to express a claim to rule over a given territory (usually a state), and its application could often have a legal aspect (as stated, e.g., in the Dumkes's contribution on Graeco-Bactria, p. 391). Haake says that the diadem was not an in-

[11] See Price 1991, 32–33.

[12] Le Rider 2007, 71, 93.

[13] Kaiser 1962; Ritter (1965, 45, n. 8) was more cautious and did not jump to conclusions over identification.

[14] See Olbrycht 2008.

tegral part of the Achaemenid apparel in the sense of an emblem ‛reserved specifically for the monarch.’ This is an unnecessary restriction of the scope of the definition: in this way we could reject almost all of the regalia as ‛not specifically reserved for the monarch.’ For instance, aristocrats as well as the king wore the Persian ‘chiton’. What mattered was the color – the royal purple chiton was *mesoleukos*, i.e. shot with white (see Xen. *Kyr.* 8.3.13). In all likelihood, the same principle pertained to the royal diadem; apart from the king, also the *syngeneis* wore diadems, but the monarch’s diadem was purple (or blue) and white. Curt. 6.6.4 claims that Alexander wore ‛a purple head-band interwoven with white, like the one Darius had once had.’ In another passage (3.3.19) Curtius speaks of blue and white royal diadem. Besides, as a rule aristocrats had their headbands tied in a different way than the royal diadems. Haake devotes a fair amount of attention to Alexander’s use of the diadem. He has misgivings about the accuracy of the information on the diadem of the authors of the Vulgate tradition (p. 295). However, there is more to the situation concerning sources.[15] Having brushed aside some crucial source accounts, Haake concocts a fictitious idea, reviving Fredricksmayer’s rather thin hypothesis that in the light of Plutarch’s *Alex.* 34.1 Alexander must have assumed the diadem in 331, soon after Gaugamela. The fact that Plutarch never mentions a diadem in this passage does not prevent Haake from contriving what is essentially an unfounded narrative. For want of sources he offers only an analogy with the coronation of Julian the Apostate. Haake is right about the significance of the diadem after the death of Alexander: it was a component of the regalia of the monarchs on the throne of Babylon after Alexander’s death. It was worn by Philip III as well (p. 298).

C. Mileta sees a connection between the diadem and the agonistic rivalry of the Hellenistic rulers (pp. 315–334). He claims that the diadem was introduced in 306–304 B.C., the ‛Year of the Kings,’ and that this was done by Antigonos Monophtalmos. It is inappropriate to assert that – as Mileta writes – the Diadochi did not share in the legacy of Alexander and the Argeads either politically or symbolically. Alexander’s legacy can hardly go unnoticed even in an overview of the general trends relating to the early Hellenistic power struggle. After all, Alexander’s regalia were flaunted by the Diadochos Eumenes in an attempt to gain the favor of the Macedonians. Mileta traces back the origins of the diadem to the *tainia* headband worn by agonists. If we admit this hypothesis, we shall have to say that the most powerful Diadochi residing in Egypt, Babylonia or Iran preferred to adapt to the sports tradition of Greek athletes rather than to cherish and continue in the Alexander tradition. Such ideas are not at all convincing, as they would enclose Alexander and the Diadochi within a restrictively Greek-

[15] See, e.g., Arr. 4.7.4. The historical context of Alexander’s reforms in 330 has been reconstructed in detail in my articles, see Olbrycht 2004, 26–28; 2010; 2013.

Macedonian political and cultural scope. By and large, Mileta's contribution – in point of the diadem's origin hardly tenable – offers stimulating observations on the significance of the attribute, which prompt a revision of existing opinions.

D. Salzmann conducts a thorough presentation of the diadem and similar headbands as part of the Hellenistic regalia depicted on the coinage and in works of art. One of the conclusion is that the shape of the diadem varied. Sometimes kings would be portrayed in the *tainia*: this applied to the posthumous images of Antiochos I on coins issued by Antiochos Hierax (p. 359, ill. 74). Occasionally gods and heroes would be portrayed wearing toroidal headbands (*Wulstbinden*, p. 360).

G. Dumke looks at the diadem on the coins of Diodotos I and II of Bactria. In Graeco-Bactria there was a strict connection between the diadem and the title *basileus* (pp. 385–393). In her second article K. Martin reviews the diadem as it appeared on coins issued by queens (pp. 395–423). Queens (*basilissai*) also wore diadems, just like the kings, albeit there were exceptions to this general rule. D. Biedermann tries to answer the question whether Mark Antony wore a diadem (pp. 425–448). He analyses the extant sculptures and coinage and reaches a conclusion that Antony did not use a diadem as an attribute of power.

The articles in this volume indicate several different traditions from which it is claimed the Hellenistic diadem was derived. A variety of headdresses could be observed in Macedonia prior to the times of Alexander III: the *petasos* with a headband, the *kausia*, and the *tainia* as the Olympic champion's attribute. But there was no diadem. Justin (12.3.8) states quite clearly that the diadem was not in use in Macedonia before Alexander. In the same passage, Justin emphatically claims that Alexander assumed the dress and the diadem of the Persian kings (*Alexander habitum regum Persarum et diadema insolitum antea regibus Macedonicis, uelut in leges eorum quos uicerat, transiret, adsumit*). Alongside Justin, other sources stress that Alexander adopted the 'Persian' diadem at a specific moment in history: in 330, when he was in eastern Iran.[16] By that time he was well into Asia, having left the confines of Greece and Macedonia a considerable while before; and he was not competing in the Olympic games, but vying for rule over virtually the whole of the civilised world in the contemporary sense of the term. At such a historic time looking back to the Greek agonistic tradition would have been groundless and politically unrealistic. Alexander was in the Iranian world, and endeavouring to win recognition in the eyes of the Iranians as their rightful monarch. Such a historical context rules out a derivation of the diadem as Alexander's attribute of royal power from Greek traditions.

There is a noticeable disproportion in the selection and array of articles. In Part I there is an Oriental section and a Hellenic section, but there is no Oriental

[16] See, most recently, Olbrycht 2013.

section in Part II. In other words there is a want of an article on the reception of the diadem in the countries of Asia, not in Greece or Macedonia. The main role in this respect would go to the Parthians and the Arsacids, the first Iranian dynasty following the Seleucids in Iran. Some good work has already been done on this subject.[17] Another worthwhile area of research would be a study of the diadem and tiara as they appeared in the monetary iconography of Kappadokia, Armenia, and Kommagene, where Oriental traditions met, mingled and crossed with Greek and Macedonian components.

The volume concludes with a set of useful indexes. As a whole it constitutes an invaluable contribution to research on the attributes of power in the ancient world, particularly in the Achaemenid and post-Achaemenid (Hellenistic) period. The articles in it offer and represent a vast amount of scholarship, and even if some of the hypotheses they put forward are a bit too speculative, they are compelling enough to prompt a revision of existing opinions and arguments. The volume's editors deserve commendation for the scholarly assiduity they put in to compile the publication and select the illustrations. The volume is the first of a new series entitled *EUROS*. A good start is a promising prospect of a successful future for the new series.

Bibliography

Alföldi A. 1985: 'Diadem und Kranz' in A. Alföldi, *Caesar in 44 v.Chr. I: Studien zu Caesars Monarchie und ihren Wurzeln* (*Antiquitas* 3/16), Bonn, 105–131.

Bittner S. 1987: *Tracht und Bewaffnung des persischen Heeres zur Zeit der Achaimeniden* (2. Auflage), München.

Bodzek J. 2011: *ΤΑ ΣΑΤΡΑΠΙΚΑ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΑ. Mennictwo satrapów w okresie panowania Achemenidów (ok. 550–331 a. C.)*, Kraków.

Calmeyer P. 1976: 'Zur Genese altiranischer Motive: IV. «Persönliche Krone» und Diadem' *AMI* 9, 45–63.

Calmeyer P. 1988: 'Zur genese altiranischer Motive X. Die elamisch-persische Tracht' *AMI* 21, 27–51.

Calmeyer P. 1993: 'Crown I. In the Median and Achaemenid Periods' in *EncIr* 6, 407–408.

Gall H. v. 1969/1970: 'Beobachtungen zum arsakidischen Diadem und zur parthischen Bildkunst' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 19/20, 299–318.

Janssen E. 2007: *Die Kausia. Symbolik und Funktion der makedonischen Kleidung* (Diss.), Göttingen.

Kaiser W.B. 1962: 'Ein Meister der Glyptik aus dem Umfeld Alexanders des Großen' *JdI* 77, 227–239.

Krug A. 1968: *Binden in der griechischen Kunst*, Hösel.

Le Rider G. 2007: *Coinage, Finances, and Policy*, Philadelphia.

Olbrycht M.J. 1997: 'Parthian King's Tiara – Numismatic Evidence and Some Aspects of Arsacid Political Ideology' *Notae Numismaticae* (Kraków) 2, 27–65.

[17] Gall H. v. 1969/1970'; Olbrycht 1997; 2013a.

Olbrycht M.J. 2004: *Alexander the Great and the Iranian world (Aleksander Wielki i świat irański)*, Rzeszów.

Olbrycht M.J. 2008: 'On Some Coins of Alexander the Great (336–323 BC) and his pro-Iranian policy' *Payam-e Bastanshenas. Journal of Archaeology of the Islamic Azad University of Abhar* (Iran), Vol. 4/8, 19–24.

Olbrycht M.J. 2010: 'Macedonia and Persia' in J. Roisman/I. Worthington (editors), *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Macedonia,* Malden – Oxford, 342–369.

Olbrycht M.J. 2011: 'On Coin Portraits of Alexander the Great and His Iranian Regalia' *Notae Numismaticae* 6, 13–30.

Olbrycht M.J. 2013: '"An Admirer of Persian Ways": Alexander the Great's Reforms in Parthia-Hyrcania and the Iranian Heritage' in: T. Daryaee/A. Mousavi/K. Rezakhani (eds.), *Excavating an Empire. Achaemenid Persia in Longue Durée*, Costa Mesa, 37–62.

Olbrycht M.J. 2013a: 'The titulature of Arsaces I, king of Parthia' *Parthica. Incontri di culture nel mondo antico* 15, 63–74.

Olbrycht M.J. 2013b: 'Iranians in the Diadochi Period' in V. Alonso Troncoso/E.M. Anson (eds.), *After Alexander. The Time of the Diadochi (323–281 BC)*, Oxford/Oakville, 159–182.

Olmstead A.T. 1948: *History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago.

Price M.J. 1991: *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander and Philipp Arrhidaeus,* vol. I–II, Zürich/London.

Ritter H.-W. 1965: *Diadem und Königsherrschaft,* München/Berlin.

Shahbazi A.Sh. 1992: 'Clothing II. In the Median and Achaemenid periods' in *EncIr* 5, 723–737.

Smith R.R.R. 1988: *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford.

Tuplin C. 2007: 'Treacherous Hearts and Upright Tiaras: the Achaemenid King's Head Dress' in C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire,* Swansea, 267–311.

Abstract

The article is a review of the book *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher*, Bonn 2012, being a reference framework for a scrutiny of issues related to the origins of the royal diadem of post-Achaemenid (Hellenistic) kings. Addressed are terminological issues relating to diadems and functionally and/or formally analogous headbands. The designation 'diadem' did not come into widespread use to denote headbands treated as an attribute of royal power until the Hellenistic period. The article addresses an issue which is crucial for the understanding of the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods – attributes of royal power, the Achaemenid, Macedonian and Greek legacy, and the nature of royal power in antiquity.