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Introduction

*Parthenos, Telesinos of Kettos dedicated a statue on the Akropolis*

If it pleases you, may you allow that he dedicate another.

In the final years of the sixth century BC, Telesinos of Kettos offered a statuette of Athena Promachos to the goddess on the Akropolis of Athens (pls. 1a–b). Not an unusual event; many of his fellow Athenians had preceded him, and many would follow in centuries to come. What stands out is the dedicatory inscription on the column, in which Telesinos urges Athena to provide the means for another votive. His eagerness makes one wonder whether he succeeded. A man by the name of Telesinos served as archon in 487/6, and it is tempting to identify these two as the same, as evidence of the goddess’ continuing favour. The fact that no second dedicatory inscription by Telesinos was found in Athens is inconclusive: he might have offered a gift to Athena elsewhere, or his dedication may have been lost over the centuries. Then again, he might not have set up anything because she did not grant his wish or because he did not survive the great conflict of his time: the Persian Wars.

Perhaps it is too much to ask for such depth of biographical detail about the Athenians whose sculpted gifts are now prize exhibits in museums of art. Still, this monument offers a glimpse of the patron Telesinos, his reasons to dedicate a statue and to inscribe it with a direct petition to Athena. He was reasonably wealthy – the statue was not large, but it was cast in bronze and set up on a column – and he considered it a fitting tribute to the goddess. It expresses his piety; at the same time, his request displays a remarkable matter-of-factness. The monument tells us further that a sculptor, in this case a bronze caster, was hired to make the statuette of Athena and presumably was paid for his work. Since only the plate attached to her feet remains on the column (pl. 1b), the quality of his

---

1 Cat. B 40, Akr. 6505, IG I 728: Φαρθένε [sic] ἐν ἁκροπόλει Τελεσίνου ἄγαλμι' ἀνέθεκεν / Κέττοιος, ὁ Χαλκὸς διδότης ἄλλο τὸ ἀναθέτα. Cat nos. refer to the database on the CD, where bibliographic references are listed in the References field of the Bases table, and in the reference tables GravDates and VotDates. See also Abbreviations.

2 De Ridder 1896, 312 no. 796; Niemeyer 1964, 21 pl. 11; Brouskari 1979, 48; Van Straten 1992, 248; Keesling 2003, 90–1; Kissas 2000, 232–3 no. 186; LGPN II 425 (9); DAA 43 no. 40 (Raubitschek suggests a horse or horseman); PAA XVI, 275–6 no. 879515; PA 13533. All dates are BC unless stated otherwise.
workmanship cannot be judged. No signature is preserved, therefore his name is unknown. Yet Telesinos liked this sculptor’s statues enough to put in his commission, and so the gift was made and offered.

Simple as this process may sound, it raises numerous questions. How did a patron choose a particular sculptor for a votive or for a gravestone? Why a bronze Athena rather than a kore in marble? Did the sculptor also provide the supporting base, and who inscribed it? Which marble was to be preferred; where could this be obtained and how did it arrive in Athens? The answers to such questions lie partly within the monument itself and can be addressed thanks to the high standard of preservation of Athenian material of the sixth and fifth centuries. They present the process of creating sculpted dedications and gravestones as a chain of choices, some conscious, some ruled by circumstances beyond the makers’ control, but all influencing their appearance. Thus, the sculpture from ancient Athens shows the traces of its manufacture, of the motives of private patrons, the purposes of sculptors, but also of the interference of historical incident.

In exploring these choices and coincidences, this study aims to open up new discussions about the production of private sculpture in its context of Athenian society. It examines the question of what went into the making of sculpture in sixth and fifth-century Athens. To shed light on this process, it must be investigated who took part in creating Athenian sculpture and what exactly they contributed. Thus, at the heart of this study is the role which the inhabitants of Athens played in the process of making sculpted monuments – statues, stelai and bases – with which they honoured their gods and their dead.

**Athenian Sculpture: An Art World**

From a modern perspective, the most important person in the creation of sculpture is without a doubt the artist. He or she conceives the idea for a statue, its subject, its composition, its pose and so forth, then transfers the idea to the selected stone and when finished, mounts it on a base. Even if the patron involved orders a statue to certain specifications, a present-day audience will attribute the essential creative drive behind it to the sculptor.

---

3 Design and carving are not always done by the same person: in 20th-century Pietrasanta, Italy, artists delivered designs which local sculptors executed, often presenting the work as their own. A documentary about this by film maker Paul Beek was broadcast in the *Close-Up* series on Dutch
Yet before a statue stands on its pedestal for the public to see, many different activities are needed. Design and carving are only two steps in a process in which not only sculptors are involved, but others too. The notion that art is never the product of the inspiration and labour of a single individual, but rather requires a collective effort of many groups and persons has been eloquently formulated by Howard S. Becker in *Art Worlds*. The art world is a network – social and professional – of all those who in some way contribute to the ultimate appearance or form of a work of art, ranging from the supply of materials to selling tickets for a show, from visiting museums to writing art reviews.

> 'Art worlds consist of all the people whose activities are necessary to the production of the characteristic works which that world, and perhaps others as well, define as art. (...) Works of art, from this point of view, are not the products of individual makers, “artists” who possess a rare and special gift. They are, rather, joint products of all the people who cooperate via an art world’s conventions to bring works like that into existence.'

This view may seem to award too much importance to those whose involvement in the process of creation is only marginal. But even minor tasks can be essential. Becker gives the example of stagehands at the ballet. Most people would not include them in an imaginary *tableau de la troupe* or a list of crucial participants. Yet without them, as he puts it, the show would not go on. A social approach to the creation of art can disregard artistic hierarchies: not in order to belittle the capacities of artists, but because it looks at the communication in a group of people whose contributions (which may be of varying importance) ultimately shape the artwork in question.

The participants of an art world in Becker’s definition can be divided in five categories, which overlap to a certain degree: the artists, support personnel, patrons,

---

5 Becker 2008, Preface to the anniversary edition, xvi.

---

distributors and the public. The role of artists is obviously essential in the creation of art, and that this was recognised in antiquity is apparently confirmed by many sculptors’ signatures on the monuments of ancient Athens. Yet an artist’s work in any period depends on the world outside the workshop as well. A sculptor in marble has to get stone and other materials for the monument. In sixth and fifth-century Athens, one can further think of paint, glass paste for eyes, precious metal for gilding, inserts or attributes, iron dowels and lead for encasing them, and so forth. These are in addition to production materials, that is, tools: chisels, hammers, drills, saws, and pumice for polishing.

Already in antiquity, tools were put in a different category than raw materials. This is particularly relevant because it ties in with Becker’s distinction between artists and support personnel. The former cut statues from marble by means of tools, while the latter provided these tools, and often the raw materials as well. The boundary between the activities of artists and those of support personnel, however, would have been blurred. For example, a sculptor’s apprentices could provide support services, but also contribute to the statue directly; cutting stone from quarries, as will be discussed in a later chapter, was done in part by the sculptors themselves, in part by specialised quarrymen. Moreover, some sculptors might have made their own tools rather than getting them from a specialist. The extent to which such overlap was the case offers an indication of the level of specialisation. One of the objectives of this study is to establish which tasks sculptors and support personnel performed in the art world of Athenian sculpture and to find out whether any changes occurred in the range of activities of either group during the sixth and fifth centuries.

The final groups in Becker’s categorisation are distributors and critics. The former provide platforms where artists can show their work to potential buyers. To the group of

7 Ibid. 35: ‘Artists are some subgroup of the world’s participants who, by common agreement, possess a special gift, therefore make a unique and indispensable contribution to the work, and thereby make it art.’
8 They appear as separate classes of items in Plato’s Statesman (Plt. 287e–289b).
9 Becker defines the category of support personnel as including those who do not work directly on the work of art, e.g. an assistant who brings coffee. Since contributions without a material expression cannot be traced in antiquity, the support personnel is for the current study limited to those whose labour is evident.
10 See below, ch. III on labour organisation and specialisation of sculptors and support personnel.
11 Becker 1984, 95, 108–19. The distribution of stone is, of course, a different matter, to be discussed in ch. II.4.
critics Becker reckons the public, theorists, art historians and the like. However, the existence of these groups in ancient art worlds is not self-evident. In the 2008 edition of *Art Worlds*, Becker explains how he devised the art worlds by generalising the observations which he had gathered from artistic practice.\textsuperscript{12} His evidence is largely from the 20\textsuperscript{th} century AD, and the use of art worlds for antiquity can be questioned. Certainly, archaic and classical Athens had no art galleries or museums, no art reviews or systematic research of art. Critiques and art history were as yet non-existent. Because of the generally tailor-made production mode, long-distance distribution of finished sculpture was limited, and professional infrastructure (such as, for example, auctions, or art traders delivering to galleries or museums) did not exist in the sixth and fifth centuries.\textsuperscript{13} In short, there was no art market in the modern sense.

However, not all art worlds from the 20\textsuperscript{th} century which Becker discusses follow the same patterns. This may be because their activities vary in nature, or because participants do things differently in different places or in different branches of art. Art worlds are, in fact, not intended as ‘a comprehensive Theory of Art’.\textsuperscript{14} They provide a heuristic for the investigation of groups of people who in some way contribute to the manufacture of works of art, and their collective *modus operandi*.

Thus considered, apparent obstacles such as a lack of a professional system of art distribution in antiquity dissolve. It is worthwhile to consider that ancient sculptors were quite mobile. Even if art works were not distributed in their finished state, styles and fashions could be exported; the trade in marble, for example, from the Cycladic islands, brought with it knowledge of the stone and new ways of working it. Similarly, the absence of connoisseurs, critics or art historians in sixth and fifth-century Athens does not mean there was no public: statues in cemeteries and sanctuaries were there for all Athenians to see and to have an opinion on. The sculptural art world of archaic and classical Athens does not exactly fit 20\textsuperscript{th}-century art worlds, and it does not need to. After all, the goal of this study is not to prove the

\textsuperscript{12} Becker 2008, xiii–iv.

\textsuperscript{13} In the fourth century, this may have been different: Praxiteles’ Knidian Aphrodite was certainly brought to the island in her finished state (Plin. *HN* 36.4). The status of Praxiteles was extraordinary, and so were the circumstances of the commission (two versions were made, of which Kos chose the dressed statue and Knidos the nude). Fourth-century sculptors such as Skopas seem to have been traveling around for architectural programmes. If, for example, he contributed to the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, Skopas, a native Parian, must have gone there in person (Plin. *HN* 36.21). For a discussion of the evidence of traveling sculptors in the sixth and fifth centuries see ch. II.4; for Praxiteles below p. 188.

\textsuperscript{14} Becker 2008, xx.
universal value of the sociological model of art worlds. Rather, it aims to shed light on how the art world of Athenian sculpture functioned.

In fact, it is precisely because art worlds sidestep the aesthetic hierarchy of artistic authorship that they fit the sculpture practice of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries. An art world engages in the ‘production of the characteristic works which that world, and perhaps others as well, define as art’. Whether the result is fit for a museum of Art is less relevant, if the aim is to explore the social dimensions of its manufacture. This focus can be designated as the socio-productional context of a work of art: the relations between groups and individuals through whose activities art comes into being, or put differently, the social discourse which shapes production in the setting of an art world. Archaeology offers the evidence for this process, from the beginning of the line, in quarries and workshops, to its end, in the sanctuaries and cemeteries of Athens.

Ancient sculpture has retrospectively been elevated to high artistic status, but there is no evidence that such views were held in the sixth and fifth centuries. The modern concept Art has no exact equivalent in ancient Greek, and it is doubtful whether the ancient alternatives convey enough of the sublime to approach modern definitions. Though pleasing aesthetics were surely much appreciated, many ancient sculptures were functional objects, sometimes literally, like for example water basins, and sometimes of a religious or ritual nature, commemorating sacrifice or a deceased, or presenting the gods with a gift. In these cases, their religious functionality was more important than their aesthetic value.

This function of sculpture in ancient Athens differs fundamentally from that which art with a capital A has nowadays, and the development of the purpose and meaning of art is closely related to the social motivation for being involved in an art world. Art in modern society is in many respects status-driven: connoisseurs, art collectors and artists are categories with which specific, often high positions in society are associated. Despite the great importance of elite status in ancient Greece, it is not self-evident that the Athenians of the sixth and fifth centuries linked status specifically to patronage of sculpture or of art in

15 This is not to say that the merits of various forms of art or artistic hierarchy were not recognised. See below, ch. III.1.
16 Nowadays, votives and gravestones can of course be considered Art (and certainly are art in the sense of an art world), but very often the participants in the present-day circles of high Art in which sculpture is produced do not agree with this. Cf. Becker 1984, 37–8; Stissi 2009, especially 23–4.
17 See Becker 1984, 100–4.
The idea that sculpture in ancient Athens is likely to have been elitist should be broached with suspicion, because it represents an anachronistic assumption about the relation between patrons and art.

Even though in modern English, the word patron conjures images of a wealthy elite bidding for art at auctions, not all patrons in Becker’s study fit this view. Nowadays, parents who have pictures taken of their child at the photographer’s shop around the corner are contributors to the art world of photography. It may be a very specific branch of that art world, but in it, they are patrons nonetheless. In this study, the word patron is used in its most neutral sense: not as an art lover of high economic and social standing which the word came to imply in more recent history, but simply as a person who had sculpture made to order. The meaning which is intended here is closer to that of a patron of a shop (though without the modern connotation of products being sold from stock) than to, for example, a Maecenas, whether in the original meaning of the word or in the sense it derived from early-modern to modern history.

Despite differences between the notion of elitist patrons of Art and the possible patrons in art worlds, ancient or modern, there is one aspect which in some form adheres to all patronage of art. Commissions for any art work, whether monumental sculpture in ancient Athens or a simple photograph of one’s children nowadays, has an element of public

---


19 See also Nauta 2002, 12–32 and *passim* for an extensive overview of the ambiguities of the word patronage in modern and ancient (notably Roman) contexts.

20 For these meanings *OED* in particular s.v. patron2. The word ‘patron’ is the most applicable denominator. ‘Buyers’ or ‘clients’ are too suggestive of stock–in–trade, and ‘commissioner’ has overtones of present–day governmental institutions. ‘Client’ is confusing also because those who ordered sculpture were hardly a sculptor’s dependants, as the Latin origin of the word would suggest (cf. Wallace–Hadrill 1989, Introduction, and ibid. Johnson and Dandeker; for ancient Athens, ibid. Millett). ‘Dedicants’ or ‘dedicators’ only apply to votives, not to gravestones, and miss the aspect of commissioning the sculpture. For discussions of this terminology, see also Ridgway 1987, 399 and *passim*; Onians 1991, 66; Kempers 1999, *passim*; Nauta 2002, 12–32 and *passim* for patronage in (Roman) literature; De Beer 2007, 16–24. See also below ch. IV.1.
Ancient dedications and gravestones were set up in very public places and one would expect both patrons and sculptors to have had an interest in their monuments' visibility. The question is whether large votives or gravestones affected the status of patrons, and if so, how much? This then leads to a second matter, namely: did the element of public display have any real influence on patrons’ choices? The answers to these questions largely depend on reactions by the public, which are for the sixth and fifth centuries hard to come by. In this study, the emphasis is therefore on the process of creating sculpture up until and including the erection of the votive or gravestone. The choices of patrons will be studied as they are reflected in the carved or engraved stone (for example, in the genres or iconography which they preferred for their sculpted monuments), not by possible responses of ancient Athenian audiences.

Considering the places in which dedications and gravestones were set up, it may seem incongruous that there can be such a thing as a private votive or grave monument. What is meant by private in this study is that sculptures were not set up by the city of Athens or its governing institutions. This criterion is used because from a social point of view, sculpture patronage by private Athenians differs from patronage of the polis, for example, in projects like the Parthenon. In such cases, an individual patron had no say about the appearance of the monument. Any relevant choices were made by a group which was too large to compare it to the influence of single patrons (or even to small groups like families) on their commissions. Secondly, a monument of the polis has by default a public purpose, whether it is to adorn the city or sing the praises of its deities or inhabitants. Private sculpture may target the whole polis as its audience, but it does not need to do so. Individuals might have reasons of their own for setting up statues, reasons in which reception by the public plays little or no part.

Before a piece of sculpted stone was erected for the public to see, however, it had passed several stages. Each of these is the realm of one of the groups in the art world, though boundaries are fluid and activities of participants in various stages overlap. Each of the groups is most involved in one phase of production; after their work is done, they pass it on to the next person or persons, and this process is repeated until the statue stands on its pedestal in public realm. Art worlds essentially consist of the communication between these

contributors. In the present study, this communication revolves around the monument, where the strands of attention and activities of all participants of the art world connect. In the following, chapters II, III and IV will therefore explore the groups which constitute the art world of Athenian sculpture per phase of manufacture. First are the presence and activities of support personnel who provided marble, then the sculptors and their associates, as well as the necessary support trades. Although patrons’ activities start off manufacture, their identities and influence have to be discussed last: not until the practical conditions of the process of making sculpture have been examined can their role be assessed properly.

Art worlds offer an ideal structure for the present study. Becker’s main objective is to uncover the socio-productional functioning of art worlds in general. In this study, the aim is to do the same for the sculpture practice in archaic and early-classical Athens. The question of what went into the making of sculpture in Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries is concerned with this particular art world, with the people who participated, artists, support personnel and patrons, with what they contributed, and how they did so. While the subject is so far removed in time, the evidence cannot be as complete as it is for art worlds of the 20th century AD. Yet the corpus of sculpture from Athens, complemented by ancient literature and epigraphy, has to my knowledge never been submitted to this particular model before. The wealth of detail which this material provides opens the door to an investigation of the sculpture of ancient Athens as the product of an art world and all its participants. In the chapters to come will follow an exploration of who they were, how they communicated with each other, and how and what they contributed to the manufacture of sculpture. Thus, this study aims to shed some new light on how sculpture was made in Athenian society in the sixth and fifth centuries BC.

**METHOD, MATERIAL AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

Telesinos’ monument, cited at the beginning of this Introduction, is from an archaeological point of view an extraordinary survivor, a stroke of luck largely dependent on its timing. Had it not been for the deposition of the damaged votives of the archaic period after the Persian Wars, a far lower quantity of archaic sculpture from Athens would have survived to the present day. To some extent, the same argument works for archaic gravestones, many of which were used to build up the city’s defences just after the Persian Wars. At the same time, such extraordinary circumstances create a distortion in the material compared to adjoining
periods. The uneven preservation of sculpture leads to methodological questions, which must be answered before an interpretation of the material is possible. The present section will offer an overview of the criteria used to select the sculpture and bases for this analysis, and of the main methodological choices made along the way.

At the heart of this study are the votive and grave monuments in marble, which private persons in the city of Athens set up between the beginning of the sixth century and the end of the fifth century BC. These boundaries require some definition, starting with the distinction between votive and sepulchral material. Of the marble dedications in this study, most were found on the Akropolis (map 1). Since no burials from the sixth or fifth centuries are known from the hill, its finds can reasonably be considered votives. Other sites in Athens are less straightforward, in particular the Agora. Not only did this site adjoin both the Akropolis and the Kerameikos (map 1), both sanctuaries and burial grounds existed in the Agora proper. Often, the function of a statue can be derived from the genre (that is, the type of the statue) or from the iconography. Korai, for example, were rarely used as grave markers in Attika. If a genre was used for votive as well as sepulchral purposes, as is the case with, among other types of statuary, lions, the distinction is less clear, and details of a statue’s appearance and its provenance offer the only clues about its function.

Excluded from this study is architectural sculpture. Buildings and their sculpted decorations in the sixth and fifth centuries were generally commissioned by cities or by sanctuaries, and only rarely by individual patrons. In cases where a patron seems to have been acting on his own in a public commission, he often did so on behalf of the city, as for example Peisistratos and his sons. Other categories of sculpture which fall outside of the scope of this study are cult statues, gravestones erected by the state for public funerals, or documentary reliefs. These can be considered public, either for a form of worship or to lay down treaties or laws, as opposed to the works which may in principal have been ordered for the private purposes outlined above.

22 For a discussion of find spots of sculpture, burial grounds and sanctuaries in the Agora as well as the changing boundaries of the Agora in the sixth century see Harrison 1965, 1–2 and passim, and below ch. I.2.

23 Problems surrounding the function of individual sculptures are discussed in the database (see data on the cd–rom).

24 Coulton 1977, 17–8; Jacquemin 1999; Neer 2001 and 2004; Scott, forthcoming; for sculpted votives dedicated by cities in Delphi, see Ioakimidou 1997. Of course, in later historical periods, individual patrons offered buildings to cities or sanctuaries more often.
The sixth and fifth centuries are particularly interesting for the study of the social aspects of the production of sculpture, because the shifts which occur in the material are so noticeable: style, genre and quantity of sculpture changed emphatically. In terms of textual evidence this period in Athenian history is well-documented too. Geographically, the boundaries of the astu of Athens, the city and its immediate environs, serve as the limits for provenance. Comparisons with material from Attika as a whole or even elsewhere in Greece would without a doubt offer interesting insights about Greek sculpture in the sixth and fifth centuries. The choice to limit the material exclusively to the city in this study was based on two things: the coherence of the data, and the character of the art world of Athenian sculpture.

To start with the latter: Athens’ art world was effectively an urban phenomenon, even though not all of the patrons permanently resided in the city itself. Most sculpture was manufactured and set up in the city, and opportunities for doing so were more frequent there. It will be argued below that Athens developed an exceptional appeal for sculptors in the course of the sixth and fifth centuries. In light of this, the city is an excellent place to study the workings of this art world, while other regions require their own investigations. The point of coherence of the data is related to this consideration. The investigation presented here can be considered a test case, in which the notion of art worlds is used to approach all possible sources of information about Athenian sculpture, to see if new insights can be gleaned from the available (well-studied) material. Quantitative comparison with other places in Greece or other periods would be problematic, because in the publications of the material of those places, different criteria of selection and analysis have been applied than the ones used in this study. In order to be comparable on a quantitative level, the research would have to be conducted with similar methods.

Of the votive and gravestone monuments from the sixth and fifth centuries which constitute the record under consideration here, almost all were previously published. Various aspects of this main body of material have been listed in the database on the CD

25 Most textual evidence used here is epigraphic; literary material from the sixth century is of course very scarce.
26 Thus, any mention of Athens in the text refers to the city alone, not the entire territory of Attica, as is common.
27 Access to unpublished pieces can be difficult, even though the staff of various Athenian museums has been wonderfully supportive. Since none of my requests for access to such material were granted, it has regrettably been necessary to leave much of the unpublished sculpture in the storerooms of various Athenian museums and the Ephorias out of the equation.
which is appended to this study. Among these are the provenance, type of marble, genre, iconographic details, patrons and beneficiaries if known, and most importantly, the date. The two centuries studied here have been divided into eight periods of twenty-five years. This is a relatively rough division by the standards of sculptural chronology. However, quantitative analysis requires equal periods, precluding finer, but uneven segments of time. Moreover, not all sculpture can be dated to the decade, but quarter centuries can in general be established with reasonable certainty. The dates are the result of a stylistic analysis and a framework of chronology derived from earlier publications, the arguments from which have been paraphrased extensively on the CD. In most cases, scholars agree on dates of Athenian sculpture. In some cases, a minority disagrees and a few objects inspire dissent. In either of the latter two situations, the statue was studied in the museum in question, circumstances permitting, in order to assess the various stylistic arguments.

Bronze statues have in principle been excluded, but their bases are taken into account. One reason for this is that while marble sculpture has been analysed by so many experts that their opinions can be compared, such an approach cannot be used for Athenian bronzes. The literature is much less extensive, but more importantly, relatively few bronzes from Athens survive, since many have been melted down over time. As a result, a comparison between the amounts of surviving marble and bronze sculpture would be unbalanced. Bases for votive bronzes provide a partial solution for this lack. Dowel holes on many bases, columns and other supports show whether a bronze or a marble statue was inserted, and inscriptions offer information on the date. In view of the purpose of this study, precise arguments for the dates of sculpture, especially around the end of the fifth century, are offered in the Database (Dates tables for votives and gravestones; Motivation field in tables Bases, Votives and Gravestones).

In the construction of the database, a conflict arose between the archaeological practice to date sixth and fifth-century sculpture to the decade or more narrowly, and the statistical need for uniform periods that allow quantification. A compromise was found in quarter-century periods. Where dates overlap two periods, statues have been entered in the quarter century in which most of the date range falls. The start and end years of each period are intended as approximate throughout this study.

The chart type is formatted in columns instead of lines, so that the impression of a continuous development is avoided. In a few charts, lines were used because this was the only way to present multiple data series legibly. Obviously, this does not mean that a continuous chronological development of the data is intended there.

More small bronze figurines are preserved, but these are too often dated with insufficient accuracy, and many are from before the sixth century (cf. De Ridder 1896; Touloupa 1991; Scholl 2006).
the availability of such information has been the criterion for including bases in the record.\textsuperscript{32} Thus, trends in bases for marble and bronze sculptures could be traced and a means of secondary comparison with the sculptural evidence was created. Epigraphic dates were mostly derived from the third edition of the \textit{Inscriptiones Graecae} for Attica, and when this was impossible from older sources such as the work of Raubitschek.\textsuperscript{33}

Since only those bases were included which belonged to private monuments and which had dowel holes and datable inscriptions, the record of bases is more selective than that of sculpture. Quantitative analysis would in some respects benefit from more complete coverage, but the attempt would also bring methodological complications. The more empty fields a record has, the less useful it becomes for analysis, especially if an accurate date cannot be established. The selection of bases suits their purpose in the present study, which is that of a comparative corpus. Furthermore, the criteria for inclusion of bases do not interfere with the composition of the evidence in this study. For example, they cannot cause more dedications by any specific group, say the \textit{hippeis}, to be included in the record, because there is no link between this group and the preservation rates of inscriptions or of dowel holes. Thus, general developments in specific aspects of the bases for bronze or marble sculpture, for example in name types or in dowel holes, are no less representative than other trends occurring in the sculpture record of this study.\textsuperscript{34}

In the following section, some aspects of the history of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries will be discussed. Chapter I presents an overview of quantitative evidence, the total numbers of votive and grave monuments. Next, the results are connected to the find spots of sculpture and bases. Once the general development of the preserved sculpture from Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries has been established and its representativity has been tested,

\textsuperscript{32} A few bases of which it is unclear which type of sculpture they originally carried have been included nonetheless, for example, if the inscription on the base was of particular relevance (e.g. a sculptor’s signature). The inclusion of bases which do not reveal the type of statue would cause the database to become inefficient in use, in particular because many of these are poorly preserved. There, the interpretation of the inscription and therefore of the date also becomes problematic, creating many empty fields in the database (see below).

\textsuperscript{33} In very few cases, historical circumstances or associated sculpture seemed to weigh heavier and the \textit{IG} \textsuperscript{I} date has been ignored. Raubitschek’s work has been used with caution, since his reconstructions are now considered overly optimistic. The Bases table on the CD, especially the \textit{References} field, contains the details of literature; \textit{IG} numbers are in a separate field. For prosopography, see the \textit{Personalia} field; for dates, see the \textit{Motivation} field.

\textsuperscript{34} Names, name types, and civic identities of persons in this study are based on \textit{LGPN} and \textit{PAA}.  
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the investigation will move to the support personnel, sculptors and patrons, and any others whose contribution warrants their inclusion in the art world of Athenian sculpture.

**HISTORY AND THE SCULPTURE OF ATHENS**

The art world of sculpture in archaic and early-classical Athens was mainly determined by internal factors. Those who contributed directly also made the greatest impact on the final appearance of the sculptures. However, sometimes the wishes of those participating in the art world might have been influenced, encouraged or hampered by events that in themselves had nothing to do with Athenian sculpture. This section will offer a brief overview of historical circumstances which might have affected the production of sculpture in this way.

War would appear to be an obvious factor of influence on the art world of sculpture. Although the list of wars which Athens engaged in over the sixth and fifth centuries is long, many of these were fought on foreign territory rather than in Attika itself. Consequently, the effect would have been advantageous (from a sculptor’s perspective) if the Athenians won, because spoils of war could pay for monuments, whereas losses outside of Attika affected the production of sculpture less directly. The two exceptions are also the two largest conflicts in this period: the Persian wars and the Peloponnesian war. Both wars were fought partially in Attika, but there are important differences. The Persian wars consisted of relatively brief conflicts, in which the Athenians were often victorious. In the battle of Marathon in 490, though in Attika, no damage was done to the city itself. Only in the 480/479 campaign did the Persians actually destroy the city.\(^{35}\)

The latter event created the sculptural debris which constitutes much of the material of this study and is of such tremendous importance in archaeological terms. But to the art world of sculpture at the time, the implications of the Persian wars are less self-evident. It might be argued that the broken votive and grave monuments in Athens had to be replaced and therefore, the sculptural art world would thrive after the destruction. Alternatively, other rebuilding work might have taken preference, in which case sculptors might not have plied their own trade for some time but worked in the general effort of reconstruction.

---

35 Hdt. 8.51–4; 9.4–6.
The Peloponnesian war was an entirely different situation. By the mid-fifth century, Athens had an empire to lose. There was no internal consensus about whom to fight and for what, and fundamentally, this war came to Attika for long periods of time. Between 431 and 404, Athens was intermittently under siege, while much of its countryside was ravaged and its inhabitants had to be moved inside the safety of the Long Walls. Epidemics and disastrous military operations decimated the population. Economically, the city was in dire straits. All this indubitably affected the lives of the inhabitants of Athens, including those in the art world. For the production of sculpture, the situation could have various outcomes. Did high mortality rates and general depression lead to large numbers of commissions for gravestones and votives? Or did people have to limit their spending and bury their deceased without a sculpted monument?

Naturally, the range of choices open to ancient Athenians is much wider than these few examples. Among the factors of influence on private sculpture, war is perhaps easiest to trace in a record such as the corpus studied here, but it is by no means the only important one. From the point of view of sculptors and the support personnel, trade and economics are essential. Can raw materials, especially marble, be brought to the city? Is enough work commissioned to sustain sculptors' careers in one place? Can sculptors be sedentary workshop owners, or do they have to travel around for a living? Are specialised craftsmen available for the work of the support personnel? All this depends on the prosperity in Athens and the efficiency of its trading networks. The influence of such practical matters on sculpture production is discussed in chapters II and III.

From the patrons' point of view, wealth was a major factor in any sculptural decision. A lack of it meant that setting up a statue or stele was impossible. But a difficult question is how much one needed for a gravestone or marble votive. Was this within the means of the richest citizens, the pentakosiomedimnoi and hoppeis alone, or were zeugitai or thetes also capable of sculptural patronage? This is a particularly complex matter, because it is intertwined with the problems of interpretation which surround the identity of the Athenian elite and the property classes instituted by Solon. It is difficult to determine what these classes precisely entailed and which percentage of the population they constituted. The questions who in Athenian society ordered sculpture, and how their position in the social

36 E.g. Thuc. 2.18.1–23.3.
37 See e.g. Ober 1989 and 2004; Davies 2004; Mossé 2004; Patterson 2006; Rhodes 2006; Van Wees 2006 (and other articles in that volume, Blok and Lardinois 2006).
hierarchy influenced the choices they made as patrons can only be approached in the reverse, as it were. First the testimony of the sculpted monuments and their inscriptions must be presented, and subsequently, this has to be combined with the results of recent scholarship on Athenian society and citizenship.

Criteria for status and citizenship in Athens did obviously not remain the same over the sixth and fifth centuries. Three decades after Solon’s reforms came the tyranny of Peisistratos, traditionally dated between the middle of the fifth century and his death in 528/7.\(^{38}\) The impact which his rule had on the lives of the Athenians is hard to assess. The three main sources closest in time, though not contemporary, are positive about Peisistratos compared to other tyrants. They mention hardly any killings and few exiles, but speak of some social reforms, cultural patronage, and a general respect for political institutions as they were.\(^{39}\) There is no evidence that Peisistratos or his sons changed Solonic legislation.\(^{40}\) If they took on the building projects which some sources suggest, and if Solon’s laws of citizenship stayed in force, the attraction of Athens for craftsmen from elsewhere would have in fact have grown.

After the murder of Hipparchos and the expulsion of Hippias by the Spartans, Herodotos describes factional strife, \textit{stasis}, among powerful Athenians.\(^{41}\) Kleisthenes, a prominent member of the clan of the Alkmeonidai, was the one to take the lead in reforming Athenian power structures. He changed the traditional division of four tribes to a system of

\begin{footnotes}
40 Thuc. 6.54.6: ‘\( \tau\alpha\ de\ \\\\alpha\ \lambda\lambda\alpha\ \acute{\omega}\nu\tau\eta\ \eta\ \pi\alpha\\lambda\iota\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\kappa\varsigma\\varsigma\ \omicron\mu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\ \iota\chi\rho\iota\varsigma\theta\omicron\)’... for the rest, the city was left in full enjoyment of its existing laws...’. See also Patterson 2006\(^1\), 274.
41 Spartan intervention described in Hdt. 5.62.1–65.5. For the struggle between Kleisthenes and Isagoras, son of Teisamenes, see Hdt. 5.66.1–2. Also \textit{Ath. Pol.} 20.1. Cf. also Ober 2004, 264–5; 268–75 for a discussion of partly conflicting evidence about Kleisthenes’ actions: Ober concludes that Kleisthenes skilfully used the newly developed civic awareness of the Athenians (281–3). Also Patterson 2006\(^1\), 275–8.
\end{footnotes}
ten tribes based on demes from various parts of Attika. Whatever he may have intended with these reforms, effectively they constitute the beginning of democracy. The combination of a victory over the Persian empire and the consequences of early democracy must have affected both the city and its inhabitants considerably.

From the late 470s onwards, the Delian–Attic League and subsequent overseas expansion brought increasing wealth to Athens, while changing the city’s self-image as well as its internal relations. At this pinnacle of Athens’ power, Perikles entered the political stage. He was a pivotal figure in the art world, the instigator of the Parthenon with its extensive sculptural programmes, offering work to masons and sculptors for decades. But he influenced the art world in a less direct way as well, by changing the conditions of citizenship under which all its participants lived. The Periklean Citizenship Law proposed that only children of two Athenian parents would be citizens. That this had an impact on the Athenians’ lives, including those of the city’s sculptors and patrons, is obvious; whether it also changed the sculpture which they made and ordered respectively, remains to be seen in chapter IV below.

Perikles died in 429 from the effects of the epidemic which was rife in the city. The final decades of the fifth century were certainly not the most prosperous or successful for Athens, yet votive and sepulchral sculpture, as will be discussed below, thrived. This alone suggests that the relation between the city’s general historical circumstances and the production of sculpture is not always straightforward and that it changes from one period to another. It is at this cusp of Athens’ history and its sculpture that this particular art world of the sixth and fifth centuries can be traced and studied.

---

42 Hdt. 5.67 and 5.69; Ath. Pol. 20–1. See also Fornara and Samon 2001, 28–9; Mossé 2004, 254; Ober 2004.
43 Taken further by the reforms of Ephialtes in 462/1. Cf. Patterson 2006¹, 278.
44 See Patterson 2006¹, 278–83; Blok 2007 and 2009 [with earlier bibliography].