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1 A city of statues

1 QUANTITATIVE PERSPECTIVES IN SCULPTURE

Approximately a century and a half ago, the Akropolis of Athens yielded an extraordinary find of votive sculpture, buried there in the fifth century BC. To this day, the impact of this assemblage on the archaeology of ancient Greece can be felt: by sheer numbers the collection is impressive, and many of the statues are among the most appreciated of Greek sculpture. The aims of this study, however, require a broader selection of evidence. So, the sculpture under consideration in this study was found not only on the Akropolis, but also in other parts of Athens, such as the Agora, the Ilissos area in the southeast of the city, burial grounds such as the Kerameikos, and a few scattered sites around Athens (map 1).

At first glance the resulting record offers a straightforward picture (chart 1). Numbers of votive and grave sculpture from Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries change noticeably in three of the eight quarter-century intervals in which they have been divided here. The first of these transitions, at the turn from the third to the final quarter of the sixth century, presents an increase of over a hundred sculptures, four times the number of the third quarter of the century (table 1a). This high number falls to a much lower level in the second quarter of the fifth century, with only nine examples against 109 in the first quarter. The third and last conspicuous change is a rise from 28 to 133 in the final quarter of the fifth century. These are the main events in the private sculpture of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries as they present themselves in the record of this study. The main question in the present chapter is how representative this image is of the manufacture levels of sculpture in this period, and consequently, how reliable the sculptural evidence is.

That the Athenian sculpture record, like any archaeological assemblage, is incomplete, would be immaterial if it were clear how it relates to the original corpus. The early fifth-century deposits on the Akropolis and elsewhere in the city contain much, but not all Athenian sculpture from this period, and we cannot know what proportion of the original amount is preserved, nor whether material from various quarter centuries has survived to a similar degree. It can be established where the highs and lows in the extant material are, but the causes of these changes, the reasons why the record appears as it does, are not obvious.
So, any interpretation based on the relation between the history of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries and the development of its sculpted dedications and grave monuments remains out of reach.

In a sense, the large deposit of sculpture from the Akropolis contaminates the dataset: because the material was buried, it has not weathered and disappeared but is uncommonly well preserved, most likely in higher numbers than would have been the case had it stayed above ground for longer. In short, the higher survival rate of the material of the Akropolis distorts ordinary patterns of preservation of archaeological remains.

The steep fall in the second quarter of the fifth century is often regarded as the result of the sack of Athens in the Persian wars, after which the city's inhabitants are thought to have stopped putting up marble votives and lavish gravestones, because they were rebuilding the city. In this view, attention turned to private sculpture once more after the situation had settled down and housing was largely rebuilt. Plausible as this explanation sounds, it is not unproblematic. First, it isolates the sculpture record from roughly 525 to 470 from the surrounding periods, paradoxically suggesting a historical vacuum. Peaks in archaeological material cannot be considered separate from their chronological context, in this case a gradual development during the seventh and sixth centuries and the recovery of sculpture from the mid-fifth century into the fourth. Second, in this version of events the history of Athenian sculpture is forged by the Persian wars: the peak and low which occur between the last quarter of the sixth and the middle of the fifth centuries depend on the Akropolis deposit, and because this assemblage is so unusual in character, it cannot offer any insight in trends in the production of sculpture in sixth and fifth-century Athens. Arguably, the situation is not quite so barren. Statues and reliefs from elsewhere in Athens and from the outskirts of the city provide invaluable comparative evidence for the overall development. Other types of votive or sepulchral material from Athens can provide useful parallels as well.


Even if the influence of the Persian debris should be approached with caution, some of its features are clear. Most of the debris from the war was deposited sometime during the second quarter of the fifth century, and the wealth of extant sculpture from the turn of the century is preceded and followed by periods of relative scarcity (table 1a, chart 1). The question is, how far back in time does the influence of the Persian debris on the evidence reach? Does the beginning of the sculpture peak in the final quarter of the sixth century coincide with the oldest buried Akropolis material? The answer is no. Votives of the first quarter of the fifth century were found together with older material: deposition has increased their survival rate, and it would appear – unsurprisingly – that this applies more to votives from around the Persian wars than for older ones. The next question to ask is whether it can be established how much of the increase of the last quarter of the sixth century is due to post-Persian burial, and how much to an increase in the original corpus, i.e. possibly in production? There may have been less pre-525 sculpture to begin with, because less was produced. Alternatively, clearances in the sixth century may have disposed of a part of the sixth-century sculpture.

The Persian wars are of obvious influence in the sculpture highs and lows of the sixth and fifth centuries BC, in particular around the turn of the century. However, developments at other times, such as the rise of sculpture during the sixth century, have nothing to do with the wars. So, one must look elsewhere for causes of the earlier trends in sculpture. The sculpture ‘scene’ is bound to have been sometimes restrained, at other times stimulated by events in contemporary history, but clear connections between its impulses and historical circumstances can rarely be established. Besides external factors, the art world of sculpture had an internal dynamic of its own. The combination of external and internal factors of influence on the art world lies at the root of the developments in sixth and fifth-century Athenian sculpture.

What is conspicuously clear, and apparently a phenomenon from within the art world, is the popularity which sculpture had gained among the Athenians by the late sixth century. Stone votives in Athens had started in the later seventh century, but the amount of preserved votive sculpture stayed modest until much later (chart 1). On the whole, the sixth century

---

47  Martini 1990, 2, 89 (c. 670–650 BC), Ridgway 1993, 4, 41 and Palagia 2006, xiii consider the middle of the seventh century the start of large stone sculpture in Greece. Detailed discussion in Martini 1990, 132–200; Ridgway 1993, 21–43. Boardman GSAP 23 sets the beginnings at Athens around 600; Hurwit 1985, 244 ‘towards c. 560 BC’.
bears witness to expanding monumentality and rising numbers of both gravestones and votives in marble.\textsuperscript{48} Around the mid-sixth century, numbers of gravestones were similar to those of stone dedications (table 1a; chart 1). However, the two differ in that numbers of gravestones remain relatively low for most of the two centuries studied here, while votives show a dramatic peak. Contrary to votives, gravestones do not develop consistently up in the sixth century: between about 550 and 525, numbers fall slightly. The dip is very small, and perhaps no more than a coincidence. Alternatively, it is possible that archaeologists’ views on the chronology of the Akropolis sculpture play a part in this: the importance attributed to the Persian debris as a turning point in artistic style may have steered chronology closer to the early fifth century, drawing material from surrounding periods towards the time of the destruction of the Akropolis.\textsuperscript{49}

After a lapse in the mid-fifth century, sculpture numbers recover and both votives and gravestones from the final quarter of the fifth century survive in relative abundance (table 1a).\textsuperscript{50} The history of this period is dominated by the Peloponnesian war. As with the Persian wars in the first quarter of the century, it is unrealistic to let wartime conditions alone account for developments in sculpture. The timing of the two wars in relation to the sculpture peaks in the record is enlightening. On the Greek mainland, the Persians first struck in 491/0; they did the most damage to Attika in 480/79. The entire episode was contained within the first quarter of the fifth century. The Peloponnesian war, on the other hand, spanned the larger part of two quarter centuries, running on and off between 431/0 and 404/3 BC (in Attika and elsewhere), and this is discounting the preamble to the war in the second quarter of the fifth century. Furthermore, the Persian war took place at the end of a prolific sculpture era, when sculpture numbers were evidently just starting to decline (chart 1). By contrast, at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war numbers were rising from a deep low, a trend which continued and even intensified throughout the war years. Not even in the

\begin{footnotes}

\footnote{Boardman \textit{GSCP}, 90, 183. This also applies to gravestones, at least in the first half of the sixth century (Richter \textit{AGA}, 2–3). Regarding the votive monuments: the percentage of smaller korai for example is quite high in the late archaic period but since they were placed on columns and pillars, the whole monument would have been quite impressive. Cf. Jacob–Felsch 1969, 15–7; Kissas 2000, 19–20; Karakasi 2001, 147; Keesling 2003, 12.}

\footnote{If this has happened, evidence for this phenomenon might be found in the sculptural and epigraphic chronologies of style: see section II.2. also Hurwit 1989, 73; Keesling 2003, xv, 42–55 for a more detailed summary of the discussion on the relation between epigraphy and sculpture; Stewart 2008\textsuperscript{1} and 2008\textsuperscript{2} for style.}

\footnote{In casu 56 votives and 76 gravestones in the database. See table 1.}
\end{footnotes}
fourth century does the evidence show any onset of decline, in contrast to the situation around the Persian wars. In short, the first of the major wars seems to end on the eve of a lull in sculpture production, whereas the second war seems without consequence for sculpture, allowing marble votives and gravestones to bloom throughout its duration and into the fourth century.

The two wars surely evoked different responses among the inhabitants of Athens, thus changing sculpture and the sculpture trade as well. Yet there must have been other factors, more inherent to the production and use of Athenian stone votives and gravestones and less intertwined with the events of fifth-century history. After all, sculpture itself changed during the two centuries, and so must have the Athenians’ views on it. A good example is the rise of bronze, which apparently became a popular alternative to marble, notably for votives.

In this chapter, two types of analysis will be applied to the material: a statistical and comparative method. The data record which was collected for this study has been submitted to these two methods first in its entirety, second, according to function (votive or sepulchral), and last, divided by provenance. The aim is to investigate, in so far as possible, to which extent the trends in the preserved sculpture are representative of actual quantities of sculpture produced in the sixth and fifth centuries. To this end, quantities of votives and gravestones will not only be compared to each other but also to numbers of their respective supports. Where the amount of preserved sculpture allows it, statistical analysis will be applied. Finally, non-sculptural material from Athens may shed some light on which patterns are typical for sculpture, and which are more general phenomena. Thus, this chapter will

---

51 Bergemann 1997, 159–79 lists naïskos and so-called ‘Bildfeld’ stelai from the end of the fifth century and in the fourth. His sources are: Scholl 1996 for the latter; Conze AG; and Clairmont CAT for general overviews. Although the provenance of the pieces is not listed in Bergemann’s catalogue, a summary count shows that all of Attika produced more than 180 grave stelai in c. 390–360, just over 340 in 360–330 and nearly 140 in 330–300. Some of these are from the city itself. The high numbers of all Attic material justify the notion that sculpture from the city, too, did well in the fourth century. Some of the evidence is presented in table and chart A.

52 Especially for votive sculpture, bronzes would be ideal for comparison. This would require a re-evaluation and narrowing down of the dates, which are not always specified in publications (cf. Keesling 2003, xv, 77–85; for the earlier period they are available: Scholl 2006).

53 Tables and charts present the total numbers of votives and gravestone per quarter century; the analysis on which these results is based, e.g. the arguments about dates and other details of each sculpture or base, are listed in the database on the CD.
examine the parameters within which the preserved material reflects the art world of sculpture in sixth and fifth-century Athens.\(^54\)

**Votive Sculpture and Bases**

Besides sculpture proper, 288 supports of various types (table 1a) have been included in this study, mostly because they preserve sockets showing the kind of object they once carried – statues, stelai, tripods or basins – and more importantly whether the object was in bronze or marble.\(^55\) Supports for marble statues can arguably be counted for as many marble votives or gravestones: lack of attribution of statues to bases means either that the statue which a base carried is not preserved, or that the statue or the base or both are in too poor a state to trace the connection.\(^56\) Of the 288 bases, only 42 examples are sepulchral (diagram 1; tables 1a–b) and no less than 246 are parts of dedications. Almost all of the latter are from the Akropolis, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter.

The picture of all votive bases closely resembles that of the corresponding sculpture, though the two are not identical (chart 1b). A basic statistic analysis establishes a significant difference in development between votive bases and votive sculpture.\(^57\) Similar to the latter,

\(^54\) The aim of this discussion is not to establish once and for all how Athenian sculptural material should be interpreted. Such an objective is not only unachievable, but would also require much wider research than falls within the scope of this study. The goal in this chapter is a description of the main trends in the record of votives and gravestones. Some tentative interpretations are to further discussion.

\(^55\) Cf. pls. 1b–c, 16c, 43d. In 26 cases the material of the supported object (votive or sepulchral) is not clear, though the type of sculpture is. For the completeness of the bases in the dataset see Introduction, p. 13 f.

\(^56\) It is often impossible to connect sculpture fragments to a base, but in this study bases and unattributed fragments are used nonetheless. This is because first, most Athenian sculpture was studied so thoroughly in the 20th century that if a link is possible, it is likely to have been found, and second, problems of undiscovered matches can be avoided by analysing bases and sculpture as separate groups. It is admittedly inevitable that some fragments whose link to an existing base or statue remains unknown are counted double. There are c. 20 ascertained combinations of marble votive statues and bases; e.g. stele Akr. 1332 (cat. V 164) with base Akr. 13250, cat. B 70. Of grave monuments, only one has a known base: NYMM 16.174.6 (cat. G 34) with NYMM 12.158 (IG I\(^3\) 1196, cat. B 188). KM P 1051 (cat. G 22) and KM P 699 (cat. G 105) are sometimes attributed to the Xenophantes base (KM I 389, IG I\(^3\) 1218, cat. B 4), but neither attribution is certain.

\(^57\) A chi-square test on the totals of sculpted votives and all votive bases (including those for non-marble votives) results in a value of 71.171 (df = 7, p < 0.00). See table C.1.
numbers of bases for marble dedications increase considerably from the third to the last quarter of the sixth century. But while the quantity of sculpted votives starts to decrease early in the fifth century, that of bases first grows (table 1b). Compared with sculpture, numbers of votive bases come down less abruptly in the middle of the fifth century, from 32 in the second quarter of the century to 15 in the third quarter. After that, bases for marble dedications all but vanish.

Although the overall trend in votive sculpture differs statistically from that in votive bases, there are similarities too. Peaks and lows in votive bases are apparently less extreme than those in sculpture. Additionally, there seems to be a slight delay compared with votive sculpture. This last point is most evident at the turn from the sixth to the fifth century, when votives go down, yet bases still rise (chart 1b). They follow the downward trend a quarter century later. Another example appears in the third quarter of the fifth century, when numbers of votive bases are still falling, while votive sculpture has already adopted a new and upward direction. In the bases for marble statues from the later fifth century, the divergence is only small, since they are preserved in low numbers. However, if bases for votives in other materials (bronze or unspecified) are included, the pattern becomes clearer.

An explanation for the votive bases’ tendency to run behind on sculpture could hardly originate in a consistent delay in the development of bases in relation to sculpture. After all, why would the Athenians increase production of sculpture but not of the necessary pedestals? Thus, this trend cannot have its roots in antiquity itself. Rather, the difference could be caused by the separate stylistic chronologies of archaeology and epigraphy: as the material would suggest, a tendency of haste in the former or tardiness in the latter. This would undermine the representativity of the data in the record of this study considerably. It is important to play the devil’s advocate and entertain this possibility for the moment, to find out if the difference between bases and sculpture comes from the stylistic frameworks of the two disciplines.

One way to establish a chronological discrepancy is to extend the date range into the fourth century. If bases are dated consistently later than sculpture because of different stylistic frameworks, numbers of bases would have to increase in the first quarter of the fourth century, after the sculpture has done so rather steeply in the late fifth (chart 1). Although fourth-century material is beyond the scope of this study, the trend in bases in the

---

58 Hurwit 1989, 73 rightly remarks that epigraphy also uses style to date inscriptions; yet the stylistic analysis is directed at different objects and uses other criteria. Cf. Keesling 2003, 50–2.
late fifth century shows no signs of an approaching upward turn. A quick glance at some relevant corpora seems to confirm the conclusion that no return of bases is afoot in the fourth–century material. So, no evidence for a divergence in stylistic frameworks can be found here. If any discrepancies occur, the material suggests they must have been short-lived and unsystematic.

Bases with known and preserved statues constitute another means of establishing whether archaeology dates differently than epigraphy. In fact, sculpture and inscriptions of such ‘complete’ monuments rarely have inconsistent dates: there are only five examples among the preserved monuments in this study. One of these, a statuette of Athena, is in a sculptural style suggesting a later date than the lettering on her base (pls. 2a–b), while the other four cases are exactly the reverse. Evidently, the deviations in scholarship are minor: five is a very small number in a total of 408 stone votives (table 1b). Considering that not even all deviations are similar, i.e. are consistently later or earlier, a systematic difference in dates of marble votives and the corresponding inscriptions is again hard to contend.

Thus far, the votives in this study have been compared to the record of complete monuments (including bases), and to fourth–century material. Besides this, comparisons with older dedications and with other types of votives are useful for investigating the stylistic frameworks of the late–archaic and early–classical periods. Particularly interesting is the development of bases for bronze votives, because they have the advantage of being a clearly defined separate group: though directly related to the bases of marble votives, they have a distinct development of their own. One might expect this to be similar to bases for marble

Cf. table A; chart A. Fourth–century gravestones survive in great numbers but rarely with bases. Cf. above n. 51, Bergemann 1997, 159–79 (catalogue). Also Conze AG; Meyer 1993, 104 and passim (the latter for inscriptions). Precise dates are rarely given, but gravestones dated in bulk to the fourth or later centuries are abundantly preserved (IG ii–iii2 e.g. pp. 549–688 and 699–866). For votives a similar rule applies: see IG I1.

See above n. 56 for an overview of sculpture with known pedestals or bases.


All votive statues (338) and bases for marble votives (92), excluding bases with a preserved statue (22). Bases for bronzes or unspecified statues were in this case left out. See table 1b.

Cf. Hurwit 1989; Steskal 2004; Stewart 20081 and 20082 for the beginnings of the classical style at this time.
votives, if the Athenians were equally fond of the two materials throughout the sixth and fifth centuries. However, since far fewer bronze votives survive than marble ones, connections between preserved bronze sculpture and their bases are much rarer than for marble statues. The date of bases for bronzes can rarely be compared to the actual votive which it carried, and a consistent chronology is harder to establish.

Bases for marble and bronze votives evolve with some notable differences. First is the start of the bases for bronze votives. In the third quarter of the sixth century, the first base for a bronze dedication, probably a vessel, appears in the material (table 1b). After this, numbers rise rapidly to 37 in the final quarter of the sixth century and to 57 in the early fifth century. If a similar evolution of bases for bronze and marble is expected, the drop of the latter after the first quarter of the fifth century should also occur in bases for bronze. This proves to be the case (table 1b), but far more slowly for bronze bases than for marble bases. The 19 examples of bases for bronze votives are half of all the votive material from c. 475–450 (table 1b) and so add considerably to the discrepancy between marble votive sculpture and all votive bases in the fifth century which was discussed earlier.

Later in the century, bases for bronze votives rejoin those for marble, albeit only in general direction, as both types gradually decrease towards the end of the fifth century. Six bases for bronze votives from that period survive (table 1b). Bases for marble votives are gone before then, their last preserved example dating to the third quarter of the fifth century. By contrast, votive sculpture is soaring at this time. Neither group of bases follows its exuberant recovery in the fifth century, and it was shown above that nothing indicates a reversal of the bases’ fortune in the fourth. Since a systematic lateness in the dates of bases compared to dates of sculpture would require the bases to follow the recovery of sculpture,

---

64 Cat. B 225, EM 6222, *IG* I 597. Most sources date it just after the mid-sixth century, around 540.
66 See above p. 24. It could be argued that post–Persian material was dated up into the debris period (for example, Tölle–Kastenbein 1983); and that sculpture from the second quarter of the fifth century was dated towards the bulk of votives and gravestones at the end of that century. However, there is no sign of such a pattern in the bases; they clearly follow a different trend. It is impossible to preclude all distortion in dates devised by archaeology, epigraphy or other scholarship. However, in the material of this study and at the present state of research, a chronological shift cannot be established, and certainly not to a degree where adaptation of the framework of dates is warranted.
the idea that epigraphic chronology is systematically later than the stylistic sequence of sculpture can be dismissed. The second suggestion, that a shift between the epigraphic and sculptural chronologies would come to light in the bases for bronze, can be rejected as well: what differences there are do not amount to a systematic or recognisable pattern.

Summarising, the data in this study show nothing to suggest that the differences between votive sculpture and votive bases around 500 BC (chart 1b) are more than a one-time phenomenon. It is neither repeated nor continued before or after. Thus, the trends of bases and sculpture in the record cannot be explained by diverging chronological frameworks. The bases for bronze votives simply start later and continue somewhat longer than those for marble. In the second quarter of the fifth century, bases for bronzes reach their largest proportion in the entire period studied here, almost half of Athenian votives (table 1b), while marble votive sculpture falls to a level similar to that of the start of the sixth century. This may seem to suggest a consistent, and therefore scholarship-induced dating down of the bases, but no such pattern can be found later on in the fifth century. By then, both bases for bronzes and marble have disappeared, in votive as well as in grave monuments; sculpture itself fully recovers and remains abundant in the next century, while bases do not.

Although this overview to an extent refutes the looming notion of swerving stylistic chronologies and thus supports the representational validity of the data, the differences in development of bases and sculpture proper still require an explanation. If there is no pattern, and if the existing variation cannot be attributed to various methods of dating, then what is going on? Does Athenian sculpture become baseless?

Anticipating on a later chapter, it should be noted that the peak in votive sculpture at the end of the fifth century consists for a large part of reliefs (tables 1a, 5a). Many, though

---

69 Namely 19 out of 39: 48.7%.
70 E.g. eight statues from 475–450 compared to seven from 600–575: the latter cat. V 1, Akr. 592; cat. V 62, Akr. 582; cat. V 122, Akr. 190; cat. V 156, Akr. 225, 226; cat. V 222, Akr. no.; cat. V 223, Akr. 3869; cat. V 283, EM 6521a–b. From 475–450: cat. V 158, Akr. 695; cat. V 160, Akr. 599; cat. V 245, NMA 4802; cat. V 250, AM S 218; cat. V 306, EM 6542; cat. V 314, EM 6556; cat. V 315, EM 6536; and cat. V 338, EM 6058. The date of burial of the debris and the spread of the material from the first half of the fifth century are relevant to this: see below p. 49 and further. It should be noted that the few votive statues from c. 475–450 still constitute about a quarter of all sculpture at the time. Since grave stones are so rare in this period, this means that they encompass almost a quarter of all monuments.
71 For a more detailed analysis of stelae and reliefs, below ch. IV.3.
not all of these are rather small and carry simple inscriptions on the architrave or on a rim below the relief scene. With reliefs, there is in theory little or no need for a pedestal. They may be put in slots cut out in rocky ground, or set up on existing pedestals in the crowded sanctuaries, which may have lacked space to give each new dedication its own place. Such considerations may explain dwindling numbers of bases at the end of the fifth century.\(^7\) Low numbers of bases for bronze votives at the time actually support this idea. The popularity of small votive reliefs could well have affected the market for more expensive, larger bronzes, or economic hardship may have put such bronzes out of reach for many Athenians. It will be argued in the following chapters that the favourite types of votives in the archaic period were freestanding stone statues, which were always placed on pedestals of some kind. It would be impossible to keep them upright without supports. Moreover, bases, pillars and even columns are conveniently shaped for reuse in construction. Undoubtedly, many supports from the late fifth century have disappeared into walls, foundations or lime kilns.\(^7\) But the disappearance of both statues and bases at the time when reliefs emerge seems more than a coincidence.

An interesting aspect of the material comes to light in the percentages of the bases for marble and bronze votives (table 1b). Until the end of the sixth century, those for marble are ahead, but in the final quarter the bronzes' bases overtake them. From then on, the latter predominate until the general decline of bases at the end of the fifth century.\(^7\) By then, bases for bronze votives constitute a hundred percent of all bases in the dataset. In practice, however, this entails six bases; the percentage of bases for bronze votives with respect to all votives, including sculpture, is only ten; and the impossibility of including a remotely representative number of votive bronzes severely interferes with the analysis. Rather, the waning number of bases supports the argument on genres mentioned above, that not all votive reliefs may have been set up on a pedestal or base.

---

\(^7\) There are other reasons, e.g. visibility, for putting reliefs on pedestals or pillars. Van Straten 1992, 257–9 argues that votives could be nailed to walls, or inserted in them, or hung from ceilings. Cf. below, ch. IV.6.

\(^7\) If bases are not inscribed, it is near impossible to date them, and many of this group are in all likelihood in storage in Athens without being published. Since these pieces are inaccessible and no estimates of them exist, they could not be taken into account in the current analysis.

\(^7\) Of course, numbers are in most periods rather small for a relative comparison of percentages; the approach mainly works for the period around c. 500 BC.
Differences between bases and sculpture may be explained by, for example, the rising popularity of reliefs, or the preference for smaller bronzes or terracottas. Since bronze became a favoured material for votives later than stone, its heyday might be expected later, too. The decline of bases for bronze votives was indeed kept at bay about a quarter century after that of other bases, but whether this is sufficient evidence for a ‘bronze takeover’ is doubtful. In such a scenario, bases for bronze votives would continue to do well in the later fifth century. However, the decline of bases is a general phenomenon: it applies equally to bases for bronze and marble. As will be discussed in the next section, the circumstances of conservation on various Athenian sites play an important role in this.

It can be concluded that the dates of the material in the present record are not shifted due to different scholarly traditions in archaeology and epigraphy, nor because what might be called the lure of the Persian debris. If the dates can thus be accepted more or less in accordance to the time of production of the monuments, the following must be considered. The gap which is often presumed to have occurred in the dedication of votives in Athens, and in particular on the Akropolis in the second quarter of the fifth century, turns out to be non-existent. True, the overall number of votives, namely extant votive sculpture and bases for bronze and marble votives (excluding those supports of which a corresponding statue is preserved) falls dramatically from the first to the second quarter of the fifth century. However, a total of 39 examples of votives or their bases from that second quarter are listed in the record (table 1b), which is not a small number in the wider scope of these two centuries. Rather than a break in dedications in Athens in the years after the Persian wars, this merely suggests a reduced level of activity, and most notably so in comparison with the

---

75 Conclusions about the popularity of bronzes as private votives are premature at this point. The theory that bronzes take over as the material for votives in the fifth century will be discussed below, p. 26 and p. 59.

76 Assuming that marble votives make way for bronzes in the fifth century, as e.g. in DAA, 479, Ridgway 1969, 108 and Martini 1990, 279. Pliny notes the more ancient origins of marble sculpture compared to bronze (HN 36.4) and the large number of bronze workers after Phidias, who according to Pliny was the first artist of consequence in bronze (HN 34.19). Cf. Keesling 2003, 78 for a discussion on materials.

77 Generally, it is interesting to see that bases for bronzes in the record of this study do not reach the same level as bases for marble votives in the sixth and fifth centuries. To see the meaning of these developments in bases more fully, the fourth-century material would have to be included.

78 As the suggested result of the Oath of Plataia, by (among other authors) Raubitschek DAA, 479; Boardman GSCP, 22, 90–1. Contra Ridgway SSGS, 6 (not particularly with regard to the Oath); Hurwit 1999, 141; Ferrari 2002, 14; Steskal 2004, 212–6.
high-strung demand for sculpture in the decades before. In view of the losses which can be expected just after the destruction of a city, a total of 39 extant votives is quite respectable.

The comparison of votive bases and sculpture above has shown that the chronologies of epigraphic and sculptural style in the sixth and fifth centuries are sufficiently stable to consider the dates in the record representative. This step was necessary before the record can be used in searching for interpretations of trends in the material, as well as individual cases. A further check on representativity can be achieved by analysing the gravestones of Athens. One might expect some degree of similarity in the trends of votives and gravestones. After all, it is reasonable to assume that many variables of production, placement and commission of Athenian sculpture apply equally for both.

**GRAVESTONES AND BASES**

Sepulchral material survives in less well-balanced proportions than votives, with only 42 remaining bases to 175 grave sculptures (table 1a, chart 1a) listed in the record. Numbers of gravestones are relatively constant compared to the dramatic peaks in votive sculpture. From the first until the final quarter of the sixth century, gravestones hover around 20, only rising to 28 in the last quarter (table 1b). In the fifth century, numbers drop to six examples in the first, then to one in the second quarter. Contrary to older Athenian grave monuments, the material from the early fifth century often seems quite modest both in original concept and in preservation. For example, three out of six pieces from the first quarter of the fifth century are fragments of simple basins. Not until the end of the fifth century do gravestones return to prominence, reaching 77 examples in the final quarter. The second half of the fifth century is the only time in two hundred years when extant gravestones outnumber votives.


81 KM P 1615–1616, 1617 and 1618 (see previous). For the status of basins as monuments, see further ch. IV.3.

82 From 450–425: 12 votives, 16 gravestones; from 425–400: 77 gravestones, 56 votives.
Grave sculpture from the final decades of the fifth century may abound, corresponding bases are absent: the dataset contains no more than two sepulchral bases from the entire fifth century (table 1b). The more numerous sixth-century examples more or less follow the development of marble grave sculpture at a lower level. The similarity is only superficial, though. In the third quarter of the sixth century, numbers of gravestones fall slightly (chart 1c), while their bases rise continuously, from five examples in the second quarter to 13 in the next, and to 18 in the final quarter of the sixth century. The deviation, however small, is important, for it shows that the slightly lower number of sepulchral sculptures from this period may just as well be due to the circumstances of preservation or to coincidence as to an actual decrease.

A further point of consideration is the following. The dip in sepulchral sculpture in the third quarter of the sixth century is quite minor (table 1b). Only one base from the sixth century can be matched to a statue, and therefore the rest can cautiously be added to the total of monuments (table 1a). The result shows a consistent rise in grave monuments throughout the sixth century. This being the case, one historical discussion can be closed: Peisistratos’ possible curbing of expenditure on gravestones, in order to prevent display by rivalling aristocratic families, cannot be the cause of diminishing numbers of sculptural monuments. The archaeological evidence of grave monuments offers no decrease to corroborate such an attempt at the time of his reign or that of his sons.

In the fifth century, funerary bases seem to disappear practically overnight from the record. This may be connected to another aspect of the gravestones’ history, namely the shift in type of grave monument in the two centuries. Sixth-century monuments are often impressive, for example, tall stelai with capitals and sphinxes on top or bases with large kouroi; but at the end of the fifth century, most gravestones are reliefs of modest size and often mediocre in execution. Many have no sculpted details but just an inscribed name of
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83 Cat. B 103, EM 10635; and cat. B 128, EM 10254.
84 Only one sepulchral base the record might possibly have carried a bronze: cat. B 175, EM 10255, IG I* 1202, dated to the third quarter of the sixth century.
87 Reliefs have a sculpted decorations, stelai are smooth. Though these are the criteria for listing in the database, ‘grave stelai’ is used for reliefs and stelai in the text of this study. If only stelai are meant, this is indicated.
the deceased, and the front face of the stele may or may not have born a now faded painting. In some cases, names have just been roughly scratched into the surface of a summarily worked stone, or even a modified stone that was originally made for some other purpose, for example a roof tile. Obviously, these small slabs are less in need of a base or support than the large stelai and figures from the sixth century. Monumental gravestones from the fifth century often were set up in a *peribolos*, incorporated in larger structures.

In conclusion, two trends stand out in the grave material. First, grave sculpture became on average less monumental in the fifth century, which is among other things reflected in the gradual disappearance of the bases. Second, the number of extant gravestones is almost three times higher in the last quarter of the fifth century than in any earlier period. It looks as if in gravestones of the late fifth century, numbers prevail over monumentality. Considering the ongoing Peloponnesian war, the evacuation of Attic citizens into the city, and the epidemics that hit Athens during the final decades of the fifth century, it is to be expected that many sepulchral monuments were needed. More surprising is the lack of gravestones from the earlier fifth century. For if the inhabitants of Athens found the resources for honouring their dead during the Peloponnesian war, why would they not have done so just after the Persian wars? Another source of puzzlement is the fact that the inhabitants of crowded, exhausted, war-ridden Athens in the late fifth century made such efforts to obtain gravestones, while comparatively, their attention for votives seems to have been less intensive.

**VOTIVE AND GRAVE MONUMENTS: A COMPARISON**

The preponderance of votive material over gravestones in this study is beyond doubt; the question is whether sculpted dedications outnumber gravestones throughout the research
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89 E.g. Hegeso (cat. G 62, NMA 3624) though the *peribolos* is from the fourth century, and Eupheros (cat. G 46, KM P 1169). It is likely that the fourth-century *‘Bildfeldstelen’* would often have been set up like these two examples. Moreover, the thicker *naiskoi* which developed in the fourth century could also stand without bases. Most of the *periboloi* in Athens are from the late fifth or the early fourth century (Garland 1982). See also Bergemann 1997, 158–79 and 181–2 for *naiskoi*; 183–210 for a catalogue of *periboloi* (cf. Morris 1998).
90 For this and other questions about patrons’ motivations to order sculpture, cf. below ch. IV.4–5.
period, or this is the result of concentrations in parts of the two centuries. In other words, do gravestones follow the development of the votives and their prominent peak around 500 BC? For most of the sixth and fifth centuries, trends in votive and grave sculpture run in the same direction, but their total quantities differ. These variations occur in particular in the period of the approximately fifty years around the turn of the century. With votive sculpture topping gravestones by 85 and 97 in the last quarter of the sixth century and the first quarter of fifth (table 1, chart 1), this period is at the root of the total difference between votives and gravestones. The end of the fifth century also shows a considerable deviation, but there it is the gravestones which surpass the votives by 21. Apart from these three quarter-century episodes, differences between votives and gravestones are minor.91

This pattern does not change much if bases are included (charts 1b–d).92 Variations between all votive and all grave monuments in stone, including bases for marble sculptures, are most conspicuous at the end of the sixth century and in the first quarter of the fifth century. In the first three quarters of the sixth century, the difference between votive and grave sculpture is not affected much by adding bases. However, larger gaps tend to widen when bases are taken into account (table 1b, chart 1d). For example, 106 votives from the first quarter of the fifth century grow to 133 when bases for marble are included and to 177 with those for bronze votives. Gravestones from the same period increase from 28 to 46 with bases, a considerable rise, but bases for bronze obviously cannot add anything in this case. Similarly, seven more votive than sepulchral statues survive from the second quarter of the fifth century. The gap grows to 17 when bases for marble votives are included, and with all bases reaches 38. This pattern begins to reverse in the third quarter of the century, when marble votives are overtaken by sepulchral marble.93

---

91 The differences per period are: 600–575, 2; 575–550, 0; 550–525, 1; 475–450, 7; 450–425, 4.
92 In a test on total numbers of votives and gravestones including all bases except those of which the statue is preserved, over the eight periods between 600 and 400 BC. (table C.2), the chi-square value is 179.043 (df = 7, p < .000). In other words, there is a statistically significant difference between the development of these two groups. For votive and grave sculpture only (table C.3), the chi-square is 106.092 (df = 7, p < .000), i.e. significantly different as well, as is the result of the complete marble monuments (table C.4), which excludes the bases for bronzes and duplicates, but includes all other materials: chi-square 127.677, df = 7, p < .000). The divergence of grave and votive material at around 500 BC, and in the late fifth century are the cause of this result. If these periods are excluded, the significance disappears, but at the same time the sample then becomes so small that the test is no longer sufficiently reliable.
93 Votive sculpture from 450–425: 12, with one base for a marble votive; gravestones 16.
Thus, the differences between dedications and gravestones are enhanced by bases until the mid-fifth century. This does not apply in the second half of that century, when gravestones outnumber dedications: they bring the total of votive monuments to 62 in the final quarter (table 1b), while sepulchral monuments remain at 77. A quarter century earlier, bases for bronze votives had even compensated for the entire difference between sepulchral and votive monuments. All this shows that already large differences around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century increase further when bases are thrown into the equation, largely because of the higher survival rate of votive bases, and especially of those for bronzes. The pattern applies until approximately the middle of the fifth century (chart 1d); but it does not work for the later part of that century.

So far, the analysis has shown that numbers of sculpted votives and gravestones are fairly constant in the first three quarters of the sixth century (table 1b; chart 1c). Differences between the two groups are small and inclusion of bases in this period changes very little, since both votive and sepulchral bases rise slowly and sculpture quantities are stable. From the final quarter of the sixth century onward, the trends of votives and gravestones diverge. The gravestones and their bases continue at a relatively steady pace. Although the final quarter of the sixth century offers a respectable amount of grave sculpture (in sepulchral bases it has the highest number of any quarter-century period studied here), these numbers cannot quite match 75 extant votive bases and 113 votive statues (table 1b; chart 1d). This situation continues in the first quarter of the fifth century.

Two things emerge from this survey of the figures. First, the quarter-centuries in which strong change occurs in the sculpture record (the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, the second quarter of the fifth and the final quarter of the fifth century) coincide with the times when differences between votives and gravestones are largest, both proportionally and in absolute numbers. Combined with the fact that numbers of gravestones are steady, except

94 E.g. 21 more gravestones than votives from the final quarter of the fifth century.
95 With a total of 27 examples against 18 gravestones. Cat. B 137, EM 6295, is for an unspecified statue; and cat. 136, AM I 5128 for a marble votive. The other 13 bases for votives from this period are for bronzes. From 425-400: cat. B 177, Akr. no. 7; cat. B 176, Akr. 13264; cat. B 104, AM I 3398; three in the Epigraphical Museum, cat. B 105, EM 10330; cat. B 143, EM 6296; cat. B 146, EM 6297. In the record of this study, no sepulchral bases from this period are preserved.
96 For marble votive statuary, just one base from the second half of the fifth century remains: cat. B 136 (previous note), a base for a marble statue, perhaps by Kalamis (450-425). Only one base is for an unspecified gravestone: that of Menesthos, EM 10254, cat. B 128. Cf. below n. 209.
for the peak of the late fifth century, it appears that it is the votives which cause most of the difference. The statistical analysis confirms that the significant divergence is mainly rooted in the material from the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, a majority of which are votives. Thus, it stands to reason that the higher than normal preservation frequency of the Akropolis votives around 500 BC is the main cause of the diverging trends in votives and gravestones.

Considering the background of these late-archaic dedications, namely the Persian debris, it seems safe to say that from an archaeological point of view, this votive peak is the anomaly. The increase in the final quarter of the sixth century does not reflect the normal preservation frequency for the Athenian material, but a much higher one. The high number of extant dedications from the sixth and fifth centuries draws mainly from the one large peak of votives around the turn of the century, and this difference between votives and gravestones increases when bases (mostly votives from the Akropolis as well) are included. Even though the large quantity of gravestones from the end of the fifth century compensates somewhat for the overall surplus of votives, and despite generally similar levels of sixth and fifth-century votives and gravestones outside of the peak periods, the predominance of the dedications over sepulchral monuments is unchallenged.

Yet even if the debris material thus constitutes a distortion, the great quantity of dedicated sculpture from the last quarter of the sixth and the first quarter of the fifth century reflects how popular these votives were in that period. Regardless of the difficulties in interpreting these numbers, sculpture production was evidently high during the late sixth and early fifth centuries. It is impossible to know how much of the sculpture from the Akropolis actually went into the deposits, but in all it may have been a larger portion of the original assemblage than is commonly assumed. After all, practically the entire Akropolis has been excavated. Furthermore, at the time when systematic excavation started, the deposits are likely to have still contained relatively much of what was buried there in the fifth century. If so, the Persian debris may be one of the rare chances to approximate the production rates of sculpture in Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries. The peak of dedications around the turn from the sixth century to the fifth could be more representative of real manufacture rates than is traditionally thought.

---

97 According to Korres 2002, 181, some remnants of original stratigraphy are preserved in pockets along the North Wall of the Akropolis: excavating these could offer a firmer view of the stratigraphic sequence and the possibility of a representative sculpture record.
This is, of course, a paradox: the debris peak is an anomaly, yet at the same time, it may be representative. The answer lies in definitions. Within the context of an average survival rate of sculpture in an ancient city which has been inhabited to the present day, and thus offers limited possibilities for excavation, Athens’ gravestones represent a default development. In principle, their pattern cannot be taken as a reflection of actual production, because too much was lost and cannot be recovered. By contrast, the very clear and abrupt rise and fall of votive monuments roughly around the Persian wars constitutes an abnormal preservation rate: it deviates from what can be expected, namely a trend like that of the gravestones.

It would obviously be unwise to attempt to approximate absolute figures from such a distant period, but some aspects of the material are hopeful. The proportion of preserved votives from the Akropolis deposits is higher than normal, and the layers in which they were discovered have been left relatively intact until excavation. As will be argued below, it is unlikely that the Athenians put damaged votive sculpture anywhere else than in the deposits on the Akropolis. If this is the case, the assemblage may cover a relatively large part of the original collection of archaic sculpted monuments. Consequently, the debris would then not only reflect the sequence of developments in sculpture through time, but also could be fairly representative as a closed assemblage from this period.

The discussion in this section has traced the relation between the two groups of material, one of which is preserved according to more average circumstances, whereas the other was submitted to extraordinary burial. However, the representativity of the preserved votives of the Akropolis compared to the original quantity of dedications at the time of deposition is only partly necessary to the purposes of this study. An analysis within the limits of each of the quarter-century intervals, for example, of provenance or of type of marble, would not require proof that the preserved material as a whole reflects exactly what once stood on the Akropolis. Nevertheless, the representativity of the extant material is an interesting issue. The remainder of this section will therefore explore the following question: which conclusions, if any, can at this stage be drawn about the rise and fall of the manufacture rate of sculpture, and its reflection in the votives and gravestones of the sixth and fifth centuries?

It is conceivable that in a large sacred compound such as the Akropolis, dedications were taken down every now and then, as is known of bronzes.98 Taking this into account, the
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abrupt rise of sculpture in the last quarter of the sixth century could in theory reflect three scenarios. In the first, the Athenians might have cleared the Akropolis intentionally just before the final quarter of the sixth century, for example to make room for a building programme. A second possibility is that the material has been lost, because survival chances would be generally lower for material further removed in time from the moment of burial. The third and last option is that the level of production was actually lower before the final quarter of the sixth century. In the latter case, the increase in sculpture would represent an extremely steep rise in the demand for sculpture. Such abrupt popularity seems rather unnatural and would require further explanation.

A similar argument applies to gravestones, albeit with an extreme loss of favour instead of rising numbers. The fact that there is only one preserved gravestone from the second quarter of the fifth century in the data record suggests that far fewer gravestones were produced than in the archaic period, although this inference has to be nuanced by the influence of, again, the circumstances of preservation. Nonetheless, it can be assumed that production of gravestones was low at this time. The one example from the second quarter of the fifth century, however, precludes an argument ex silentio, namely the idea that production of gravestones came to a complete halt after the Persian wars. The conclusion from the material would be that the production of gravestones was sometimes very slow in the fifth century, yet it was uninterrupted.

Although tables and charts thus far have conveyed quite a few dissimilarities in the developments of votives and gravestones, their depositional histories are not unalike. Votives were interred on the Akropolis as parts of foundation deposits, for ramps and as fill for the containment walls; gravestones served much the same purposes in the Themistoklean wall of the second quarter of the fifth century. Theoretically, this could have led to parallel levels of preservation of gravestones and votives in that period. The nature of a defensive city–wall is that it covers many kilometres, mostly underneath the modern city and out of reach. As a result, too little is known about the complete structure and its possible use of the material in cemeteries around the city. One could argue that hypothetically, an inventory of sculpture from the entire wall would even the score with votives, provided, of course, that similar quantities had existed in the first place. Given the actual extent of excavation, it makes sense that gravestones in the dataset are few compared to the sculpture from the votive deposits of

---

99 EM 10225, see above n. 84.
the late sixth and the early fifth centuries. However, this cannot be taken as evidence of lower production rates of sepulchral sculpture, only of smaller quantities of preserved and excavated grave monuments.

One phenomenon strays notably from the general pattern in the material: the boom of gravestones in the final quarter of the fifth century, pushing them substantially ahead of votives for the first time in two centuries. At that moment, there were no major reasons of deposition, conservation or construction, as there were in the early fifth century, which could have ensured a high survival rate of this kind of sculpted material. Thus, in the absence of a ‘Peloponnesian debris’ from the early fourth century, the steep rise is puzzling. It suggests different *raisons d’être* for the peaks of votives around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, and of gravestones at the end of the fifth. The function of the sculpture may play its part in this, and will be investigated below. First, another topic requires some attention: as has become clear from the above, the provenance of votives and gravestones is a key element in the interpretation of their development. The next section will examine this further.

2 *Provenance: Sanctuaries and Cemeteries*

The provenance pattern of Athenian votive sculpture (table 2a, chart 2; map 2) develops along lines which are similar to those of its total amount, as is to be expected with a majority of votives coming from one site: the Akropolis. For gravestones, trends in provenance are less consistent and less uniform (chart 2a). The main find spot for gravestones is sometimes the Kerameikos (in the first half of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth), at others the Agora (in the third quarter of the sixth century). The only provenance which dominates with larger numbers of gravestones is the ‘rest of Athens’ (Athens Other) in the final quarter of the sixth century and the second half of the fifth (table 2a). This category comprises scattered locations in the city, which for want of a better solution are treated as one group in this study.

Gravestones are relatively scarce, so that variations in provenance appear rather more conspicuous than they actually are. Their bases are even fewer (chart 2c): before the fifth century, two-thirds of the sepulchral bases in the record come from the Kerameikos. The equivalent sculpture from the site comes to 38 percent of all gravestones. However, the most prolific period of the Kerameikos, the final quarter of the sixth century, has only 11
bases (table 2b). That seems somewhat meagre in comparison with numbers of bases for votives from the Akropolis in their best period, namely 69 from the final quarter of the sixth century and 100 from the first quarter of the fifth. Rendered in percentages, the impression of an Akropolis monopoly is confirmed (table 2a): more than three quarters of all votive sculpture and about 90 percent of all votive bases were found on the Akropolis or on its slopes. In grave monuments, Athens Other is the largest provenance category with 47 percent. Thus, funerary sculpture is much more evenly spread over various sites in the city than dedications are.

Of course, percentages are not very representative when numbers are as low as in the sepulchral bases of sixth and fifth-century Athens. But what is already clear from this survey is that the Kerameikos is the main source of funerary bases, but much less so of grave sculpture (charts 2a–c). This situation and the supremacy of the Akropolis in the provenance of votives will be the two main issues in the following section. The votive material will be compared to pottery and terracottas from the Akropolis, the gravestones to some of their counterparts from Attika. Bases for bronze sculpture will shed some light on the role which this material played on the various sanctuaries and cemeteries of Athens.

THE AKROPOLIS

Material from the Akropolis dominates the votives of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries as well as the record of this study in general (table 2c). After relatively constant numbers during the first three quarters of the sixth century, the next two periods provide 96 and 94 examples respectively. In the second and third quarters of the fifth century, numbers tumble to five in each period, before rising again in the final decades of the fifth century (chart 2). The record contains 28 Akropolis votives from the last quarter of that century. If the 12
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100 Dated 475–450: archer, Akr. 599, cat. V 160; diskos, EM 6058, cat. V 338 and three frs. of basins, EM 6536, 6542 and 6556; cat. V 315, 306 and 314 respectively. Dated 450–425 are the group of Prokne and Itys (Akr. 1358, cat. V 165), although contested (see the Votive Dates table in the database); two reliefs with goddesses, Akr. 2478 and 2508, cat. V 252 and 251 respectively; a head (probably of Athena), Akr. 635, cat. V 155 and the head of a youth Akr. 699, cat. V 249. From the Asklepieion in this period is a relief with a woman, NMA 2544 Χ∆, cat. V 249. For the sculpture of the transitional period between archaic and classical on the Akropolis, see especially Stewart 2008.
dedications (table 2a) from the late fifth-century Asklepieion on the southern slope of the hill (map 6a) are included, this number rises to 40. Straightforward as they may seem, these numbers must be approached with caution. Since the circumstances on the Akropolis, especially the Persian debris, play such a key role in the absolute chronology of Athenian and Greek art, the evidence from this site has to be weighed within the context of its history as much as is possible, for example, by comparing it with other available quantitative data. The representational validity of trends in sculpture can only be established in connection with the events of their time and the excavation history.

The Akropolis deposits known as the Perserschutt are a bane and a blessing to archaeology (map 3a). Were it not for this assemblage, the archaic votive sculpture of Athens would be largely beyond our knowledge. Nonetheless, the material seems to raise more questions than it can answer. Especially in light of the archaeological potential of a site like the Akropolis, there is a frustrating lack of information. Over the last decade or so, several comprehensive studies have been published recounting and re-analysing the exploration of the Akropolis in the past two hundred years. More or less systematic excavations on the site were started in the first half of the 19th century by L. Ross. Between 1836 and 1855 he published reports of his campaigns, which he hoped would uncover the foundation layers of the Parthenon and shed light on details of its construction. To this end he excavated trenches between the Parthenon and the south wall of the Akropolis. However, he became aware of an older layer below the one he was aiming for, and had it searched thoroughly (maps 3c-d).

101 The Asklepieion record is counted as part of the Akropolis, but kept separately in the charts for research purposes later on. There is an exception: a pillar for a bronze statue, EM 4469a is from the Asklepieion, but since it dates from before the foundation of Asklepios’ cult on the south slope of the Akropolis and may well have been dedicated to Athena, it is counted as part of the Akropolis bases. Cf. also cat. B 252 in the database.


104 Somewhat more randomly by Count Choiseul-Gouffier and Fauvel in 1787; then by Lord Elgin between 1800 and 1802. The Akropolis was officially declared an archaeological site by the Bavarian-born king of Greece, Otto, in 1834. Hurwit 1999, 98, 298; Schneider 2001, 47; Steskal 2004, 39 n. 50.

105 Ross 1855, 104. The word used by Ross is ‘durchwühlen’. Lindenlauf 1997, 52–3 gives the exact date of January 4th 1836 (Gregorian calendar). What Ross considered lesser material (tiles, damaged building blocks, and ‘shapeless and worthless marble lumps’), he had brought to the
Many of the fragments from this layer, dated by Ross before the construction of the Parthenon, showed traces of burning, in particular some red-figured sherds. Just above his pre-Parthenon layer, Ross uncovered stone chippings (maps 3c–d). Because of the ‘Persian’ date of the layer below, he believed that this material was building debris of Kimonian date. Although he realised that his burnt level had to be connected to the Persian destruction of the Akropolis, his find received surprisingly little attention in contemporary archaeological circles and for some time afterwards. It was not until the extensive excavations by P. Kavvadias in the 1880s revealed spectacular discoveries of sculpture from the debris that the issue was put at the forefront of scholarly attention.

At the end of the 19th and in the early 20th century, a new enthusiasm for pre-classical Greek art led to a greater interest in the monuments destroyed by the Persians. As
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107 Between the foundations of the south–east corner of the Parthenon and the top of the south wall of the Akropolis (known as K1, Bundgaard 1976, 79–81). Cf. Lindenlauf 1997, pl. 3.1; Bundgaard 1976, 75 fig. 42, 80 fig. 44 and pls. A, B.2, K.4. The latter dates this wall to 454–448, whereas Lindenlauf considers it much older, probably pre-Persian. She argues among others that the fill behind K1 does not contain any marble chips until quite late (only in the ninth layer do poros fragments, marble chippings etc. start to occur). Cf. Lindenlauf 1997, 67–9; Tschira 1972, 158–231; Korres 1997¹, 225; Steskal 2004, 40–2; Stewart 2008¹, 395–407 (Kimonian date: the fills are from construction rather than from the Persian destruction).
108 This to the point where notwithstanding Ross’s clear reference to the Persians in the report (Ross 1855, 104), later authors doubted that he had realised what he had found: Studniczka, AM 12 (1887) 372. See also Lindenlauf 1997, 52 n. 54.
109 Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906; republished in Bundgaard 1974. A large collection of sculpture was discovered between 1863 and 1866 when the museum was built on the south–eastern outcrop of the Akropolis, in the remains of Building IV. Among the finds were the torso of the Kritios boy (Akr. 698, cat. V 51) and parts of the Moschophoros (Akr. 624, cat. V 2). The 1860s excavations were conducted by K. Pittakis; slightly later by P. Evstriadis. The latter composed the excavation report in 1878, and his find list of that time is not consistent with reports contemporary with the excavation, as observed by H. Brunn (Jdl 1864, 83–9). Cf. Bundgaard 1974, 9–25; Hurwit 1989, 44–55; Lindenlauf 1997, 54; Steskal 2004, 46–9; Stewart 2008¹, 389–401.
110 Hurwit 1989, 54. Lindenlauf (1997, 54–5) argues that the fact that the classical material had mostly been exhaust in publications and the extensive excavations on the Akropolis in the 1880s played its part.
a result, the term *Perserschutt* evolved and the importance of the debris for absolute
chronology became clear. The discovery of, among other things, 14 archaic statues near the
north wall of the Akropolis by Kavvadias especially fired the imagination (maps 3b and 5,
location B). Although the location of the find, north–west of the Erechtheion, is known,
even here it is uncertain exactly which statues come from it. Places on the Akropolis which
are less conspicuous in terms of sculptural or other finds are worse: sparsely documented,
their exact locations and contents are often lost. The fact that the chronology of the
Akropolis stratigraphy is so hotly debated indicates both how conjectural and how
fundamental it is.

For the present study, this raises complications on two levels. The first is the find
context of the sculpture in the data record of this study: this is important not only because of
the chronology of early–classical sculpture (as illustrated in the korai on plates 2c–d), but
even more so because of the moment when they were interred or built into other structures
on the Akropolis or elsewhere in the city. A scenario in which the Athenians immediately rid
the citadel of all debris differs essentially from one where they left the site as it was for
several decades, only tidying up what was necessary for day–to–day subsistence, in this case
for use of the sanctuary. This matters a great deal because the treatment of the debris is
likely to have influenced dedication practices at the time, including erection of sculpted
votives. The second issue is the reliance on the Akropolis debris for the chronology of ancient
Greek sculpture. Since the latter point looms rather ominously over the sculptural record
studied here, the discussion will begin there.

111 Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906, 23–32. Other sources cite 9 korai, because 9 are still identifiable
(overviews in Bundgaard 1974, 14; Steskal 2004, 49–53; Stewart 20081, 381–9; cf. next note).
This appears to be the only ‘pure’ Persian debris deposit on the Akropolis: the contents is archaic
(Sterwart 20081, 406).

112 Lindenlauf 1997, 70 n. 179. E.g. Hurwit 1999, 141 lists the Nike of Kallimachos (Akr. 690, cat. V
19) as one of the finds at this spot, while Brouskari 1979, 125–6 gives her a location south–west
of the Erechtheion. Pieces of the column and ionic capital of the statue were found scattered over

113 Lindenlauf 1997, 54; Cf. Stewart 20081, 406; Bundgaard 1974, 10–4, 27: in Kaweraus drawings
and the accompanying reports, find spots of sculpture are rarely indicated, or very sketchily. Find
spots in the database are indicated as accurately as publications allow, which often results in the
unspecified provenance ‘Akropolis’.

114 Cf. Hurwit 1989 on the Kritios Boy (Akr. 689, cat. V 49); Marx 2001, the Endoios Athena (Akr.
625, cat. V 90); Steskal 2004, passim; Stewart 20081 and 20082.

115 Style as a means to define masters’ hands gives invaluable information about sculpture practices.
However, when used to establish chronology, there is a risk of circular argument. A solid
The chronology of ancient Greek sculpture depends on datable fixed points and stylistic comparison with material from those cases. Apart from late–archaic treasuries in Delphi, especially the one which the Athenians built probably around 490–480 BC,\textsuperscript{116} dated material includes an inscription in Athens from the archonship of Peisistratos, grandson of the tyrant, the dedication of which is described by Thucydides.\textsuperscript{117} Neither the date of this inscription’s nor of others (for example, allegedly the same Peisistratos’ inscription on the altar of the Twelve Gods, or the fragments of the Tyrannicides’ base)\textsuperscript{118} are undisputed. The only real chronological fixture in Athens is the construction of the Parthenon.\textsuperscript{119} Therefore, the second quarter of the fifth century remains a vexing problem. It is generally accepted as the beginning of the classical period, and there is a widely shared assumption that sculpted votives in marble fell out of favour with Athenians at this time. Explanations range from the oath of Plataia to emerging democratic sensitivities; in some views, it was because marble was replaced by bronze as the material of choice.\textsuperscript{120}

Something approaching a definite answer to the question of the fall in dedications in the second quarter of the fifth century would require analysis of all the arguments regarding every single votive from the Akropolis, including excavation details; in most cases, this information is simply lost.\textsuperscript{121} One statue for which a full investigation of the circumstances of discovery did prove possible is the Kritios Boy (pls. 3a–b), a keystone in the chronology of early–classical sculpture. In his study on this subject, J. Hurwit asks how the Kritios Boy should be dated in relation to its find spot and the Persian debris, and how this date fits into

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{itemize}
\item Boardman \textit{GSCS}, 159–60, 210–4; Stewart 2008\textsuperscript{1}, 595–601.
\item Thuc. 6.54.6; Tölle–Kastenbein 1983, 574 n. 9; Arnusch 1995, 135–8; cf. Stewart 2008\textsuperscript{1}, 608.
\item Even so, the lower date of the Parthenon foundation is much debated, e.g. Bundgaard 1976, 134 dates 455 BC, which Hurwit considers too late (the ‘generally accepted date’ (Hurwit 1989, 45 n. 4) being eight years later).
\item Raubitschek \textit{DAA}, 479; Hurwit 1989, 64–5; Stewart 2008\textsuperscript{1}, 391. To which extent the material record actually supports this view will be considered later on. Raubitschek speaks of an earlier decline of marble as material for votives on the Akropolis. Cf. below p. 59. On the Oath in this context: Steskal 2004, 212–4 with lit.
\item Lindenlauf 1997, 47. M.M. Lee, \textit{AJA} 1996, 395 lists find spots of several korai; cf. Stewart 2008\textsuperscript{1}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotes}
the chronological framework; in other words, whether it is late archaic or early classical, or when one style period ends and another starts.122

The discovery of the Kritios Boy is surrounded by uncertainties. Presumably, the torso was uncovered south–east of the Parthenon, on or near the site of the former museum by Evstriatidis, while the head was found between the museum and the south containment wall of the Akropolis.123 Relying on the available information about find spots, style and technical details of the statue as well as the literary sources, Hurwit attempts to establish the date of the statue independently of the question whether its style should be classified as archaic or classical. He offers three possible scenarios.124 In the first, the Kritios Boy is pre-Persian (though in classical style, which therefore is considered to start before 480), was destroyed by the Persians and lay around on the Akropolis until it was buried during the building activities of the mid–fifth century BC.125 The strongest arguments for this are the wear on the statue and in particular on the damaged areas of the neck where the head was cut off.126 A second suggestion is that it was decapitated by accident (Hurwit notes that this is the least appealing version) and that this happened when the statue was set up soon after the Persian wars, leaving enough time for weathering before deposition. Hurwit’s third possibility is that the Athenians cut off the head intentionally, perhaps in a ritual killing of the statue just before burying it.127 The main flaw of this theory lies in wear on the breach surfaces. If the statue was purposely decapitated and buried immediately after, wear on the breach surfaces is hard to explain.128 And why would they have left a sculpted sacrificial victim lying around?

---

122 See above n. 114.
123 Cf. above n. 109. Hurwit 1989, 53–5, esp. 55 n. 40–41. The head was found much later than the torso. Also Stewart 2008¹, passim; id. 2008², 584–5. On the Akropolis, the Propylaia kore (Akr. 688, cat. V 44) was found in similar stages and pieces (cf. database).
125 The Persians might also have cut off heads to ‘kill’ the statues and disempower them. Cf. Houser 1988, passim; Stewart 2008¹, 388.
126 Rolley 1994, 339–43, fig. 330; Stewart 2008¹, 387–8, 394 for the argument of forceful decapitation. For detailed analysis of weathering and related arguments see Hurwit 1989, 63–4.
127 Hurwit 1989, 62 (decapitation), 79 (burial). Stewart 2008¹, 379 agrees with this view; in the case of bronzes, the heads would have been preserved while the torsos were melted down (analogies in Olympia, ibid. 387–8).
128 Hurwit 1989, 80. He also indicates that the erosion of marble surfaces is hard to predict, though, and that in this case, the wear could explain both the first and the last theory of events.
All theories regarding its burial aside, Hurwit concludes that the style of the Kritios Boy cannot be anything but early classical or Severe, and:129

‘...had it been found anywhere but on the Acropolis, with its (perhaps exaggerated) reputation for containing vast deposits of pure Perserschutt, there would perhaps have been little hesitation about dating it after 480.’

Justified as this remark may be, the evidence should be regarded in a wider perspective. The transition from archaic to classical sculpture in Athens hinges on the 480s because of the fixed date of the Persian wars, the deposits, and their reputation. This is not so much because the Persian wars ‘liberated’ Greek art, which would rather anachronistically presume direct political and conceptual transference of war circumstances onto artistic style.130 The combination of excavation data (if properly presented) and detailed relative chronology can provide a less finely netted, but nonetheless usable framework for the transition from one period to the other. The classical style in sculpture was, so to speak, in the making for a good part of the later archaic era. Besides the obvious differences, there is also strong continuity from archaic to classical sculpture.131 The precise overlap of the periods is hard to establish both at the beginning and the end of the transitional period. Although the possibility of dating sculpture with an accuracy of ten years is appealing, it is not always most effective.

Ultimately, Hurwit decided on a date between 479 and 475 BC for the Kritios Boy: post-Persian, but allowing enough time to create wear on the surfaces before it disappeared into the ground.132 In the quarter century intervals used here, such a date does not even move the statue into the following period: it remains where authors who prefer to blame the

129 Ibid. Hurwit makes similar comments about the Angelitos Athena (Akr. 140, cat. V 61) found with e.g. the Moschophoros, Akr. 624, cat. V 2 (ibid. 65). The latter has caused less controversy among scholars, though Ridgway 1970, 31 and 34–5 discusses the unreliable excavation context. Cf. the Votive Dates table, cat. V 61.

130 Boardman GSAP, 85. Hurwit 1989, 70, 78 disagrees. For extensive discussions of the stylistic transition from archaic to classical, see e.g. Ridgway SSGS, passim (for a discussion of scholarship work up until 1970, ibid. 4–8), and most recently, Stewart 20081 and 20082.

131 E.g. Boardman GSCP, 20–3, 26; Hurwit 1989, 78; Ridgway SSGS, 93. Hurwit’s assumption (1989, 65) that only few votive statues would remain ‘immediately pre-Persian’ if controversial pieces were left aside, however, seems to be defied by the data –depending on the definition of ‘immediately’.

132 Hurwit 1989, 80. Which possibility is most likely for the decapitation and other damage to the statue he does not elaborate on in the final conclusion.
Persians for its decapitation have put it. The same advantage of quarter centuries becomes evident in the study by Tölle–Kastenbein. Her concentration of chronology–defining events around 500 BC would not affect the dates of this statue nor of others in this study very much. In short, the chronology applied here may be somewhat cruder than is possible, but it avoids certain problems which are hard to solve at the present state of research. Nonetheless, the question how votives which were destroyed in the Persian wars were treated in the interlude between the wars and the start of the fifth-century building programmes is relevant. After all, how the Athenians handled their own and their ancestors’ demolished votives reflects their attitudes towards the sculpture in this study.

The Akropolis is the main source of votive sculpture in Athens in the sixth century, primarily because votives in the Persian debris had a better chance of survival. From this point of view, it may come as a surprise that the relative prominence of the Akropolis votives extends into the period after interment of the debris (table 2a). The percentage lies around half of all sculpted votives during the second, third and last quarters of the fifth century, a situation which is unexpected for two reasons. First, as has been mentioned above, no large-scale deposit from the fourth century is known that could explain such high survival rates of sculpture from the Akropolis or any other part of the city from the century before. So, if the predominance of the Akropolis in the sixth century is explained by deposition in the mid-fifth century, no deposit can account for high percentages of Akropolis votives later in that century. Second, marble dedications are widely believed to have declined from the late-archaic period on, because bronze became the preferred material. This suggestion can be investigated by means of the marble sculpture from the Akropolis combined with bases for bronze and marble votives; larger bronze statues are, of course, mostly lacking.

133 Tölle–Kastenbein 1983, esp. 576–7 tab. 1, 584. These events still fall into the quarter century where they are positioned in the present study. The system proposed by Francis and Vickers 1981, shifting everything down 30 years would, if correct, move the statues out of their generally accepted dates, and out of the ones used here. However, I agree with the arguments put forward by Hurwit 1989, 73 n. 125, Tölle–Kastenbein 1983, 575, Shear 1993, and especially Steskal 2004, 142–6 that such a shift would be quite unlikely.

134 It should be noted that the marble dedications are also considered part of the Persian debris, too. E.g. Hurwit 1989, 64–5 states that ‘...statistically, a marble dedication stands a better chance of being pre-Persian.’

135 For example, Robertson 1987, 164; Jacquemin 1999, 37; Keesling 2003, 78; Osborne 1998, 163; Marconi 2001, 258; Stewart 2008¹, 387; cf. also above n. 76.

136 See above n. 52. Very few bronzes are sufficiently preserved, which would seriously hamper a comparison. For an overview of major Akropolis bronzes, Stewart 2008¹, passim.
Before the sixth century, the Akropolis votives had mainly consisted of bronze statuettes, appliques (for wooden furniture etc.), cauldron fragments and pottery, of which precise find spots are even harder to trace in the excavators’ reports than sculpture. In general, pickings of marble votives on the Akropolis seem to be rather slim in earlier times, and this continues into the first decades of the sixth century. A few early examples of marble dedications are an inscribed base dated to the mid-seventh century and some lamps from the end of that century or from the early sixth. After seven extant marble dedications from the first quarter of the sixth century, things begin to improve in the second quarter. It is only toward the end of the sixth century, however, that votive sculpture really takes off. The question is, why is this the case?

Assuming that the chronological framework is adequate for the purpose at hand, one possible explanation is that all sixth-century votive monuments in the record have survived solely because of their deposition in the mid-fifth century. If this is the case, fewer marble dedications would have been made in the first three quarters of the sixth century than in the next fifty years. Alternatively, it has been suggested that Peisistratos tried to curtail votives and maybe also gravestones, to keep aristocratic rivals from expressing their power and wealth. For the grave monuments, it was already argued above that the material shows not lapse corroborating such intervention; but the votives require further analysis in this respect. The possibility of increased production will be explored below as well, but first the influence of deposition deserves some attention: if the Persian debris, in the widest sense of the term,

---

138 Holtzmann 2003, 38; Hurwit 1999, 95. All the early bronze statuettes were found in the excavations in the 1880s according to Holtzmann with as far as the context goes the same result as for the other material.
139 Hurwit 1999, 95, n. 58 for the inscription (IG I3 589, Jeffery LSAG 71, 76 no. 7) and n. 60 above for the lamps (also Holtzmann 2003, 44).
141 Cf. Hurwit 1999, 35: ‘…skewed by unusual circumstances of preservation and loss.’
142 Holtzmann 2003, 48 thinks it more likely that the emerging lower classes took over the aristocratic custom of setting up marble dedications. Schneider 2001, 98 agrees. Contra Shapiro 1991, 631. Also above p. 32.
were the reason for the state of the evidence presented in this study, it would be unnecessary to look any further for an explanation.

Developments in the votives from the Akropolis (as in the dedications from Athens as a whole) remain modest in numbers until the final quarter of the sixth century (chart 2b), when numbers on the Akropolis rise steeply to 96 sculptures, then to drop marginally to 94 in the quarter after 500 BC. The slow ascent in the earlier sixth century appears as an extension of the paucity of votives in the seventh century BC. If Athens’ wealth is assumed to have grown over the sixth century, an increase in valuable votives is to be expected; but nothing like this happens until the final quarter. When the rise finally does occur, it is so dramatic that it seems beyond any natural development such as, for example, a greater demand for sculpture. This rather suggests the influence of the Persian debris, though other causes present themselves, as will be discussed shortly.

Votives dedicated on the Akropolis forty or fifty years before the late-archaic peak may well have been still in situ, i.e. where they were erected, when the Persian wars started. If so, they were accumulated in the debris deposits later in the fifth century. If this is correct, the question arises as to what happened to the earlier material, dating back half century and more before the outbreak of the war (chart 2)? Did no such material exist, and do the peaks of the late sixth and early fifth centuries simply reflect an increase in production at that time? Or was the early sixth-century material lost before the Persian wars started, either on purpose or by accident? If the latter is the case, what happened to this sculpture?

---

143 E.g. as a result of Solon’s reforms or Peisistratean rule: see Lavelle 2005, 1 and passim; Van Wees 2006, 381; Foxhall 1997, 123, 128. Cf. also Steskal 2004, 197–204. For an overview of Athenian economic growth in the sixth and fifth centuries: French 2006 [repr. 1964].

144 If there had been an unofficial ban on votives until the last quarter of the century, i.e. until Peisistratos’ death, the rise could have occurred quite abruptly. No such thing is known from any sources, however, and there are other reasons why this is highly unlikely. Holtzmann (2003, 46, 48) also remarks that a ban by the Peisistratids is improbable in the light of the archonship of e.g. Kleisthenes and Miltiades during their reign, who were, after all, from rivaling families: they could hardly have been kept from dedicating. Cf. AM I 4120, IG I 1031.

145 Terracotta and stone architectural fragments, as well as the Hekatompedon Inscription (IG I 4, EM 6794), suggest the presence of several smaller structures on the Akropolis (Tolle–Kastenbein 1993, 48 and 63 locate them on the south side, within what she interprets as the open-air Hekatompedon area; cf. Lipka 1998). They date from the second quarter of the sixth century until the classical period. Some may have been shrines (cf. Korres 1997, 227) but others probably were treasuries similar to Delphi or Olympia. Since, unlike the latter, the Akropolis was not a Pan–Hellenic sanctuary, it is uncertain who commissioned them. If the patrons were aristocratic families of Attika, it could explain their apparent lack of interest in sculpted votives: these treasuries were especially suitable for more costly votives, which could be stored inside. Klein,
One obvious explanation would be a clearance of the Akropolis, for example because of building activity. During the sixth century, at least two monumental temples were built on the hill, and it is well possible that others were started or already existed (maps 4a–b). The chronological evidence, however, is problematic. A new temple may have been planned in the late sixth century, but traces of its foundation hardly remain on the site. Some scholars interpret this as evidence that there was no second temple on the south side of the Akropolis, only a new one on the site of the so-called Dörpfeld foundation (the so-called Archaios Naos, map 4a), or even just a renovation of the existing building in that location. Others argue that the Parthenon foundations were built over, and therefore erased or covered, all traces of earlier construction, including a temple of Athena which had been under construction on the south side of the Akropolis at the time. This pre-Parthenon is usually dated in the 480s, just after Marathon.

A new temple of Athena on the Akropolis, for example, on the Dörpfeld foundation, and begun during the reign of the Peisistratids, could account for a clearance of larger private
dedications. The suggestion is that first, some of the monuments would have had to be moved aside to make room for buildings and construction ramps; and second, that it provided the tyrants with an excuse to remove reminders of the wealth and power of other families, especially those with a long history of prominence. If this is true, the slow rise of Akropolis votives in the sixth-century record could be explained by gradual removal during the third quarter of the century. The official account would have been that it was necessary for construction, but some statues could remain in place while others had to go, which would explain why there is some material from the earlier sixth century, but not very much.

A problem attached to this explanation is this: where did these statues, allegedly cleared by Peisistratean (or, in fact, Kleisthenic) building activity, go? It is hardly likely that the Athenians took the trouble of taking them down from the Akropolis for burial elsewhere, all the more so because the sanctity of the dedications probably demanded appropriate, and therefore local, burial. In the very extensive literature about the Akropolis, to my knowledge no mention is made of any deposits which date exclusively to the earlier sixth century. In short, the removal of the votive statues from the site at some time in the sixth century can be dismissed as at best unlikely. Neither were they found in an identifiably sixth-century context in any of the Akropolis excavations. Thus, it is warranted to conclude that no sizable group of Akropolis sculpture from the first three quarters of the sixth century went missing before the Persian wars. This seems to suggest that the sixth-century record from the Akropolis is for a considerable part determined by the original quantities of dedications on that site, and that the low numbers from the first half of the sixth century are more or less representative. Or are there still other factors to consider?

---

150 For a clearance date in the 530s (with a new temple finished c. 525) see Korres 1997, 225; id. 2002, 184. A later date of the Older Parthenon in Stewart 2008, passim. Another type of building activity on the Akropolis which could explain a lack of dedications is represented by the supposed palace of the Peisistratids on the rock (Hurwit 1999, 118). It is generally considered unlikely that they actually lived here, though (see e.g. Camp 2001, 35; and Holtzmann 2003, 46).

151 This would fit the idea that the Rampin horseman is one of a pair representing Hippias and Hipparchos (Hurwit 1999, 118; contra Eaverly 1995, 73–8; Ridgway 1993, 200–1; Trianti 1998, 183–97; Holtzmann 2003, 64).

152 Obviously, unpublished material from Athens could throw a different light on this matter. For the present study, however, there is no other choice than to base the argument on the available evidence: conjecture about the numbers of these unpublished fragments, let alone their quantitative development, is pointless.
Dedications in other materials than stone may shed some light on this subject.\(^{153}\) The Akropolis has yielded many small plaques and figurines in terracotta (pls. 4a–b), which provide a useful complement to the record of this study. An approximate count of those pieces (chart B.1) datable with enough accuracy to be of use here has the following results: 141 small terracotta dedications are late–archaic, 112 of which are plaques decorated with various subjects in relief or paint, and dated to the first quarter of the fifth century.\(^{154}\) The other 29 are figurines, the majority of which dates to the same period, while five examples are from the last quarter of the sixth century. Unfortunately, Vlassopoulou’s catalogue of terracotta votives from the Akropolis does not include enough of the classical period to serve as a parallel for sculpture for the fifth century in its entirety.\(^{155}\) Nonetheless, the outcome for the archaic period is interesting.

Small terracotta figurines are clearly abundant in the first quarter of the fifth century, despite the five examples from the end of the archaic period. Of the terracotta plaques which Chr. Vlassopoulou lists, no examples were dated accurately enough to be used here. In other words: the entire group of datable votive plaques comes from the early fifth century. The figurines are poorly preserved compared to the plaques, and their dates are often difficult to establish. However, the analysis of both figurines and relief plaques is based on stylistic criteria quite similar to those used in sculpture, while painted plaques are dated by means of arguments akin to those in the analysis of vase painting, helped by the occasional overlap with vase painters’ hands. Thus, there is no reason to accept the chronologies of sculpture and pottery, but to dismiss these arguments in the case of terracotta.

Terracotta votives (chart B.1) show a similar development to other Akropolis material in the record of this study. The only differences are, first, that the rising numbers of sculpted monuments at the end of the sixth century occur later in small terracotta votives (tables 2b–c; 153) Insight in this record is severely hampered by the absence of wooden votives in excavations. Finds in Samos offer a glimpse of more extensive use of this material. Kyrieleis 1984, 140–5; cf. Vlassopoulou 2003, 17.

154 Based on Vlassopoulou 2003 (selection criteria and method described on 23–6). Table B.1 and chart B.1; all pieces from c. 525–475 BC. E.g. pl. 4a.

155 Unlike Schulze 2004, who does not provide dates accurate enough to be of use here. Her conclusion is that of the painted votive plaques from the Akropolis, 8 are proto–Attic, 15 are white–ground, 106 are black–figure and 14 red–figure. Three are uncertain, eight have a decoration in relief and six are from non–Attic origin but given the iconography, probably made for the Attic market (Schulze 2004, 11).
B.1); and second, that examples of such terracottas from the earlier sixth century seem to be altogether lacking.\textsuperscript{156} In part, this may be due to the difficulties of dating the older terracottas, as a result of wear and damage. Yet early and middle archaic terracotta dedications seem very scarce in general, even more so than stone votives. The easiest explanations for this would be the loss of poorly preserved material during early excavations, or simply a late arrival of terracotta as a material for votives on the Akropolis. It is possible that varying preferences for types or materials of votives influenced the development of sculpture in the sixth-century.

Smaller dedications in terracotta were less durable, less expensive and less prestigious than large marble pieces. They would pile up relatively fast, being suitable for minor occasions, frequent dedication, and costing little. Still, it has been convincingly argued that small votives were not restricted to the poor, but were dedicated by wealthier worshippers as well.\textsuperscript{157} While sculpture was beyond the means of a substantial group of inhabitants of Athens, terracotta plaques and figurines could and would have been offered by almost everyone. Their numbers must therefore have increased rapidly, and so space would have become scarce on parts of the Akropolis which were reserved for such votives. A further aspect is that small terracotta dedications damage easily. They were obviously not meant for eternity, so the risk of offending patrons by getting rid of their votive statuettes or plaques would have been slim – if they even noticed. In this respect, sculpture is very different from these smaller and less costly votives.\textsuperscript{158} If nothing else, the sheer weight of a stone statue would induce sanctuary staff with spatial concerns to leave it alone just a little while longer.

Taking this into account, the pattern of preservation of small terracottas emerging from Vlassopoulou’s study makes quite good sense. From the earlier sixth century, hardly any small terracotta votives seem to be preserved, either because they were not made, or because they were cleared away (on a regular basis or because of construction). In both cases, the material found in the fill would develop roughly as chart B.1 actually shows: a large group dates from a brief period just before the destruction of the site by the Persians, but earlier

\textsuperscript{156} The numbers of votive bases and the equivalent sculpture turn upward c. a quarter century earlier than terracottas. See tables 1 and B.1, chart 1b.
\textsuperscript{157} Schulze 2004, 50.
\textsuperscript{158} For the static, temporal qualities of sculpture v. the mobility of smaller votives; and patrons’ considerations in this, see K. Verdery, \textit{The Political Lives of Dead Bodies} (1999) 5–12; Jacquemin 1999, 213.
material is scarce. Nor could there in fact have been much later material, because that would have been cleared away, damaged, or lost over time. In other words, the window for preservation of small terracotta votives was much narrower than that for sculpture, mostly due to practical reasons, and the extensive building on the classical Akropolis is a stroke of luck. Without it, very little of this material would have been preserved at all, or at least, little would have been in a recognisable state.

Things are slightly different for pottery. Sheer numbers of sherds from the Akropolis in the sixth and fifth centuries dwarf remains of both sculpture and terracottas (chart B.2). Moreover, it may be assumed that quite a lot of the plainer ware was lost because at the time of excavation this type of material generally received less attention. That in spite of these circumstances such large quantities remain is telling for the enormous production of Attic pottery compared to sculpture, and its frequent use in ritual and as votives on the Akropolis.

Nevertheless, it is very difficult to define how pottery dedications worked. It is uncertain whether the pots proper were the votives or their content was. It is not even clear whether they always contained a gift or only sometimes, and if so, in which cases. V. Stissi has pointed out that assemblages of pottery from Greek sanctuaries like the Athenian Akropolis probably do not consist entirely of dedications. There are signs that often, these collections encompass pottery for rituals, festive meals or everyday use by sanctuary residents. The distinction between these vessels and those which were offered to the gods is by no means always clear, especially because of circumstances of excavation and publication of sanctuary pottery on many sites.

---

159 Early terracottas from the Akropolis are being prepared for publication by A. Moustaka. She kindly informs me that c. 25 fragments from around the middle of the sixth century could well be from free-standing votives. It is also possible that some decorated smaller buildings on the archaic Akropolis, e.g. oikemata. Cf. below n. 177.

160 Many uncertainties surround this suggestion, and it raises questions: for example, where did the bulk of removed terracotta votives go? It is important to take into consideration the link between different physical characteristics of votives and preservation history: this theory is only offered as a point of departure.

161 The numerical data for this part of the analysis were derived mostly from Stissi 2002.

162 Stissi 2002, 233, in particular ns. 1106 and 1108.

163 Ibid. 242–3 where he presents the argument that open pot forms were dedicated empty, while closed shapes may have held further offerings. Since inscriptions on pots mostly refer to the pot itself and not to the contents, the dedication was probably not about the latter. Cf. Van Straten 1981, 86; Simon 1983, 315–6.

164 Stissi 2002, 240.
With regard to their function, vases, even when dedicated as votives, fall into a different category than sculpture or figurines. The latter have no practical, day-to-day purpose. They were specifically made for dedication and in the period covered here, they had no other function. To a modern mind, this distinction may carry more weight than it may have done for an Athenian from the archaic or classical periods, but the functionality of a stone or terracotta figurine undeniably differs from that of, for example, a drinking cup, even when dedicated.\textsuperscript{165} Despite these differences and the mixed record of pottery, its development over time is interesting. For the present case, the data can be divided no further than in fifty-year periods, which hampers the comparison somewhat.\textsuperscript{166} Even so, it is clear that the great bulk of datable Akropolis pottery is from the second half of the sixth century (chart B.2).

Quantities of sculpture and terracotta are practically lost in the huge wave of pottery at this time. Thus, the largest group from a single quarter century must fall within the second half of the sixth century. Considering that the newly invented red-figure in the final quarter of the century should be added, while black-figure vases were still being made as well, the peak probably falls in the final decades of the sixth century.

Despite this difference in absolute numbers, trends in sculpture on the sixth-century Akropolis are not so different from black-figure pottery as one might expect. The second half of the century is the richest sculpture period with 114 examples (table 2a), though the difference with the first half of the fifth century (99 extant sculptures) is not large.\textsuperscript{167} In pottery, numbers are obviously more dramatic, but the factor of multiplication and the timing are similar.\textsuperscript{168} However, in the early fifth century black-figure gradually went out of fashion. Numbers of red-figure pottery never compensate for this or reach the levels which the pottery on the Akropolis had achieved in the late sixth century.\textsuperscript{169} Apparently, early red-figure ceramic votives were not as popular as their black-figure counterparts had been.

When the pottery from the Akropolis is set against the terracotta plaques and figurines, it is striking that the latter seem to concentrate entirely in the period immediately preceding and partly coinciding with the Persian wars. By contrast, a considerable portion of

\textsuperscript{165} De Polignac 1984, 14–5 argues that from the eighth century onwards, more and more votives were specifically made for worship instead of for what he labels daily use. See below ch. IV.5–6.
\textsuperscript{166} After Stissi 2002, table XVI.14.
\textsuperscript{167} I.e. from the third quarter of the sixth century: 18 examples, from the final quarter: 96.
\textsuperscript{168} From the first to the second half of the sixth century, Akropolis sculpture increases roughly by a factor 4, and black-figure pottery by 5.0. All pottery increases by approximately a factor 6.8.
\textsuperscript{169} Stissi 2002, 248.
the pottery seems to have been around for four or even five decades before interment. Of course, many pots need not have been complete in 480 BC. Much of the material is highly fragmented and may well have been broken long before the Persian destruction. The fact that the bulk of preserved pottery dates not from the narrow period around the Persian wars, but slightly earlier, opens up the possibility that this part of the pottery assemblage, contrary to the terracottas or sculpture, was not only broken but also buried before the Persians provided a reason.

Over the past two centuries, the Akropolis was as good as fully excavated. This means that most of the votives which were buried there, whether in stone or in terracotta, must have been uncovered. As was suggested earlier, it is unlikely that large numbers of marble dedications were actually taken away from the Akropolis before the debris deposits were formed. This would mean that the low numbers of sculpted votives from the earlier sixth century and the higher ones from the end of that century would be to a certain degree representative of the actual quantity produced at the time. The large majority of terracotta figurines and plaques from the end of the archaic period indicates either a development similar to sculpture, or a late emergence of this type of votive on the Akropolis. Between the small terracottas and marble sculpture, a slight but interesting difference exists, namely that the former material appears to peak slightly later than the sculpture.

Several larger terracotta statues on the Akropolis probably date to the middle of the sixth century. If these fragments were freestanding votives in their own right, they may have been cleared away and used as fills when a major building project was begun in the second half of the sixth century. The relative paucity of monumental stone votives from this period would in this case be due to the fact that large terracottas were a favoured alternative. If, on the other hand, the terracottas were not freestanding but architectural,

170 Ibid. 239.
171 On the fifth-century Akropolis, pottery apparently falls by c. 91%, sculpture by c. 67% (table B.2).
172 See above n. 97.
173 This is of course presuming that the dates of pottery and sculpture can be relied on.
174 As suggested by A. Moustaka. See above n. 159; for further literature, below n. 177.
175 Hypothetically, some to the contemporary pottery might have shared that fate. Later construction might have disturbed these deposits, for no exclusively sixth-century pockets of pottery have as far as I know been excavated on the Akropolis.
176 To my knowledge, no votive bases which certainly carried terracottas were found on the Akropolis. However, damage may make it difficult to distinguish between those for marble votives and those for terracottas.
they may have adorned the small buildings known as oikoi or oikemata (map 4b). There is
evidence for several of these on the sixth–century Akropolis. Their terracotta pediments
and akroteria could have ended up in the deposits when they were torn down to make room
for the consecutive building projects of the late sixth and early fifth centuries.

Oikoi were probably shrines or treasuries for storing the more valuable gifts to the
gods. Of those on the sixth–century Akropolis or their contents, little is known, except that
they existed and that their function probably resembled other structures of a similar kind,
such as the treasuries at Delphi. Precious metal vessels, for example, could be kept here,
free from exposure to the elements and, if necessary, under lock and key. Until inscribed
lists of the treasures of the Akropolis sanctuaries were kept in the later fifth century, there
are no overviews of precious metal dedications, and even the inventory lists are
problematic. Such expensive votives as had existed on the archaic Akropolis were probably
taken when the sanctuaries were pillaged by the Persians. What was left was melted down
afterwards. As a result, there is no reliable information about their original numbers, and
hardly any traces of them now remain. But if the oikoi were donated or used by wealthy
Athenian families, their interest in marble sculpture would perhaps have lessened in favour of
both the oikoi and the precious dedications inside.

A collection of bronze statuettes excavated on the Akropolis and the bases of larger
bronze statues are all that is left of what in archaic times must have been an impressive
collection of metal dedications. Nonetheless, the widely held view that bronze replaced

---

177 E.g. Furtwängler and Kienast 1989, 66 n. 235; Harris 1995, 18; Lipka 1998, 80; Hurwit 1999,
328.

178 See Neer 2001 and 2004 for a full analysis of the function of treasuries. Perhaps Samos offers a
better analogy, since the sanctuary of Hera is, like the Akropolis, not Pan–Hellenic: cf. Kyrieleis

179 Cf. Stewart 2008, 403. For further analysis of the proportion of metal vessels in sanctuary

180 Many of the inventories from the fifth century seem to have been mostly used for public
dedications and cultic objects: Harris 1995, 28. Moreover, not everything was inscribed on the

181 As mentioned above, bronze statuettes were excluded from analysis because of their less specific
chronology. Bases for bronze have been discussed above, p. 26, 59. From 525–500 date 37 bases
for bronze items; from 500–475, 57 bases are for bronzes, nine of which were probably metal
vessels. Five examples carried tripods while one, EM 6444 (IG I1 831, cat. B 99) bore a bronze
basin. The attribution of a vessel of a particular material to a base is subjective. While for tripods,
marble as the main material for votives cannot be taken at face value. The quantitative evidence is doubtful, and the relation between genres and the material of votives may cast an entirely different light on this notion.\textsuperscript{182} This is best illustrated by the dedications from the Akropolis in the late fifth century.

Most votives from the last half of the fifth century are reliefs, all of them in marble.\textsuperscript{183} There are some exceptions to this generic uniformity, such as the group of Prokne and Itys and a head of a youth.\textsuperscript{184} Many of the classical votives, especially those from the Akropolis, are rather modest and often worn and fragmentary. Their provenance is listed simply as Akropolis or as the Asklepieion, the former producing 28 and the latter 13 of the total of 58 dedicated reliefs from the second half of the fifth century (table 2c). If the Asklepieion is considered part of the Akropolis, 41 out of 58 is a large majority.\textsuperscript{185} In all, votive reliefs from the Akropolis are dwindling in the second and third quarters of the fifth century (at five in each period), but in the last quarter they abound.

Bases for votives present a slightly different picture. The data record contains 15 bases found on the Akropolis from the third quarter of the fifth century (table 2b), all but one of which carried bronze dedications.\textsuperscript{186} In the last quarter of the fifth century, the Akropolis

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{182} Above p. 27–2, and n. 135; also below ch. IV.
\item\textsuperscript{183} See also the previous section. Out of 46 votives from the Akropolis area, five are not reliefs. In total, there are 68 votives from the second half of the fifth century in the dataset. See tables/charts 5–6 and below ch. IV.3 for further analysis of genres. Reliefs are often studied separately (e.g. Mitropoulou’s \textit{Corpus} or Vikela 2005). Consequently, they are often left out of comparisons with votive sculpture from the late–archaic period. Strangely, grave reliefs from the late fifth century are also rarely compared with contemporary votive reliefs.
\item\textsuperscript{185} Interestingly, the provenance details of most of the Akropolis votives from this period are not further specified. Moreover, find spots of bases on the Akropolis seem more accurately recorded than those of sculpture. This is in so far understandable that sculpture damages more easily and fragments are therefore often smaller than those of bases. Quite a few fragments of sculpture, many of them reliefs, were found built into walls from the Periklean era, i.e. \textit{in situ}. Cf. next section.
\item\textsuperscript{186} The base for a marble statue: cat. B 136, AM I 5128 (from the Agora). A base for statue of unknown material: cat. B 137, EM 6295. Cat. B 145, EM 6515 is for a bronze statue, but was found off the Akropolis.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
produces only four bases.187 In the site’s record of the second quarter of the fifth century, bases for both bronze and marble sculptures had appeared in greater numbers (table 2b).188 Yet from the next two quarter centuries, there are no bases for marble votives, and only 12 and six for bronzes.189 Although the bases from the Akropolis are somewhat more numerous than those from other parts of Athens in the second half of the fifth century, the downward trend is conspicuous.

In contrast with the absence of bases for dedications in marble from the final quarter of the fifth century, the preserved votive sculpture outnumbers all bases by far at this time (tables 2a–b).190 As soon as the extant marble votive sculpture from the Akropolis, especially the large corpus of reliefs, is included in the discussion, it is clear that six bases for bronzes cannot compete with 28 marble votives (table 2a) – despite the complete absence of bases for marble dedications. The conclusion must therefore be that bronze can only be considered a favoured material over marble for Athenian votives of the fifth century if the sculptural record is judged selectively. The notion that on the Athenian Akropolis, bronze dedications took over from marble, whether in the late archaic or the early classical period, is not supported by the evidence.

**THE AKROPOLIS: A CLOSER LOOK**

Because the excavation records of the Akropolis are incomplete, it is worthwhile to try and find out if the distribution of Akropolis votives in this study can offer additional information. The site has been roughly divided in a western, centre and eastern zone, the first running approximately from the Propylaia to the Erechtheion and the Parthenon (map 5). The middle includes the space in between these two sanctuaries and the area from the Parthenon to the

---

187 In total, six bases for bronze votives date from the final quarter of the fifth century, and none for marble votives. The four from the Akropolis are EM 6296 (cat. B 143), EM 6297 (cat. B 146), Akr. 13264 (cat. B 176) and Akr. no. ? (IG I 3 900, cat. B 177). The other two are AM I 3398 (cat. B104) found near the Stoa of Attalos and EM 10330 (cat. B 105) and described as from Athens (Amandry, *BCH* 100.1 (1976) 18–22, 63).

188 If sculpture is included: nine bases for marble, five statues, none overlapping; 18 bases for bronze.

189 See above n. 67.

190 For examples see above n. 100.
southern containment wall of the Akropolis; the eastern part encompasses the area east of
the Erechtheion and Parthenon. A fourth zone runs along the north containment wall and
includes the north slope.

This last zone, being the largest, produced most of the Akropolis sculpture (table 2d,
chart 2d). East and west are similar in numbers while, not surprisingly, the middle area
yielded only few sculpted votives: although south of the Parthenon, and between the
Parthenon and the Dörpfeld foundation some sculpture was uncovered, the architectural
features in this area fill most of the space. Votive sculpture thus appears to have been buried
at the edges of the Akropolis rather than in the middle. This is even more clear for bases
(table 2d, chart 2e): 35 bases for votives from the first quarter of the fifth century were found
in the north area, and 20 from the quarter century before. Only the bases with no provenance
specification within the Akropolis constitute a larger group. Moreover, bases from the eastern
and western part again survive in similar quantities, while in the central area, they are much
fewer in number. Most bases from the last quarter of the sixth century were found on the east side of
the Akropolis (table 2d), although the quarter–century periodisation and some uncertainty as
to provenances require some caution. On the west side, most are dated to the early fifth
century. The majority of bases comes from the north zone, and this group peaks in the first
quarter of the fifth century with 35 examples. Sculpture from the same area concentrates in
the final quarter of the sixth century (table 2d), but differences in sculpture quantities per
location are smaller, because so much of the material does not have a specified provenance.
The first quarter of the fifth century produces as many statues from the eastern as the
western part of the Akropolis, but again, numbers are low and stay so for the rest of the
century. In the second quarter of the fifth century, bases continue in reasonable numbers

191 This division is based on the architectural setting and the organisation of space as it is
reconstructed for the fifth century. The Asklepieion on the south slope has been counted
separately.

192 From between c. 600 and 400 BC, the east and west part of the Akropolis produce 32 and 34
votive bases respectively, the north zone 64 and the centre 16. For sculpture, east and west
counted 24 and 23 votives, the centre nine and the north 36 examples. Interesting are the find
spots of monuments that are listed simply as ‘from the Akropolis’: among these, 180 are statues
while only 80 are supports.

193 Table 2d. Apparently, the find spots of bases were noted more accurately than thos of votive
sculpture. This could have to do with the fact that bases were more often found in walls, and so
more difficult to remove: the chances of the exact provenance being recorded might thus have
been greater.
only in the western part of the Akropolis, where the building pits of the Periklean building programme, notably for the Propylaia, were the last to be open. Some among these bases may well have been set up after the Persian wars, but have fallen victim to the fifth-century remodelling of the Akropolis.

Post-Persian dedications among in the debris raise questions about the composition of the deposited material. Of various theories regarding the period between the Persian wars and the reconstruction of the Akropolis, one proposes that the destruction debris was collected in piles, out of way of the main thoroughfares on the site, and lay untouched for up to two decades before it was buried together with post-Persian material.194 The Erechtheion and perhaps the temple of Athena Polias, or temporary versions of them, must have been back in use quite soon after the destruction; it is unlikely that the ritual life of the city would have ground to a halt for long.195 For a while, heaps of debris were put aside on the site. By the time they were buried, some later material was included in the assemblage. This version of events and the evidence of detailed Akropolis provenances can only be related by using common sense. It is hardly possible that the Persians bothered to move any material after they wreaked destruction. The ones to do so would be the Athenians, who would have tried to get the debris out of the way with minimal effort.

If these small differences between the various provenance areas in the Akropolis (table 2d) are accepted as representative, they seem to indicate that within the temporary debris piles, material from one period may well have occurred more frequently than from others. For example, the north zone has more bases and sculpture from the first quarter of the sixth century than from other periods, whereas the eastern area reaches its summit a quarter century earlier. As can be expected, in the second quarter of the fifth century, the west of the Akropolis is most prolific, though low numbers (nine bases and no sculpture) put this statement into perspective.196

194 Hurwit 1989, 63; Boersma 1970, 46. The latter emphasises the victory in the battle of Eurymedon, the spoils of which were necessary to finance the new Akropolis south wall, if not the north wall as well. Also Stewart 2008, 393. Contra Korres 2002, 184, who argues that the sight of the broken votive sculpture would have been too distressing for the Athenians, especially in view of the sacred setting.


This is not to suggest that any deliberate selection took place before the debris was buried. Concentrations of material in one period per area, and the evidence that not all areas peak at the same time, shows that dedications may have been roughly set up in spatial clusters per period, because some areas filled up and new space was then allotted to dedicants. As a result, debris from such clusters would often (not always, for sometimes fragments of one statue were found very far apart) have ended up on the same pile, simply because it was the nearest one. The placement of statues must somehow have been regulated; whoever was responsible appointed areas of the Akropolis for dedication until they were full. In view of the popularity of both small terracottas and monumental sculpted dedications in the late sixth century, these areas must quickly have become crowded. Thus, new dedications would be set up in other parts of the Akropolis, perhaps causing the material to be kept together to some degree, and spread in time and place according to the pattern which the Akropolis assemblage in this study shows.

Another aspect of this view is the relation to building activity. Apart from a quick filling up of the space for private votives on the Akropolis in the late sixth century, construction may also have made it necessary to turn to new dedication zones. A move of votive bases to the north and west or southwest of the Akropolis in the first quarter of the fifth century may have been caused by building activity, located for example on the pre-Parthenon at the end of the sixth century, which required clear access to the various sites of construction in the fifth century. It is impossible to choose one conclusively or to reconstruct exactly how or when the piles of debris were formed and processed. Yet it seems clear that the debris was not buried right after the Persian wars, nor did it lie around where the Persians had left it until the construction of the temples began in the mid-fifth century. Thus, deposition may date to the 460s, when containment walls were begun and the site was cleared for further building.

197 On a related note, Osanna 2001 and Ferrari 2002 suggest that the remains of the temple on the Dörpfeld foundation stayed in use until the late fifth century: a fire in 406 BC would have destroyed this temple.

198 For recent discussions of the containment walls of the Akropolis and their dates, see Korres 2002; Steskal 2004, passim and Stwart 2008.
THE KERAMEIKOS

The largest single site for grave monuments from Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries, the Kerameikos, provides the most sepulchral monuments (map 6b). As was discussed earlier, numbers of funerary sculpture and bases are much lower than those of votives, and their provenance is less consistent (table 2c). In the Kerameikos, trends in gravestones change direction every quarter century of the sixth century. The second quarter is relatively prolific with 15 pieces. Though modest compared to votives, for grave monuments this number is considerable (charts 2–2a). After this small peak, they go from five examples in the third quarter of the sixth century to eight in the last quarter of the sixth century, and again to five in the first quarter of the fifth century. A gap follows in the second quarter of the fifth century, but numbers return to five in the next period. The final quarter of the century is richest both for the Kerameikos and for grave sculpture in general. With 21 examples, the Kerameikos comes second only to the category Athens Other in this period.

Bases for bronze grave monuments are extremely rare in Athens in both the sixth and the fifth century. Only two examples appear in the record: a base in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens, EM 10255, and what is believed to be an Ionian capital base, once part of a grave monument from the Kerameikos. The former comes from the aqueduct near the Tower of the Winds, next to the Roman Agora, which casts some doubt on its use as a funerary monument. Otherwise, bases for bronze grave statues seem to be lacking, which

199  Its preservation is relatively good, although early excavation has obscured some of the evidence.
203  Kerameikos: 21 of a total of 77 gravestones. Athens Other (49 in 425–400) will be discussed in the next section. Cf. also above p. 39.
204  Ionian capital: cat. B 288, KM no. ? For an interpretation, see Niemeyer 2002, 31–2 fig. 31–2. EM 10225 see next note or above n. 84.
205  Cat. B 173, EM 10255, IG I 1202; Peek, AM 67 (1942) [1951], 80 n. 135; Jeffery, BSA 57 (1962), 11 n. 5; Kissas 2000, 249 no. 3.
is a strong indication that bronze was in principle not used for grave monuments in archaic Athens. A total of 42 bases for marble gravestones dates to the sixth century, many of them from the Kerameikos.\textsuperscript{206} There are some discrepancies between grave bases and grave sculpture. First, the third quarter of the sixth century shows a decline of gravestones, while the number of bases rises. Then, bases and gravestones follow a similar pattern until bases abruptly disappear in the first quarter of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{207} There are no sepulchral bases from the fifth-century Kerameikos, at least not of private monuments.\textsuperscript{208} In fact, only two funerary bases from the fifth century are preserved: the monument of a woman, Menestho, and one erected to the memory of one \[------\]antios.\textsuperscript{209} On the other hand, funerary sculpture makes a strong comeback after its mid-century lapse and interestingly, the Kerameikos is no longer its predominant find spot.

The total number of gravestones is about half of that of votives, but the number of sepulchral bases in the record only reaches slightly less than one-sixth of the total number of votive bases (table 1a). Even if pedestals for bronze statues are excluded, the number of votive bases for marble dedications is double or triple that of marble funerary bases (table 1b). This can be explained in several ways. Sepulchral bases may have been less accurately recorded than votive ones in epigraphic and archaeological research.\textsuperscript{210} Alternatively, fewer sepulchral bases may have been preserved or more may be as yet undiscovered. This would of course depend on their location. Finally, fewer sepulchral bases than the equivalent sculptures might actually have been produced in Athens in the archaic period, which would need further explanation. These three suggestions, one stemming from methods of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{206} Divided as follows: 25 from the Kerameikos and four from the Agora, all from the sixth century; 13 from elsewhere in Athens, including one example from the Akropolis (cat. B 183, EM 13486, the monument of Kleito; it is hard to understand what this base was doing on the North Slope of the Akropolis).
\item \textsuperscript{207} All but one: cat. B 103, EM 10635. See above n. 151.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Pythagoras, \textit{proxenos} of Selymbria, probably received a state burial c. 460 BC. His monument (with stepped base), is not included here because of its public nature. See Köhler 1885, 366; Brückner 1909, 6–10 figs. 3, 5–7; Möbius 1968, 9 n. 4; Hoepfner 1973, 145–63, pls. 77–8; Knigge 1988, 97–9 no. 10; Wijma 2010, 256–7.
\item \textsuperscript{209} EM 10254, cat. B 128, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 1302 (Menesthos). The type of statue once on this base is not entirely clear. There is a rectangular cutting on top of the base which might indicate a number of gravestone types. EM 10635, cat. B 103 (for \[------\]antios) was found in Aiolou St. (Jeffery, \textit{BSA} 57 (1962), 132 n. 30; \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 1236). It is a stepped base with part of the original limestone block (a stele) still preserved in the socket.
\item \textsuperscript{210} Kreeb 1999, 10 n. 12.
\end{itemize}
recording, one from preservation and one from production, could separately or in combination account for the discrepancies between gravestones and their bases, and to a lesser extent, between trends in votive and sepulchral bases. In this section, all three aspects will be discussed.

Judging by the bibliography on the subject, scholarly neglect cannot to be blamed for low numbers of bases – especially not for funerary inscriptions. The Kerameikos excavations have been published extensively, as are the funerary practices of archaic and classical Greece and of the Athenian Kerameikos in particular. The first possibility above, a less thorough record for gravestones than for votives, would thus seem unlikely. After all, an urban cemetery with a relatively complete diachronic burial record from prehistory until Roman times has obvious appeal for scholars. However, the early start of the excavations (similar to votives) restricts the possibilities for the more context-oriented approach favoured nowadays. Archaic Attic gravestones have so far rarely been assembled for quantitative analysis, which requires all available material to be included rather than only the best

211 The collection of bases in this study is suitable for these questions, because they are not concerned with a comparison of votives and gravestones, but of funerary bases with their equivalent sculptures. Their relative spread over time is studied here rather than the total numbers. Since the same selection criteria were applied to both votive and funerary monuments, the results of both trends can be compared, even if this will say little or nothing about the absolute numbers.

212 For the present case, most importantly Brückner 1893; Clairmont CAT; Conze AG, IG II²; IG I¹; Jeffery 1962 and LSAG; Knigge Ker. IX and 1988; Kübler Ker. VI and VII.1; Kunze–Götte Ker. VII.2; Morris 1992, ch. VI 156–73; Peek Ker. III and GG; Riemann Ker. II; Salta 1991 (specifically for Athens and Attika); Scheibler Ker. XI; Schörfl–Vierneisel Ker. XV; Stupperich 1977. See Jacob–Felsch 1969, Kissas 2000 and Kosmopoulou 2002, for the bases and supports rather than inscriptions. M. Kreeb (1999) gives an overview of research on Kerameikos inscriptions (p. 9–10 ns. 3–12); see B. Petrakos (1998) for an epigraphic bibliography of the site.

213 See previous note. Also Curtius 1862–5; Karo 1943, Kerameikos 2001 passim, Niemeyer 2002 and numerous articles in e.g. the Athenische Mitteilungen and the Archäologischer Anzeiger (see bibliography there).


215 E.g. Morris 1987, 1992; Kreeb 1999, 12. Systematic excavations in the Kerameikos by the Archaeological Society of Greece, in particular by S. Kumanudis, started in 1863. In 1913, the official permit was transferred to the German Archaeological Institute, which has excavated on the site continuously except for two interruptions during the World Wars. Re-excavations of some areas now add to our grasp of the burial practices associated with the graves, sacrificial pits or Opferrinnen and gravestones. See Stroszeck and Posamentir 2002.
In view of the many examples of quantitative research on graves, it is fitting to apply numerical analysis to gravestones as well, in spite of smaller quantities. A first question to this end is why sepulchral bases and gravestones seem to develop differently (tables 1b, 2b–c).

One explanation for the paucity of grave bases is poor preservation, resulting in a smaller number of grave than votive bases. The great bulk of Athenian votive sculpture and related material is from the Akropolis, and the high survival ratio of sixth and early fifth-century material is partly due to the Persian debris. The question is whether a sepulchral equivalent of that debris exists. In a well-known passage of his Histories, Thucydides describes how immediately after the Persian wars the Athenians hurriedly built a defensive wall around Athens, using every piece of stone that they could lay their hands on (map 1). According to Thucydides' account, the signs of their haste were still clearly visible in his lifetime. In classical Athens, cemeteries lay on the outskirts of the city; they were therefore in close vicinity to the wall, and available materials, especially base blocks from grave monuments, were used for its construction. Thus, the Themistoklean wall, in particular the stretch between what is now Piraeos Street and the church of the Holy Trinity was an ideal depot for sculpture, a sepulchral counterpart to the votive debris from the Akropolis.

In 1916, the first extraction of a grave statue from the Themistoklean wall was recorded: the Dipylon head, named after the north tower of the gate it had been built into (pl. 4c). Since then, many gravestones and bases have come to light in the remains of the city circuit. Elsewhere in the Kerameikos they were found too, a few even in situ over graves.

---


217 Thuc. 1.93.1–2. The trajectory of the wall and the existence of earlier versions will be discussed below: n. 279. See there for various trajectories suggested in scholarship.

218 For the position of burial grounds in Greek cities and Athens in particular, Winter 1982.

219 Thuc. 1.90.3. Cf. e.g. Knigge 1988, 62.

220 Cat. G 6; NMA 3372, 3965. Buschor, AM 52 (1927) 205; Niemeyer 2002, 22; ibid. 55 for a bibliography of Themistoklean Wall finds.

221 Culminating in 2002 in the find of four new pieces of archaic grave sculpture and two capitals (Niemeyer 2002): cat. G 17, KM P 1699; cat. G 18, KM no. ?; cat. G 19, KM P 1698; the Ionian capital KM no. ?, cat. B 288. The second capital showed no signs of the type of statue and its inscription was not usable for this study. It was therefore left out.

222 In total the database contains 41 statues and 26 bases from before the Persian war with provenance Kerameikos (table 2b); of these, 22 gravestones and 11 bases were found in the
Since smaller, loose pieces were big enough to be used as building material, one wonders why some of the Kerameikos monuments were left out of the wall. Were there limits, religious, social or other, to what could be taken for Athens' defence? It is perhaps more likely that such oversights ensued from the general chaos after the destruction of the city in 480 BC. Some monuments may have been lost in the rubble and by the time they were found, the construction of the wall had already reached the superstructure of clay bricks, or was even complete. Some sculptures were irregularly shaped and less useful for the foundation. Some pieces stayed out of the original wall, but were later used for repairs of the city circuit or of other infrastructure in the area.

The latter scenario has been suggested for six pieces of archaic sculpture discovered in 2002. They were left near the fifth–century ground level for practical reasons until the time when they were used for repairs. All of them have wheel-marks, resulting from their position in the road to the Sacred gate. Later, the road was abandoned and channels were built over it to keep the Eridanos river from flooding the area. However, the date exact of the road is disputed. A date immediately after 480/79 is a possibility, but so is one later in the fifth century when the Eridanos had proved to be a problem.

The Themistoklean wall provides a relatively solid date ante quem for the sculpture found in it. Contrary to the Akropolis deposits, however, the wall never held all the pre-Persian sculpture from the Kerameikos. Archaic spolia were used in later buildings on the

---

223 E.g. NMA 2687, cat. G 76, was roughly chiselled to fit into the wall better. Unlike other pieces, after this it could be – and was – used for the wall. Cf. Knigge 1988, 53–4 fig. 52.

224 Perhaps the head of a youth in Severe Style, cat. G 31, KM P 1455? It was found in Hellenistic rubble south of the Sacred gate. Also cat. G 105, KM P 699: Gruben, AA 1969, 32 fig. 6; Willemsen, AM 85 (1970) 29 pl. 11.2. The wall was probably renovated after several earthquakes in the 420s, and certainly rebuilt after the demolition at the end of the Peloponnesian war. The latter phase is known as Kononian and dates from 394 BC. on. See Thuc. 3.87.4; 4.52.1; 5.45.4. For a brief outline of the historical events see Knigge 1988, 49–54.

225 Niemeyer 2002 50. Cf. above n. 221.

226 For the date of these particular structures of the Kerameikos, Niemeyer 2002, 47 (quoting G. Kuhn for the research on the date of the foundations; cf. 23) and contra Knigge 1988, 56–7. Cf. above n. 224.
site, and some of the loose material lay around for quite some time before being re-used. Although few gravestones were found in situ, the scattered finds from the Kerameikos show the accuracy of Thucydides’ account: no time was wasted on a complete clear-out of the cemetery, as probably happened on the Akropolis. This means that though the records of the two sites result from the same event, they are composed differently. In the Kerameikos, the debris was probably never fully cleared at all, but many gravestones were built into the wall very soon after the Persian wars. On the Akropolis on the other hand, it took quite some time for the piles of debris to actually be buried, but then it was done thoroughly. In short, the post-Persian deposition of votives from the Akropolis was slow, but meticulous. That of the gravestones from the Kerameikos was fast and hurried, using only part of the material in the initial wall. So, the grave monuments had a smaller chance of becoming building material and therefore of survival than those on the Akropolis. In this light it is understandable that from archaic times, fewer gravestones and their bases than votive monuments are preserved.

These circumstances, however, do not account for the difference between funerary bases and grave sculpture. In principle, bases are ideally suited for construction. Their numbers rise from the second quarter to the end of the sixth century, although the highest number of 11 examples in the last quarter of the sixth century is not high. At the start of the fifth century, funerary bases disappear from the Kerameikos, which may suggest the influence of the wall. But why would pieces from the first three quarters of the sixth century be more likely to end up in it than later ones, which were most recent at the time the wall was built? It is quite unthinkable that the Athenians sorted the emergency building material beyond the practical: they were in a rush and simply took what was at hand. Theoretically, it is possible that a group of bases from the late-archaic period was concentrated in an as yet unexcavated cemetery, whose gravestones were built into a part of the wall elsewhere. If a new area had just come into use as a burial ground at the end of the sixth century, the

---

227 The present data record 14 out of 24 Kerameikos bases as associated to the wall and environs. Of sculpture, 23 of 39 items from the pre-Persian Kerameikos (plus one outside of the Kerameikos) are associated to the wall; only two actually come from the wall itself: the lion KM P 1053 and the relief of a man KM P 1132 (cat. G 23 and 75 respectively). For contexts of sculptures found in the Dipylon area see Hoepfner, Ker X, 106–8.

228 The exception of the stele in the Kerameikos museum, dating to 600–575, is hard to explain. Compare above n. 222.

229 There is a possibility that some of the grave monuments were repaired and remained in use. However, there is no physical evidence for this in the present data record.
nearest stretch of the Themistoklean Wall would be richest in funerary sculpture and bases from that zone.

However, this view surmises the existence of such a cemetery and of an unexcavated stretch of Themistoklean wall outside the Kerameikos, which was at least originally full of grave sculpture and bases from that period, and yet is completely unknown to ancient sources as well as present-day archaeology. The ample research in the area makes this unlikely. Moreover, if a stretch of the wall containing most of the late-archaic gravestones really existed, one would expect at least some exceptions in the wall at the Kerameikos, one or two gravestones or bases from the early fifth century. But no funerary bases from after the turn of the century were found there. In fact, no excavated parts of the wall anywhere in Athens have produced funerary bases from the first quarter of the fifth century. This suggests, though admittedly ex silentio, that in the early fifth century the use of bases became less ubiquitous. By consequence, no sculpture from this period should be preserved, at least none which would need a base or pedestal.

Like sepulchral bases, grave sculpture from the early fifth century is conspicuously absent from the excavated parts of the Themistoklean wall. Beyond the wall, however, the picture is different. Five examples of grave sculpture from the early fifth century show that grave monuments were made at this time (table 2a). All of these are statues which needed some kind of support; yet no bases for them from the fifth-century Kerameikos are listed in the record (table 2b). It is not unusual that numbers of bases and statues do not add up, but here, they are lacking entirely. It is impossible to set up these statues without bases, so it must be concluded that the early fifth-century sepulchral bases are missing from the archaeological record. This means that for the late-archaic funerary monuments of the Kerameikos, the extant material does not represent the levels of sculpture production. One explanation might be that the bases, convenient as they are for construction, were used as building material more than sculpture fragments. The fact that the sculpture fragments from

230 See below, p. 78–80.


232 Outside of the record of this study, hardly any sepulchral bases from the Kerameikos in the first quarter of the fifth century seem to survive either. IC I lists one example from Athens, IC I 1236 (cat B 103) but it was found in the Od. Aiolou, east of the Kerameikos proper.
this period are quite small and that three out of five are fragments of basins, thin slab–like pieces, suggests that they were overlooked or deemed useless, while bigger objects and bases were put to use in the new circuit wall, now underneath the modern city.233

Practically no sepulchral bases from the fifth century are preserved (table 2b).234 Grave sculpture on the other hand abounds in the second half of the fifth century, rising from none to six to twenty, in the second, third and final quarters of the fifth century respectively. Only the category Athens Other produces more at the end of the fifth century. The absence of bases of grave monuments in the later fifth century is – contrary to the situation in the first quarter – not surprising. More than three quarters of gravestones from the Kerameikos in the second half of the fifth century are reliefs or stelai. The evidence shows that at the time, these stelai were often placed on the walls of family grave precincts or periboloi, serving as memorials for several consecutive generations.235 Many are quite modest in size and the structure of the peribolos would have sufficed to support them. In this respect, the evidence is more straightforward than of the votives of the late fifth century: it is clear in which way many of the gravestones could have been placed, even though few were found in situ.

THE AGORA AND BEYOND

The site of the Agora (maps 7a–b and 8a) is represented in the record with 57 votive and grave sculptures from the archaic to the classical period (table 2a). Of these, 33 are votives and 24 gravestones: an even division compared to the Akropolis and Kerameikos. Quite a few sanctuaries in the Agora would seem likely candidates for sculpted votives, because their deities regularly received such gifts in other places. For graves and therefore gravestones, the Agora was off–limits in classical times, but there was a burial ground on the western slope of the Areopagos (close to, though not actually in the Agora: map 8b) which was used well into

233 Fragments of poorly preserved (and so undatable) bases for late–archaic grave sculpture might be present in the excavation’s storerooms. Despite the thoroughness of the archaeologists working at the Kerameikos, not all bases nor all sculpture fragments (from the Kerameikos nor from other sites in Athens) are published yet. Future additions to the record of Athenian grave monuments will undoubtedly shed new light on this material, but for the present, any analysis can only be based on what is available.

234 Above n. 209; neither is from the Kerameikos.

235 See pl. 52c; also e.g. Knigge 1988, 137; Garland 1982; Shapiro 1991, 656; Schmaltz 2001 (for the late fifth and the fourth century BC). Cf. also Patterson 2006.
Archaic times.\textsuperscript{236} Its presence could mean two things. First, the ban on burials of deceased adults within the city-walls may not have been in force yet, and so, gravestones found in the Agora might actually have come from graves there. Alternatively, the city walls of the archaic period may have enclosed a smaller area than the later Themistoklean fortifications, and the cemetery was therefore not in the restricted area.\textsuperscript{237} No sculpted monuments were apparently found within the boundaries of this burial ground.\textsuperscript{238}

Bases from the Agora proper are few, but like sculpture, evenly divided between votive and sepulchral material (table 2b).\textsuperscript{239} The numbers, six and four respectively, are so low that there is little point in analysing them. The only thing that can be said is that no bases for gravestones appear to have been found in the Agora after the sixth century. The sepulchral bases which are preserved date to the third quarter and in one case to the last quarter of the sixth century BC.\textsuperscript{240} Votive bases are as scarce, with only two examples from the final quarter of the sixth century and two from the first quarter of the fifth.\textsuperscript{241} Nor do they increase in the fifth century.\textsuperscript{242} One of the rare late examples, AM I 5128, may have been dedicated on the Akropolis originally and is sometimes considered the base of the Sosandra, dedicated by Kimon’s brother-in-law Kallias.\textsuperscript{243} An explanation for its find spot, far from the Propylaia where ancient sources locate it originally, is lacking.\textsuperscript{244}

\textsuperscript{236} Map 9a shows the distribution of graves and main buildings from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Cf. also Young 1951\textsuperscript{1}; Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 69–70; Winter 1982 (response to Young); Salta 1994, 8–10.

\textsuperscript{237} Some funerary sculpture and bases from the Agora may have been used in the Themistoklean wall; if so, this would suggest that that wall ran not too far from the cemetery. The trajectory of the city walls of Athens, archaic or Themistoklean, however, is problematic: cf. below p. 78.

\textsuperscript{238} The record of this study contains no gravestones from this area, nor bases of either function.


\textsuperscript{242} Cat. B 104, AM I 3398 (IG II 876; 425–400) and cat. B 136, AM I 5128 (IG II 962: 450–425). Considering the amount of unpublished material on the website of the Agora excavations, there are undoubtedly more examples beyond the reach of this research. Cf. http://www.agathe.gr/resources.html.

\textsuperscript{243} Richter 1950, 205; base found in Agora Section Ψ 38, house 614/18. The original described in Luc. Im. 4. There is some confusion whether this statue was itself nicknamed Sosandra, or was a gift to Aphrodite Sosandra. The reason for the epithet is uncertain too. A dedication described by
More informative than the rare votive bases from the Agora are the sculptures. In the record from the third quarter of the sixth century, gravestones in the Agora amount to nine examples and in the next period to seven (table 2a, chart 2a).\textsuperscript{245} Votive statues, like the corresponding bases, are mostly from the final quarter of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth, totalling thirteen and seven respectively.\textsuperscript{246} Later in the fifth century, they go up steadily by two per quarter century (chart 2).\textsuperscript{247} It is noteworthy that in the Agora and on the Akropolis alike, the period after the Persian wars does not completely lack sculpture. The quantity of gravestones grows slightly as well, to five examples in the last quarter.\textsuperscript{248}

In the early sixth century, material from the Kerameikos produces most gravestones, followed by the Agora (table 2a). However, in the second quarter several gravestones come from elsewhere in Athens, and in the third all three provenance categories, Agora, Kerameikos, and Athens Other are represented. From the start of the second quarter of the fifth century, all three show a similar pattern (chart 2a): a gradual increase to the final quarter of the century. In votives (chart 2), the Agora achieves modest peaks in the final quarter of the sixth and the first quarter of the fifth century. This resembles the Akropolis material, but numbers of Agora votives are much lower. In short, the Agora votives and gravestones peak when sites with the most prolific quantities of sculpture do so, but on a much smaller scale.

\textsuperscript{244} Pausanias (I.23.2) as having the same dedicator and sculptor, and placed at the entrance of the Akropolis, cannot belong to this base, since the statue was a bronze lion, not a female figure in marble. Cf. below p. 163.

\textsuperscript{245} DAA 152–3 no. 136 and p. 507. Raubitschek suggests the sanctuary of Aphrodite on the west slope of the Akropolis. The identification cannot be proven, though the combination of inscribed names is tempting and the votive it carried was apparently in marble, which would fit. Cf. cat. B 136 and below n. 701.

\textsuperscript{246} For the gravestones from the sixth-century Agora see below n. 286.


\textsuperscript{248} Cat. G 70, AM S 499; cat. G 138, AM I 6349; cat. G 162, AM I 2959; cat. G 164, AM I 1898; cat. G 166, AM I 139; there is one from the Agora in 450–425, namely the stele of Herakleides, cat. G 163, NMA 2066.
The relation between the Agora votives and those of the northern part of the Akropolis, especially the slope, is interesting (charts 2, 2d): numbers of preserved votives from the final quarter of the sixth century until the middle of the fifth (in other words, the range of the Persian debris) are practically the same as those on the Agora.\textsuperscript{249} A few fragments of Akropolis dedications were even found in the Agora.\textsuperscript{250} Considering the lay of the two sites, this similar pattern is hardly surprising.

Even though some sculptures and bases in the Agora originally came from the Akropolis, the numbers are too low to argue for a deliberate removal of sculpture or bases from one site to the other. In view of the severe damage to many of the Agora pieces (e.g. pls. 5a–c), especially those which were found close to the Akropolis, they may well have fallen or perhaps have been thrown off the hill, but not systematically brought down.\textsuperscript{251} Neither is the reverse probable: damaged votive material from the city was hardly collected on top of the Akropolis. Since it is common sense to move shattered sculpture as little as possible, at least some of the Agora votives must have come from the site itself. The question arises which shrines and sanctuaries (and cemeteries) existed in the Agora in the sixth and fifth centuries, and second, at which of these, and thus for which deities, were sculpted votives appropriate offerings?

The Agora area was laid out north of the Akropolis in the first half of the sixth century after it was probably moved from the east side of the hill (maps 9a–b).\textsuperscript{252} The exact

\textsuperscript{249} North slope Akropolis: 14 and 8 from 525–500 and 500–475 respectively. Agora: 13 and 7. Tables 2a and 2d.

\textsuperscript{250} As e.g. the base of Sosandra (above, n. 244); kore Akr. 683 with a fr. of her buttock AM S 1131 from the Agora; cat. V 28. The connection was first noted by Harrison 1955, 169–71 pl. 65; cf. Harrison 1965, 21–2 no. 75, pl. 7. The base EM 6348 (b), cat. B 262, IG I\textsuperscript{3} 644 (b) is a certain match, part of a group with two korai on column bases. Cf. Keesling 2003, 9–10 fig. 4, 210, 214. For other bases with scattered frs. from the two sites, see for example cat. B 70, B 136 and B 147. The Sosandra base was counted as found on the Agora, while the fragment of Akr. 683 was not counted separately.

\textsuperscript{251} As for example the piece in the previous note, AM S 1131 or other kore fragments from the Agora. Also: AM S 1957, cat. V 277 or AM S 2106, cat. V 104.

\textsuperscript{252} Thompson 1966, 45; Boersma 1970, 15; Travlos 1971, 6; Camp 2001, 29–36, fig. 30; Lippolis 2006, 52–6; and in general Marconi 2001. Boersma assumed that already before the sixth century, the Agora was located west or north–west of the Akropolis. However, more recent finds (such as the inscription locating the shrine of Aglauros on the north–east slope of the Akropolis, have since offered strong evidence that it was on the east side of the Akropolis. Also Dontas 1983, 57–73; Robertson 1998, \textit{passim}; id. 2005, 44. Camp 2001, 257 describes the old site as ‘several hundred meters to the east’ of the classical Agora: the exact spot cannot be settled presently, because the modern neighbourhood of Plaka prevents full excavation of the area.
location of the old Agora and the reasons for a shift of the city–centre to the northwest it in the sixth century are uncertain. After the reforms of Solon, the Agora on the north side of the Akropolis was gradually provided with public and sacred buildings.\(^{253}\) From the first half of the sixth century, remains of only few monumental public buildings can be found in the Agora or, for that matter, in Athens in general. Among the most important early monuments in the city are the one or possibly two temples of Athena on the Akropolis and a building in the Agora which the excavators considered an early Prytaneion.\(^{254}\)

Around the middle of the sixth century, public architecture in Athens began in earnest (maps 10a–b). On the west side of the Agora, shrines were built for Apollo Patroos and Zeus Agoraios, while in the south–west corner probably the first public buildings appeared (maps 10c–d, 11a).\(^{255}\) However, the sculpture record shows no evidence of votives being offered at either sanctuary in the sixth or fifth centuries. Most Athenian votives by far were gifts to Athena, while Hermes is second in popularity. The problem with the latter’s votives is that herms, listed by default as dedicated to Hermes, are in fact multifunctional objects as well as representations the god himself.\(^{256}\) A number of herms from the western and north–western areas of the Agora seems to confirm the existence of a place called The Herms near the Stoa Poikile which ancient sources describe (map 11b). However, the evidence for its original location is inconclusive.\(^{257}\)

\(^{253}\) Possibly partly by Peisistratos: cf. Shapiro 1989; cf. map 7a.

\(^{254}\) For the Athena temples: e.g. Shapiro 1989, 19 (also the first two parts of this section on the Akropolis). Prytaneion: based on Paus. I.18.3–4; cf. Camp 2001, 27; Angiolillo 1997 (10–5, 29) concludes that the house probably had public or administrative purposes, because of the building phases and the continuity in public use of the area later on. Cf. De Libero 1996, 100–1. The building has alternatively been identified as the Peisistratids’ residence (Boersma 1970, 16–7, 145 no. 144, id. 2000, 54; Shear 1978, 6–7; Morris 1987, 68; Cawkwell 1995, 77; Hurwit 1999, 120; Camp 2001, 35 (‘a plausible suggestion’); Anderson 2003, 88–92. More recently and extensively on this topic, Losehand 2007. If the location of the old Agora east of the Akropolis is accepted, the Prytaneion would be located under the modern area of Plaka. Cf. Dontas 1983, 60.

\(^{255}\) Boersma 1970, 17, 128 (Apollo), 145 (Zeus); Shapiro 1989, 50 (Apollo), 112–115 (Zeus); Wycherley 1957, 50–53 (Apollo), 122–4 (Zeus). It is sometimes contended that these shrines and the public buildings were built under the patronage of Peisistratos (he would then be responsible for all the buildings in map 10), but there is no conclusive evidence for this. Cf. Camp 2001, 28–38 for a more modest version of Peisistratid influence in the matter. For the fifth-century buildings in this location see maps 10b–d.

\(^{256}\) If considered cult statues, they should have been excluded. For more on deities, below ch. IV.4.

\(^{257}\) Boersma 1970, 52, 217; Camp 2001, 65. In fact, five of six herms from the Agora were found at the west or north–west of the site: cat. V 320, AM S 3477; cat. V 321, AM S 211; cat. V 322, Akr.
Apollo appears on a votive relief from the late fifth century, found to the south–east of the
Akropolis and connected to the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios in the Ilissos valley (map
12b).\textsuperscript{258} Another relief from this period depicts Zeus, and is therefore in all likelihood an
offering to him.\textsuperscript{259} Both these dedications are from smaller find spots in Athens; a third
example, a votive base to Apollo in the Agora, was built into the wall of the Klepsydra and so
its original location is unknown.\textsuperscript{260}

Two votive reliefs from the Agora are to Demeter and Kore and date to the late fifth
century (pl. 6a). Specifically, they were found in or near the City Eleusinion, the sanctuary of
the Goddesses at the end of the processional road from Eleusis (map 12a).\textsuperscript{261} It had a stone
temple and temenos from approximately 490 BC onward; some remains suggest an earlier
structure dated around the middle of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{262} It seems surprising that so few
marble votive reliefs from the City Eleusinion have survived, especially in view of the
Goddesses’ great popularity in the fifth century.\textsuperscript{263} Had their been any archaic dedications,
they might have been lost in the Persian wars; but considering that later, in the fifth century,
their numbers remain low, stone sculpture appears as an atypical gift to Demeter and Kore in
Athens. A remodelling of the city sanctuary of the Goddesses, commemorated in an

\textsuperscript{258} Cat. V 325, NMA 1389: Athens Other. The sanctuary of Apollo Patroos in the Agora would be a
more likely provenance (map 10c). For the Ilissos sanctuary, see Travlos 1971, 289–98; Picón

\textsuperscript{259} Storeroom of the Third Ephoria inv. 5a.

\textsuperscript{260} Cat. 124, AM I 5517, IG I\textsuperscript{3} 950, is a pillar from the first quarter of the fifth century. A circular base
dedicated to Hermes is perhaps from the Akropolis: cat. B 163, EM 6516. The inscription indicates
Hermes Enagonaios, a rare epithet that usually occurs after the fifth century. Cf. IG I\textsuperscript{3} 840.

\textsuperscript{261} AM S 1013, cat. V 270 (rel. with Demeter, Kore and Triptolemos), found in the east wall of the
Hypapanti church near the Eleusinion. A second relief with Demeter and Triptolemos (cat. V 272,
AM S 1045) was found in the ‘Valerian wall’ close by. Both date 425–400. No dedicatory
inscriptions in the record are to the Goddesses.

\textsuperscript{262} The first votive deposits date from the seventh century (Miles 1998, 16); the age of the sanctuary
earliest temple was dedicated to Triptolemos, not Demeter. For the archaic sanctuary, Miles 1998,
22–33; for the temple of Triptolemos ibid. 35–57. The question is whether votives depicting the
goddess and the hero were offered to Demeter and Kore, or to Triptolemos. Boersma 1970, 35;

\textsuperscript{263} Especially in the fourth century BC; stone dedications never became really numerous in this
sanctuary, though, at least judging from the finds. Miles 1998, 67, also 95–103 (ritual vessels).
inscription of 434 BC, may have caused a slight rise in votive reliefs dedicated to them in the last quarter of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{264} 

Apparently, the City Eleusinion was not the only sanctuary in Athens which rarely received sculpted dedications. Some smaller precincts on the Akropolis, such as Poseidon’s on the north side and that of Artemis Brauronia in the southwest, have produced sculpted votives (pl. 6b).\textsuperscript{265} Towards the end of the fifth century, Artemis was given sculpture more often on the Akropolis, though her smaller shrines elsewhere in Athens have not produced any sculpted votives.\textsuperscript{266} One relief from the Akropolis shows Artemis paired with Asklepios.\textsuperscript{267} The latter’s sanctuary on the south slope of the Akropolis (map 6a) was filled with small votive reliefs soon after its foundation in 421/0 BC (pls. 6c–d; map 5).\textsuperscript{268} From the end of the fifth century, 12 reliefs to Asklepios are listed in the record, all but one from the Asklepieion or its direct environs.\textsuperscript{269} They usually depict Hygieia and Asklepios. Except for Athena, herms and numerous statues of Nike,\textsuperscript{270} Athenians most often dedicated sculpture to Asklepios. In view of the late arrival of his cult in Athens, this is remarkable.

---

\textsuperscript{264} Of six votive reliefs from the Agora in the final quarter of the fifth century, four are to Demeter or Demeter and Kore: cat. V 172, Akr. 1348 and cat. V 324, NMA 3572, both depicting Demeter and Kore; cat. V 270, AM S 1013 and cat. V 272, AM S 1045, including Triptolemos.

\textsuperscript{265} The pedestal EM 6319 (cat. B 33, c. 475–450) and frs. of a pillar EM 6431 (cat. B 229, c. 500–475) carry inscriptions to Poseidon Erechtheus and just Poseidon. The dogs cat. V 117, Akr. 143 and cat. V 199, Akr. 550, 525 have been associated with Artemis’ Akropolis precinct (Shapiro 1989, 66; Boersma 1970, 129, 214). However, Robertson agues in his overview of worship of Aphrodite in Athens that dogs played a special role in her cult (2005, passim). If his interpretation is correct, the dog Akr. 143 might just as likely have been dedicated to Aphrodite as to Artemis, especially since two shrines of Aphrodite existed on the Akropolis.

\textsuperscript{266} Besides the main fifth-century temenos of Artemis Brauronia on the Akropolis, a shrine to Artemis Aristoboule was built by Themistokles (Plu. Them. 22.2) west of the Hephaisteion; it has been identified with a small triangular building on the corner of Od. Herakleidon and Neleus (Boersma 1970, 50, 129; Travlos 1971, 121–3; Shapiro 1989, 66; Camp 2001, 61–2 fig. 57). The temple of Artemis Agrotera was in the south-east of the city, near the Ilissos (for literature see above n. 257). See map 1.


\textsuperscript{269} The relief from outside the Akropolis was from the Kerameikos (cat. V 275; NMA 2373), the Aghia Triadha Church. It shows an incubation scene with the god and Hygieia on a larger scale than the mortals. It therefore seems clear that this was a votive to Asklepios, or at least intended as one.

\textsuperscript{270} Most of these were probably dedicated to Athena or Athena Nike rather than Nike herself. See Travlos 1971, 148–57; also below ch. IV.4.
In addition to the gods mentioned above, some of the dedicatory inscriptions in the record of this study mention Pan or Hermes and the nymphs, Aphrodite, and Kybele (pls. 7a–b).\textsuperscript{271}

Pan’s sanctuary in the cave on the North side of the Akropolis is well known (map 5a); reliefs to him and the nymphs probably come from there (pl. 7c).\textsuperscript{272} A likely dedication to Pan or the nymphs (or both) is a relief which was found on the Od. Asterokopion, near the modern observatory on the Pnyx.\textsuperscript{273}

No sculpted dedications can be connected to the altar of Aphrodite Ourania in the Agora, and neither to the small shrine of Aphrodite Pandemos below the Nike bastion.\textsuperscript{274}

Some of the sanctuaries in which one might expect votive sculpture were apparently not, or not yet, used for offerings of this kind in the fifth century. For example, at the Olympieion (map 13a), no sculpted votives from the fifth century have been found, nor are any marble dedications certainly from the Hephaisteion.\textsuperscript{275} Considering that several of the temples in the Iliissos area (map 12b) date from the sixth century or even earlier and must have been highly revered, this lack of sculpted votives to the deities involved is unexpected.\textsuperscript{276}

\textsuperscript{271} Pan and the Nymphs: cat. V 321; NMA 1329. A possible relief to the nymphs is cat. V. 194, AM S 1948 (Agora) depicting a nymph and a youth holding someone by the hand, suggesting another figure on the part that is now missing, perhaps Hermes. A shrine to nymphs was found south of the Odeon of Herodes Atticus, but its date is uncertain (Daux 1958, 660; Boersma 1970, 141, 164; Brouskari 2002, 32–43 with ref.; Mitropoulou 1977, 74 no. 153, fig. 212. Cat. V 87, Akr. 655, is a small seated Kybele, but the circumstances of her dedication are unclear. Aphrodite is the named recipient of an inscribed pillar, found built into the wall between the Nike bastion and the Beule gate (cat. B. 98; EM 6425). Cf. below n. 274.

\textsuperscript{272} Travlos 1971, 417–21; Camp 2001, 119. Another cave had links to Apollo (Camp ibid.) but evidence of sculpture from this shrine is lacking.

\textsuperscript{273} Cat. V 194. See n. 271.

\textsuperscript{274} Camp 2001, 118–9, fig. 144 J: inscriptions indicate the location of the sanctuary. See also the cave of Aphrodite and Eros on the north slope of the Akropolis, ibid. 120, fig. 144D; also Travlos 1971, 228–32. A thorough listing and analysis of Aphrodite’s cult in Athens in Robertson 2005.

\textsuperscript{275} The Olympieion was started by the Peisistratids c. 515 BC, but not finished until the reign of Hadrian. That would explain the absence of votives from the fifth century (Boersma 1970, 25, 145; Travlos 1971, 402–11; Camp 2001, 36–7). Construction of the Hephaisteion was started around the middle of the fifth century and finished in the final quarter of the century: there, the lack of votives is more unexpected. See Boersma 1970, 59–61, 139, 191, 199; Travlos 1971, 261–88; Camp 2001, 102–4.

\textsuperscript{276} Travlos 1971, 289–98. The temple of Apollo Pythios, now considered to be a building south of he Olympieion, dates to the middle of the fifth century. Boersma 1970, 61; Travlos 1971, 100–3; Shapiro 1989, 50. Nor are there any stone votives which can be linked to sanctuaries like that of Dionysos Eleutherios south of the Akropolis or numerous other shrines and sanctuaries known in Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries.
Even if the recipient deity of a votive is known, the place of its original dedication may be rather difficult to establish. This is somewhat easier for the Akropolis material, where the extant dedications constitute a closed set and Athena was by far the most frequent recipient deity of offerings. Other gods and goddesses are much less often represented in inscriptions or in the iconography of sculpture from the Akropolis. Moreover, sometimes even epigraphic and iconographic details combined cannot prove exactly in which sanctuary scattered votives were originally dedicated. A relief with an image of the Athena from the Akropolis, for example, may have been offered to Athena Polias or Poliouchos, Promachos, Parthenos or even to Athena Nike.

Last in this section, a few remarks on Athenian gravestones and cemeteries are in order. Athens' burial grounds stretched along its exit roads and converged near the gates of the city walls (map 1). As was discussed above, the trajectory of the ancient fortifications is particularly relevant to the material of this study. The most famous city walls of Athens are the ones built just after the Persian wars thanks to the efforts of Themistokles, who went to Lakonia to stall the Spartans' intention to prevent the fortification of Athens. Plutarch and Thucydides write that he was successful, and the walls were built in record time. However, it is quite likely that some form of fortification existed in the sixth century already, and the Themistoklean wall was in part just a repair or an improvement of the old circuit. F. E. Winter has argued that an earlier suggestion of an oval-shaped circuit from Solonic times is too extensive. He proposes a modest trajectory which ran near to the Akropolis and dated approximately from the 560s (partly shown in map 9b). This, he argues, would be in line with the evolution of fortifications elsewhere in Greece at the time. The Themistoklean wall

---

277 See below ch. IV.4.
280 Thuc. 1.83.1–2; Plu. Them. 19.
281 As Boersma already noted (1970, 45, 151, plan IV, Athens). Compare also Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 70; and Hdt. 9.13, Thuc. 1.89.3; 6.57.1. The wall in the excavation on pl. 8a deserves more attention in this respect.
282 Winter 1982, 200; the earlier suggestion Travlos 1971, 8 fig. 5, 20 fig. 28; ibid. 158 denies the existence of pre-Persian city walls. See also: Salta 1991, 8.
283 Winter 1982, 203.
was the first one to include the Pnyx and the cemetery on the Agora. Its trajectory runs mostly under the modern city.

Athenian gravestones of the sixth century can perhaps shed some light on the matter of the older city circuit. Not many archaic gravestones have been found in the city outside of the Kerameikos: of the few that were, none date to the first quarter, six from the second and four from the third quarter of the century (table 2a).\textsuperscript{284} In the last quarter of the sixth century, numbers rise to 16 examples, but from the next period there are none, and from the second quarter of the fifth century only one, a stele.\textsuperscript{285} The Agora has produced one gravestone from the first quarter of the sixth century, nine from the third, and seven from the last quarter.\textsuperscript{286} With one possible example from the first quarter of the fifth century,\textsuperscript{287} 18 of the 24 Agora gravestones are from the sixth century (table 2a). In the rest of Athens, it is just the other way round: far more gravestones from the fifth century than from the sixth are preserved. This is entirely due to the final quarter of the fifth century, whose 49 gravestones from 'Athens Other' constitute the largest single-period sepulchral group from one provenance category.

In view of the spread of cemeteries along the city walls, this pattern is not surprising. The Agora had been in use as a burial ground in the eighth and seventh century BC, and in the sixth century this practice continued.\textsuperscript{288} It was probably only in the early fifth century, when the older Agora was relocated in the area north of the Akropolis and began to take its classical form, that the cemetery was abandoned.\textsuperscript{289} Winter argues that the sixth-century burials in the Agora had in fact been outside the wall, since the archaic city wall was little

---


\textsuperscript{285} EM 10225, cat. G 173.


\textsuperscript{287} The lion AM S 1942, which could also have been a votive. See Dates table cat. G 106.

\textsuperscript{288} Even though Morris 1989, 316–7, considers the burials in the Agora late by Greek standards. Cf. also map 8b.

\textsuperscript{289} Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 70; Morris 1989, 317.
more than an extended Akropolis defence. Inside or outside the walls, part of the area of the Agora was used for burials in the sixth century. After 500, a lack of gravestones confirms that the area no longer had this purpose, as the burial grounds moved to the city gates in the new circuit. The wider distribution of late fifth-century gravestones over the city should be seen in the light of this development.

The high number of gravestones from the end of the fifth century was doubtlessly caused by the concentration of the inhabitants of Attika in the city, and the subsequent outbreak of contagious and fatal diseases. That being said, the large quantity of grave sculpture from the late fifth century continues into the fourth, and this is in conflict with a decimated city population. A further aspect of this material is the widening range of sizes, degrees of technical quality, and complexity in comparison to the earlier fifth and the sixth centuries BC. In the following chapters, it will be argued that shifts in quantity and quality of the gravestones are connected to a changing population; they are part of a wider development in an increasingly complex urban society.

3 Numbers and Provenance: An Overview

The preceding discussion of votive and sepulchral monuments lays the foundation for more detailed consideration of the manufacture and social setting of sculpture. More importantly, it has investigated basic questions of method. Consequently, it can be concluded that the chronologies of sculpture and bases as they can be found in scholarship are both usable for the purposes of this study and sufficiently reliable. There is no evidence for a systematic chronological inconsistency between the dates of epigraphic and archaeological material. That being said, highs and lows in the record, especially at the turn from the sixth to the fifth century, are not straightforward. The surrounding periods are not as devoid of monuments as is often believed. More importantly, a similar, if slightly less extreme trend in sculpture numbers occurs in the late-fifth century. Thus, an attempt to connect the patterns in the

290 Winter 1982, 103.
291 Kurtz and Boardman 1971, 92; Salta 1991, 58–63; Morris 1992, 134 (after 425). For epigraphic material per gate see Salta 1991 64–9, and to a lesser extent 70–105 (later material).
292 See above n. 51.
sculpture of the earlier and the late fifth century to historical circumstances should be conducted under the *caveat* that the political situation and the events of Athenian history in the late fifth century are fundamentally different from those of the beginning of that century.

It was suggested in this chapter that the Persian debris peak may be quite close to the rate at which sculpture was produced and dedicated in the half a century before the Persian War. If so, numbers are rather modest for such a long period of dedication. This raises questions regarding the patrons, namely: which, and how many, of the inhabitants of Athens participated in the process of dedicating sculpture? Moreover, did they always dedicate marble statues, or did the Athenians’ preference for votives drift from one type or material of votive to another?

The rise of bronze votives would have been an obvious reason for lower number of votives in, for example, the middle of the fifth century. However, numbers of bases suggest that such a role is an exaggeration. Bases for bronze votives continue into the second quarter of the fifth century, but from after the middle of the fifth century they occur only marginally more frequently than those for marble statues. For gravestones, bronze never was a factor; and though a small peak around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century appears in the grave material, numbers of gravestones never match those of votives until the last quarter of the fifth century. The choices of patrons, notably their preference for reliefs and stelai (further to be discussed in the final chapter below), seems to have much to do with this phenomenon.

Provenance is the other main subject of this chapter. Not surprisingly, most of the material is from the Akropolis. For grave monuments, the main single find spot is the Kerameikos, in particular the Themistoklean Wall. The degree of excavation of this wall, its original trajectory or possible predecessors pose questions which cannot be answered at the present state of research: conjecture about the number of statues still hidden in the circuit’s foundation is pointless. The Akropolis, however, is nearly completely excavated. The examination of its sculpture, epigraphy and other groups of material such as terracottas, has led to the proposition that around the middle of the sixth century, a shift in the dedication patterns of the Athenians took place. Terracotta statues from the first half of the sixth in some cases served as freestanding dedications in this period, or were part of architectural decoration of small treasuries or *oikoi* on the archaic Akropolis. Rather than being built by other poleis – the Akropolis was not a Pan–Hellenic sanctuary – they may well have been offered by the city’s wealthy residents, Athenian or otherwise. Further gifts could be stored in them, especially costly ones which were better kept safely indoors.
Considering this variation of votives in the earlier sixth century (some marble votives from this period also survive), the rise of sculpture in the late–archaic period almost seems an impoverishment: fewer or no oikoi and large free–standing terracottas survive from the second half of the century, while more and more marble sculpture and, until the end of the sixth century, pottery is preserved. The disappearance of the oikoi in the late–archaic period has as yet unknown reasons: a likely cause is construction, even if it has to remain undecided what exactly was built or when. Votive sculpture goes through a minor low in the third quarter, but the sum of votive statues and bases stays the same. And so, Peisistratos cannot be blamed for having curbed aristocratic display in the votive sculpture on the Akropolis.

Sculpted dedications from the earlier sixth century may have been damaged due to the building activity, much of the sculpture from the later sixth century was destroyed by the Persians. Either way, this sculpture could only have ended up in two possible ways: down the hill, or into the building pits. The first option is unlikely because of the trouble involved. Some statues might have been considered salvageable by their patrons or the sanctuary; taking a deity’s property out of his or her sanctuary was a problem; transporting sculpture carefully would have taken a disproportionate effort; and most importantly, where would this material have gone? It was not found elsewhere in Athens, and the building pits on the Akropolis itself were excavated practically in their entirety in the 19th century. Consequently, the Akropolis sculpture from the Persian debris might be considered to quite a large extent representative of the original numbers of marble votives until the time of deposition. That other sanctuaries in Athens have produced far fewer marble votives, may in part be due to poor preservation. Further possible factors, such as traditions of offering certain votives to certain deities only, and changes in these practices over time, will be discussed in a later chapter of this study.

In gravestones the situation is very different, since especially in the second half of the fifth century, funerary sculpture comes from many cemeteries all over Athens. From this period, not many private gravestones are from the Kerameikos anymore, but all the more from other locations in the city. On respect in which gravestones are similar to votives is the fact that the development of sepulchral monuments does not indicate any interference by the tyrants. When funerary bases and sculptures are added up, they show a continuous rise throughout the sixth century.

By the final decades of the fifth century, gravestones and votives were no longer as impressively monumental as they had been a century earlier. Their shapes and sizes had generally become modest, and easy to produce and set up in large numbers. Part of this
trend is the disappearance of bases for gravestones from the record, presumably the Athenians began to insert their gravestones in the walls of *periboloi* rather than erect them separately. The question remains whether such developments in votive and funerary sculpture are mirrored in other characteristics, for example, in the position of patrons or deceased, the recipient deities, the iconography, or in the materials of which they were made.