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IV A patron’s world

1 SCULPTURE PATRONAGE AND THE ATHENIANS

Sculpture in archaic and early-classical Athens relied largely on patronage. Without demand for statuary, sculptors would not have taken up residence in Athens simply because they could not have made a living there. Already in the archaic period, many signatures of individual sculptors in Athenian epigraphy indicate that it was worth their while to remain in the city for longer periods of time, or even to set up shop there. The demand for votive and sepulchral sculpture was an important reason to stay; and the patrons who created these favourable circumstances helped the development of sculpture.\textsuperscript{846} Much of what they preferred was reflected in the statues which were produced. Although the purpose of a commission must have had some influence on, for example, the type of sculpture, it was the patrons who determined how much they wanted to spend and on which occasions they wanted to offer statues. Material, size and complexity of a sculpture were in theory at the patron’s discretion. To which extent Athenian patrons were involved in these aspects of their commissions is a main question of this chapter. Did Athenian patrons choose only things like the genre of their commission, or what a figure in a relief would be holding, or did their influence reach further?

In inscriptions, there were choices to be made, too.\textsuperscript{847} Epigrams might be made by patrons or by professional poets, while some chose for a plain name inscription. By the late fifth century, the letter-cutters who carved these inscriptions were specialised craftsmen, but on some bases the dedicatory inscription is in a different hand than the signature, which may mean sculptors carved their own signatures.\textsuperscript{848} For example, an associate of the sculptor who

\textsuperscript{846} Consecutive architectural projects in Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries possibly provided work for sculptors at the times when private demand was less strong.

\textsuperscript{847} I would like to express my gratitude to Rolf Hochscheid and Mathieu de Bakker for their help in translating the inscriptions in this chapter. Any errors remain, of course, my responsibility.

\textsuperscript{848} Cat. B 10, cat. V 38, Akr. 136, 4346 (a–b), 6506 (c–d), is a statue of Athena set on a fluted column with a Lesbian capital. The dedicant is Epiteles, the sculptor Pythis. Cf. \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{1} 680 (cat. B 22, Akr. 9746) with \textit{IG I}\textsuperscript{1} 788 (cat. V 60, Akr. 140). The latter, the Angelitos Athena, is inscribed on the fragments of the column on which she stood with the signature of Euenor: this is in a different
was good at lettering may have cut the inscription, while the master sculptor personally signed his work. Alternatively, as early as the sixth century a specialised letter-cutter may have come in for the inscription, perhaps at the site where the statue was to be erected. In short, patrons could choose who did the inscription, what it would look like, and what would be in it; but if they did not want to do so or were incapable, others would work out the details, be they the sculptor, a poet or a letter-cutter.

Sculptural and epigraphic evidence of these choices by the patrons reflects something of their motives for ordering sculpture. These may have been religious, economic, political or a combination, the emphasis shifting from one aspect to the other in accordance with the occasion and the patron’s personal circumstances. Sculpture patronage was based on the social and cultural backgrounds of the Athenian patrons, which is why the evidence about them is invaluable. Thanks to the preserved material, sculpture patronage in Athens can be approached from two angles. Through the epigraphic record, the identity of patrons can to a certain extent be traced, while the results of their choices can be found in the preserved votive and sepulchral monuments. This information makes it possible to investigate the connection between the social identity of patrons and the appearance of their sculpture, or in other words, between the patrons’ status and their sculptural preferences.

Without a doubt, patrons had personal motives for setting up votive or sepulchral sculpture. The questions is: did they also have more public reasons? Was sculpture a means of improving one’s social or even political status in ancient Athens? Should the art world of Athenian sculpture be seen as an arena for conspicuous consumption? An attempt to answer these questions must start with an overview of how inscriptions were used, and practical limitations attached to it. The next topic for consideration is what patrons ordered: the genres and iconography of the monuments. A closer look at the evidence from epigraphy about the identity of those who ordered and erected sculpture in archaic and early-classical Athens will follow in sections four and five. Patrons’ choices may have been curbed by rules or legislation imposed by sanctuaries or by the city’s authorities. This chapter will conclude with an exploration of such sacred and civic guidelines regarding votives and gravestones.

hand than the votive inscription Angelitos son of Ech[––]. The former example dates to 525–500, the latter 500–475. The different hand cannot be caused by later additions to the monuments: the signatures are dated around the same time as the votive inscriptions (the alternative could be the case e.g. on cat. B 217, Akr. 4184).
The place of inscriptions

In the inscription with which this study began, Telesinos of Kettos entreated Athena to grant him continued prosperity: *Parthenos, Telesinos of Kettos dedicated a statue on the Akropolis; if it pleases you, may you allow that he dedicate another.* The request brings Telesinos amazingly close to the reader, even twenty-five centuries after it was written. Although not all inscriptions are as personal as this one, the names and the wording in general show to a certain degree how patrons wished to be represented: prospering in business, excelling in a profession, in military or political success or simply as worthy human beings.849 The place of inscriptions on monuments varies, and certainly not all preserved gravestones or votives were inscribed.850 Apparently, some patrons thought it unnecessary. This may have been their choice, but the use of inscriptions may also have been subject to rules of a social or religious nature; and there may have been practical considerations. The latter will be examined here.

Names of sculpture patrons on votives or of their deceased relatives on gravestones are mostly inscribed on the bases: namely, in 264 out of the 288 examples with an inscription collected here (table 6, chart 6.2). Only 131 out of 513 sculptures are inscribed. No statue in the material of this study has an inscription (table 6, chart 6.112),851 and the inscribed objects apart from bases belong to specific genres. In votives these are most often basins (a total 52 out of the 131 inscribed sculptures)852 and in gravestones usually stelai or

---

849 See sections 4 and 5 below for this aspect. This study does not purport a full investigation of name types in archaic and classical Athens, which requires different research criteria (cf. the work of D. Kretschmann at the university of Utrecht). It merely offers a survey of trends in name types over the sixth and fifth centuries, to find out whether this corresponds with any patterns which appear in the sculpture of the present data record.

850 Regrettably, the proportion of monuments which were purposely not inscribed cannot be established since the bases of too many of the sculptures and reliefs do not survive.

851 In other parts of Greece, statues were sometimes signed: cf. Keesling 2001, 11–2, 216 n. 30. Cult statues (and their bases) have long been considered unsignable, too. Donderer noted (see above n. 699) that the artist’s signature may have been in a practically invisible place on the statue itself, as e.g. on Pheidias’ Olympian Zeus. There is of course a religious difference between cult statues and private gravestones or votives; but besides, an inconspicuous inscription on private sculpture defeats the purpose of public display.

852 For an overview of genres in this study, see table 5. Discussion below, p. 206 and further. Out of 52 votives with name inscriptions, 40 are basins (table 6a), mostly from 500–475 (29); one from 600–575 (cat. V 283, EM 6521a–b); seven from 525–500 (below n. 866); and three from 475–450: cat. V 306, EM 6542, of a certain ***odoros***; cat. V 314, EM 6556 dedicated by [---]eus?; and cat. V 315, EM 6536, the basin of Satyros. The other 12 votives with patrons’ names are: a diskos (cat. V 338, EM 6058, of Demophilos?); a plaque or stele dated 525–500 (cat. V 333, EM 5529, for [---]eus?}.

856 There is to my knowledge no parallel in vase painting where the name is inscribed inside the contour of the figure. The François Vase or the Siphnian frieze at Delphi e.g. do have painted name inscriptions, but none of these is on the figures. Insteadm they are on the background around them. See also below n. 859.

archaic period was not conducive to high visibility. In the fifth century, this problem would have been less pressing, since textile in sculpture was often painted one solid colour by then. However, the new preference for more tranquil surfaces may have precluded inscribed or painted letters on them. A more pictorial approach to painting statues which evolved in the later fifth century enhanced sculpted surfaces with light-and-dark contrasts, by covering depths with darker colours than more protruding parts. Such impressionism would have been spoiled by painted names. Some stelai had painted images (pl. 26a) or sculpted elements were given more detail with paint. It is possible that dedicators' names were sometimes painted rather than inscribed on monuments, but no examples survive.

A large majority of inscriptions on votive bases (229 out of 264 more or less recognisable names on bases: table 6) contrasts with the small proportion on funerary bases: there are 35 examples on bases, but 79 are on grave sculptures proper. Over two thirds of all name inscriptions in this study are on the base of the monument, while slightly over a third is on sculptures, mostly stelai or reliefs (tables 6a–b; pls. 24a–b). But while gravestones are often inscribed, inscriptions on votive stelai or reliefs from the late fifth century are much scarcer. The votive and grave reliefs from this period (table 5) differ little in appearance, apart from the iconographical idiosyncrasies of the two functions. It is

858 The sculpted drapery was usually complemented by copious use of colour, as can be seen in e.g. the reconstruction of the Peplos kore, Akr. 679, cat. V. 6, as proposed by Brinkmann and Brijder 2005, 47–55; also from a closer inspection of the decoration of the horseman in the Kerameikos, cat. G 22, KM P 1051, which shows light spots where paint protected the stone, revealing an elaborate pattern of various motifs.


861 E.g. cat. G 107, NMA 86, the Antiphanes stele had painted animals, now invisible to the naked eye. The stele of Theron (cat. G 36, AM I 2056) is smooth except for two lines on the top and bottom and an incised floral motive. Otherwise the decoration was painted and visible when it was found. Both date c. 525–500. The stele of Nautes son of Eudemides of Torone, cat. G 148, NMA 2588, was a roof tile with a painted taenia; the stele of Lissos, cat. G. 143, KM I 417 had a painted astragal along the top of the front.

862 It is perhaps unlikely that those who could afford a stele were unable to pay the letter-cutter. Even crude, make-shift gravestones have inscriptions scratched in, e.g. the stele of Dorkion and Kallis, cat. G 156, EM 489.

863 Of bases whose statue is known, the inscription counts for the base, not for the statue.

864 Of inscriptions on sculpture, just over 60% are on gravestones; of inscriptions on bases, 87% are on votives.

865 Eight votive reliefs from 425–400 have name inscriptions: cf. below n. 874.
noteworthy that the Athenians inscribed so many of their gravestones, but so few of their votive reliefs or stelai.

Thus, archaic sculptures proper are rarely inscribed, but in the fifth century this changes for grave stelai and reliefs and to a lesser extent for their votive equivalents. Only two bases for grave monuments date from the fifth century, both with inscriptions (table 6b). Though these are very low numbers, the survival of any sepulchral bases is interesting in the light of their strong decline in this period. It seems that a few bases were still made for sepulchral monuments. In the beginning of the fifth century, votive bases are more numerous and so are their inscriptions: all 32 votive bases from the second quarter are inscribed (table 6a). After that, inscribed votive bases seem to dwindle, too. The last in the record is a base for a marble votive from the third quarter of the fifth century.

Basins are often inscribed on the rim rather than the pedestal. A reason for this may well be that the wide basin hides the shaft of the support (pls. 20c, 26b) and an inscription on it would be hard to read. Other genres with practical reasons for inscribing the object rather than the pedestal are reliefs and stelai, since the inscription can be fitted on the frame or the pediment. Both basins and reliefs show a peak at the end of the archaic period (table 5); but the fastest growing genre in this period is that of the korai, which is also the largest group of a single genre at the time. Their dedicators had their names inscribed on the

---

866 Six out of 28 gravestones, eight out of 113 votives were inscribed in 525–500. Gravestones: cat. G 36, AM I 2056 (Theron st.); cat. G 107, NMA 86 (Antiphanes stele); cat. G 137, EM 10253 (fr. of plaque); cat. G 152, EM 416 (fr. of st.); cat. G 152, BMFA 1987.621; cat. G 172, NYMM 1985.11.4 (2 diskoi). Votives: cat. V 282, EM 6547 (fr. basin); cat. V 287, EM 6529 (fr. of basin of Komonides); cat. V 288, EM 6544 (fr. of basin); cat. V 289, EM 6526, Akr. Θ 65 (frs. of basin); cat. V 293, EM 6535 (+6555?) (frs. of basin of Polyxenos); cat. V 296, EM 6546 (fr. of basin); cat. V 307, EM 6524 (fr. of basin); cat. V 331, EM 6417 (st. of man?). An exception is the grave stele of Aristion from which has the signature (Aristokles) on the stele, just below the carved figure.

867 Dated 500–475 is cat. B 103, EM 10635 the base of the funerary statue (probably in marble) of [-----]antios; cat. B 128, EM 10254 carried the grave statue of Menestho (c. 450–425).

868 Not all names can be deciphered. Cf. table 1 and 6. It is uncertain whether this could be the result of deliberate or coincidental selection of blocks, e.g. for construction.

869 In the second, third, and last quarter of the fifth century numbers fall from 32 to 15 to six (cf. below n. 873).

supports, whatever shape they took: columns, pillars and all kinds of lower bases. Later in the fifth century, numbers of inscribed names slowly returned to the levels of the earlier archaic period. Inscribed bases for bronze votives stayed in production in the fifth century, though also in smaller quantities than before (table 6a).

Inscriptions on grave sculpture develop quite differently from those on votives (tables 6a–b, charts 6a–b). Almost two thirds of all grave reliefs and stelai from the sixth and fifth centuries are inscribed. In the third quarter of the fifth century, the percentage is slightly higher and in the final quarter it reaches more than four fifths. By comparison, only 52 out of 338 votive sculptures are inscribed (table 6a) and without basins, there would be only 12 examples. Thus, there is a fundamental difference between inscriptions on votives and those on gravestones. For the former, inscriptions are most commonly placed on the supports, with the exception of basins (table 6a). In early–archaic grave monuments, bases are quite popular for inscriptions too, but in the later fifth century this changes (table 6b) and they move to stelai and reliefs instead. Votive reliefs do not follow this pattern to the same degree.

The discussion above suggests that the place of inscriptions depends largely on the genres of sculpture and on the period in question. The most likely sculptures to be inscribed are basins of the late sixth and early fifth centuries and the grave stelai of the second half of the fifth century. Trends in the placement of name inscriptions seem to hinge on a practicality: the manner of erection of the dedication or gravestone – with or without a pillar, column, or base, on a wall or in a cutting in the ground. This, in turn, depended on the genre, size and shape of the statue or stele for which it was intended.

---

872  Of a total of 120 grave stelai and reliefs, six are technically cippi; four have been counted, although only finials are preserved and it is possible they belong to an extant stele. Of the latter, 74 are inscribed.
873  For 450–425, 10 out of 14 grave stelai in the dataset are inscribed; for 425–400 59 out of 68.
874  Eight out of 52 votive reliefs from 425–400 have inscriptions: cat. V 231, NMA 1329, IG I 955, rel. to Pan and the Nymphs; cat. V 233, NMA 1341, IG ii/iii 4356, rel. to Asklepios; and cat. V 325, NMA 1389, IG I 956, rel. to Apollo (inscribed on the gelson). The other five reliefs have inscriptions but the patron’s name is unclear: cat. 172, Akr. 1348, to Demeter and Kore; cat. 225, NMA 1841, to Asklepios; cat. 232, NMA 1340, to Asklepios; cat. 274, NMA 1398, fr. of rel. to Athena; cat. 324, NMA 3572, to Demeter and Kore.
Athenian patrons had their favourites among the genres of sculpture. The main genres in this study are: seated figures (often but not always the same as) deities, youths or kouroi, korai, horsemen, animals (including single horses) and mythical creatures, vessels, reliefs and stelai, and miscellanea. The patrons’ preferences naturally changed over time, and the question is whether these shifts can be related to the social backgrounds of patrons and the changing circumstances of life in archaic or early-classical Athens. Before this can be investigated, an overview is required of which sculptural genres or types are most common and when, and how the iconographic details of a dominant genre, sculpted reliefs, develop over time. This section will present the development of genres and of several aspects of their iconography, to enable a discussion of the patrons’ choices in the next part of this chapter.

Genres in Athenian sculpture can be subdivided in three overall clusters (table 5c–d). The first of these consists of functional objects – in theory, for a marble shield or lekythos would be of little use in daily life. In the second group are six genres which can be summed up as human figures in the round, sometimes with animals added to the composition, and some divine rather than mortal. Finally, three genres of in-the-round sculpture can be grouped under the header of animals (without human figures). In the material studied here, human figures are a majority: 184 votives are or include human figures, 28 are animals and 49 other objects (table 5d). In grave sculpture, human figures are most numerous too, but only a total of 26 is preserved, while the objects and animals are relatively close in numbers.

---

876 Groups have to consist exclusively of animals to fall into this category. One of these group is preserved in the record: a miniature hunting scene of a lion and bull from the Agora, dated c. 500–475 (cat. 59, AM S 1477).
877 Mythical creatures are excluded from the human figures, as well as the one all-animal group (previous note); deities are included. Horsemen are included there too: if they were counted among animals as well, the number of animals would rise to 42. Chariot horses like cat. V 110, Akr. 575–580 have been counted as one instance. Reliefs and stelai are not among the ‘objects’.
878 Objects 17, animals 14.
In the archaic period, korai were the main genre with 98 examples (pl. 49, table 5). No other type of statue can match the 45 korai from the final quarter of the sixth century or the 32 examples in the next quarter. For a genre that is almost always used for dedication, this is impressive. Nonetheless, by the mid-fifth century, stelai and reliefs had become the most common types of sculpture in Athens (table 5a). Regardless of votive or funerary function, 155 reliefs constitute the largest genre in the sixth and fifth centuries. Votive reliefs are approximately a quarter of all votive sculpture and more than a sixth of all sculpture. In gravestones, reliefs come to about two-fifths of the total. Rather surprising is the third-largest genre in votives after reliefs and korai: basins or louteria, with just over 12 percent of all votives (pls. 26b–d). They are the only genre which approaches the high number of korai in the early fifth century (table 5a). If funerary basins are included, basins and korai end up in a tie. The total number of basins comes to 46 in the sixth and fifth centuries, and the last one dates from the third quarter of the fifth century. This shows the sharp decline of numbers of basins by then, a trend similar to the korai a quarter-century before (table 5).

Of the genres which survive in smaller quantities, among the most popular are kouroi and lamps, which occur in votive and sepulchral contexts (table 5a). Their heyday in Athens falls in the early sixth century: four kouroi (pls. 4c, 27a–d) date to this period. All are larger than life-size and compare in scale to three grave stelai (pl. 28a) and an elaborate

---

879 There are no funerary korai among them. Their absence in the record hampers a comparison with reliefs of two functions. Ranked among votives only, korai are by far most numerous: votive reliefs total 85 (table 5). For the function of korai, cf. Richter 1968; Karakasi 2001; Meyer and Brüggemann 2007.

880 The total comes to 207 examples if stelai and reliefs are added up. Cf. table 5a.

881 The 40 percent comprises 70 reliefs, but this number is still higher than the third-largest votive genre, basins.

882 Basins 29; korai 32.


885 In the later fifth century, only one preserved statuette could with some flexibility be called a kore: cat. V 256, Akr. 1310, statuette of a girl in peplos and himation.

basin or *perirrhanterion* (pl. 28b), supported by karyatids from the same period.\(^8\) By contrast, some lamps (pls. 28c–d) and a small poros lion of this period speak of more modest expenditure.\(^9\) In the mid-sixth century, reliefs and korai begin their ascent and new types appear as well: sphinxes, horsemen, seated figures, and deities (pls. 29a–d).\(^9\) Soon after their introduction, animals and mythical creatures approach numbers of korai; only reliefs are more numerous (table 5a).\(^0\) Existing genres remained popular in the third quarter of the sixth century, too.

Towards the end of the sixth century, the number of various genres occurring simultaneously in one quarter century rises rapidly from ten to fifteen (table 5b).\(^1\) The genre variation seems to increase more in votives than in gravestones (table 5c). This is no surprise, considering the large amount of extant votive sculpture from this period. In fact, the inhabitants of Athens seem remarkably faithful to their customary types of sculpture in the late–archaic period. It is true that the range of genres is wider at the end of the sixth century (table 5c), but the only new genre in the record is the sculpted group, of which the wrestling Theseus and Prokrustes (pl. 10a) form an example.\(^2\) This is one of the first groups preserved, but it is unlikely that none were made earlier: fragments in the record may now be too poorly preserved to recognise them as part of a group. What does seem clear is the increasing complexity of sculpture at the end of the sixth century: the wrestling figures are certainly more difficult to carve than an early kore or lamp.

---

\(^8\) Cat. V 1, Akr. 592, *perirrhanterion* carried by three female figures; the other votive basin fr. from 600–575 is cat. V 283, EM 6521a–b (frs. of basin with top plate). Cat. G 20, KM I 461, stele of Semiades; cat. G 96, KM P 1133, poros stele; cat. G 135, KM no. ?, plain stele.


\(^9\) Seated figures are cat. G 86, NMA 7 from the Themistoklean Wall and probably a funerary statue; cat. V 88, Akr. 169, a seated woman; and cat. V 87, Akr. 655, probably a Kybele (pl. 7b). From 550–525 date a seated man from the Kerameikos, KM P 1052, cat. G 85; and a seated woman from the Akropolis, presumably a goddess although there is no proof: Akr. 620, cat. V 89.


\(^1\) Genre totals are based on sculpture alone, not on the information derived from bases: the type of statue on bases is too often unclear.

\(^2\) Akr. 145, 370, cat. V 119.
Patrons in the archaic period had chosen genres for their sculpture from at least 12 different types (leaving out stelai and reliefs). Although these old genres remained popular in the late-archaic period, many of them disappeared shortly after its conclusion. Lamps had already lost favour with the Athenians in the second quarter of the sixth century and apparently returned neither in votive nor in sepulchral settings (table 5a). Animals, mythical creatures, horsemen and some miscellaneous types of sculpture also fell out of use at the end of the archaic period.893 Two unfinished sepulchral figurines of youths from the later fifth century are preserved, but no other statues of young men survive.894 By the final quarter of the century, most gravestones by far were reliefs. Of the votives of this period, only four are not reliefs: three goddesses and a figurine of a girl (table 5).895

Various animals had been subjects in archaic statuary, both for votive and sepulchral settings.896 Horses and horsemen (table 10b), for example, had peaked in the final quarter of the sixth century, most often as dedications and in one instance from Athens as a grave monument (pls. 15b, 31a–b).897 The record of the early fifth–century, by contrast, produces


894  Kouroi frs.: cat. G 101, KM P 1471, right lower arm with hand; cat. G 102, KM P 1512, left foot on plinth. Both were probably made in the Kerameikos, though not necessarily to be set up there. Their funerary function is uncertain, but in view of the find spot they are so listed. They may also be training pieces.

895  Girl: above n. 885. Three goddesses: cat. V 220, AM S 654, small Athena statue; cat. V 327, Akr. 3027, Athena statuette; cat. V 255, AM S 1882, a more than life–size goddess, perhaps Aphrodite, which might have been a cult statue (and if so, would not belong in this study). Further examples in Vlassopoulou 2005: from poorly preserved fragments, she has reconstructed several statues and statuettes of Athena, 11 dating to c. 450–400. Most are in too poor a state to be included here; a possible architectural function of several of them would rule those statues out. Still, the image of ubiquitous reliefs is toned down somewhat by this. Cf. below n. 970.


one horse (pl. 31c) and one horseman, and these are the last freestanding marble horses of that century.\textsuperscript{898} Lions had been even more popular than horses in archaic sculpture. Of 21 votive animals (and one animal group), five are lions;\textsuperscript{899} and eight of ten preserved sepulchral animals are lions (pls. 32a–c).\textsuperscript{900} At first glance, all of these animals disappear from sculpture in the classical period. The evidence of bases, however, nuances this picture somewhat.

Bases for equestrian sculpture (horses, groups with horses such as chariots, men leading horses, or horsemen) come to a total of 21 (table 10b).\textsuperscript{901} Nine of the corresponding statues were most likely bronzes, ten were in marble, and of two examples the material is unclear (table 10b).\textsuperscript{902} If these bases are included, the total of equestrian monuments rises to three in the second and the third quarters of the sixth century each; 19 in the final quarter;

---

\textsuperscript{898} Cat. V 143, Akr. 148, horseman; cat. V 162, Akr. 697 part of the front of horse.

\textsuperscript{899} Votive lions: cat. V 204, Akr. 3834, 545, fr. of lion (550–525); cat. V 202, Akr. no. ?, Nikepyrgos Lion; cat. V 55, Akr. 3832, 3833, lion; and cat. V 329, AM S 1577, lion, all dated 525–500. The lion cat. G 106, AM S 1942 is listed as funerary. Its findspot on the Hill of the Nymphs makes its function uncertain, and though it may well have been a funerary lion, it can also be a dedication or even an akroterion. Harrison’s suggestion (\textit{Ath. Ag.} XI, 1965, 29–30 no. 92, pl. 13) that the weathering indicates a high position does not necessarily mean it was architectural, since lions could also have been placed on columns in private monuments. Cf. Thompson, \textit{Hesperia} 39 (1960) 351–68, pls. 75–80; Ridgway 1993, 221–2, 249 n. 10.


\textsuperscript{901} Of the 12 from the main period of 525–500, one is a grave monument (cat. B 4, KM I 389, in marble). Some bases are not certainly for a horse: cat. B 61, EM 12353, fr. of base (550–525); cat. B 67, EM 6416 (a), 6461 (b), frs. of base (525–500); cat. B 75, EM 6462 (a), 6466 (b), frs. of base (500–475). Two of the votive bases from 525–500 are linked to preserved equestrian statues: a man leading a horse, of which the plinth with feet and hooves remain (Akr. 571, cat. V 208) fits to base cat. B 66, EM 6355 (a), 6414 (b), 6285 (c), \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 642, 642bis, offered by Nauklaus son of Eudikos, perhaps made by Gorgias. Cat. B 148, Akr. no. ?, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 617 is the dedication of Dionysios son of Koloios, and it is likely that Akr. 700, cat. V 120 belongs to this base. From the classical period are cat. B 135, Akr. no. ?; cat. B 174, Akr. 13172 (both bronze, 450–425); and cat. B 176, Akr. 13264, 425–400, possibly for a bronze Trojan horse.

and seven in the first quarter of the fifth century (chart 10b). From the later fifth century, three bases for bronze equestrian groups survive. One carried a bronze four-horse chariot, another a bronze group of a man leading his horse, and the third was possibly a dedication of a Trojan horse. Of marble horses, votive or funerary, there is no sign after the first quarter of the fifth century, so here is one aspect in which bronzes appear to take over from their marble counterparts in the early-classical period.

The in-between category of sphinxes, neither human, divine nor animal, occurs in both sepulchral and votive settings in the archaic period (pl. 33a). They seem to lose their appeal along with other genres in the classical period, for none of them date from the fifth century (table 5). In fact, their greatest popularity is quite early, in the second quarter of the sixth century. However, sphinxes do sometimes appear on classical reliefs (pl. 34a). Other mythical creatures in marble statuary are possibly Kerberos with Herakles, Medusa running (pls. 34c–d) and the remarkable hippalektryon (pl. 34b). The young man riding it must be a hero on some mythical adventure, but their story is now unfortunately lost.

Human figures, mortal or immortal, appear to do slightly better in the fifth century than animals and mythical creatures. From a total of 139 in the sixth century they go to 72 in the fifth (table 5d). But in fact, 32 of the fifth-century examples are votive korai exclusively from the first quarter of the century (table 5a); eleven votive deities and ten kouroi are from the same period, as well as two grave kouroi (pls. 30b–c). In short, the fifth century only produces a reasonable number of human figures in the round in its first quarter.

---

905  Cat. G 65, KM P 280, I 192. In the sixth century, sphinxes also sometimes appeared on reliefs: cat. 210, Akr. 3702 is a double relief with a sphinx on one side and a horseman on the other. Statues of sphinxes from the late-classical and hellenistic periods do survive: see e.g. LIMC VIII, s.v. sphinx.
906  Cat. 127, Akr. 597, hippalektryon; cat. 207, Akr. 431, group feet and paws of group, probably Herakles with Kerberos. Both 525–500. Cat. G 76, NMA 2687 is the Gorgon stele, with probably Medusa in the predella.
In sum, the majority of genres of archaic marble sculpture declines after the first quarter of the fifth century (table 5c; cf. 5b); in fact, all in-the-round sculpture becomes scarce. Mythical and ordinary animals, horsemen, seated figures, and lamps all disappear from votive and sepulchral sculpture in Athens. Even basins, which had gained popularity only recently in the early fifth century, dwindle after the end of the archaic period. Of other genres, such as kouroi, korai, goddesses, and groups, a few fifth-century examples survive, often with a slightly changed iconography.

This pattern is confirmed in the bases: those for sculpture in the round, sphinxes, animals other than horses, and so forth, all come from the archaic period. Bases for stelai and supports for basins persist somewhat longer in the fifth century. Only three categories of sculpture feature more frequently in the fifth than in the sixth century. Marble funerary lekythoi are an invention of the second half of the fifth century (table 5) and have no comparison in the archaic period. They become relatively popular as grave markers in the later fifth century. However, the two archaic types of sculpture which not only survive in the fifth century, but in their new form become the classical genres par excellence, are stelai and reliefs. By the end of the century, they were the Athenians’ favourites for practically every purpose of their private sculpture.


908 Cat. B 1, EM 6216, fr. of a column for a marble animal, 575–550; cat. B 30, Akr. 3826, fr. of a cavetto capital for a marble sphinx?, 550–525; cat. B 155, EM 6428, fr. of a base for a marble animal?; and cat. B 232, Akr. 9955 (a: once Θ47), EM 6321 (b), frs. of a pillar for a bronze? animal, both from 525–500. The latter is the only possible bronze animal (again other than horses) in the record. For groups on bases, see table 8a–b.

909 Only six pedestals for marble basins are preserved, ranging from the beginning to the middle of the fifth century cat. B 35, EM 6327; cat. B 36, EM 6267; cat. B 38, Akr. 607, fr. of pedestal are all dated 500–475. Cat. B 33, EM 6319, fr. of pedestal, and cat. B 34, EM 6354 date 475–450. Cat. B 99, EM 6444, fr. of pedestal from 525–500 was perhaps for a bronze basin. It cannot be established whether any of the preserved basins belongs to these pedestals; if they all were independent, marble basins would reach a total of 51 examples, 35 from the first quarter of the fifth century and five from the second. Of 525–500: cat. B 35, EM 6327; cat. B 36, EM 6267; cat. B 38, Akr. 607. From 500–475: cat. B 33, EM 6319; cat. B 34, EM 6354.

The Subjects of Reliefs

Reliefs and stelai can depict any sculptural genre, which affiliates them in contents to their in-the-round counterparts. In this way, the iconography of fifth-century reliefs absorbs elements of many sculptural genres. The sculpted depictions of horsemen from archaic times continue in classical reliefs (pls. 35a–b; table 10b). Animals, mythical creatures and loutrophoroi (pl. 34a) reappear in reliefs in the fifth century, where they had been carved in the round earlier. All these objects and figures appear as motifs when reliefs rapidly increase in numbers after the middle of the fifth century. In general, reliefs or stelai with images of animals seem to have been rare, until one considers the stele of a man called Antiphanes, seemingly undecorated except for the inscription of the name. When it was excavated, the original paint was intact, revealing a rooster, a dog and a snake which are now no longer visible. Thus, some stelai seem non-figurative, some decorated with incised or painted geometrical or floral motifs and some seem completely without decoration; but how many of these had painted depictions which are now lost, like the stele of Antiphanes?

Some subjects on votive and sepulchral reliefs of the sixth century return in the next century. For example, man–and–dog stelai can be found in both the archaic and classical

911 Reliefs with horses or chariots from the sixth century: cat. V 241, Akr. 6866, with charioteer (?), 575–550; dated 525–500: cat. V 242, Akr. 1340, with horse's head; cat. V 210, Akr. 3702, double relief; cat. V 118, Akr. 1342–3, with charioteer. Cat. V 244, Akr. 289, with woman (Athena?) and horse; and cat. V 126, Akr. 3706, with man and horse date 500–475. For some of these, the status as individual votives is contested, and some charioteers may be divine or heroic. Later on, they are mostly mortals: cat. V 254, NMA 1394, with man and horses; cat. V 246, AMS 1289, with horseman, both 450–425. Of 425–400: cat. V 253, Brocklesby Park 42, with horseman; cat. V 240, NMA 1358, Akr. 2966, with two figures; cat. V 233, NMA 1341, with Asklepios and 'carter'; cat. V 169, Akr. 3360, with horseman; cat. V 166, Akr. 2760, with youth and horse.


913 Cat. G 8, NMA 3709, pl. 36b: a double relief with a lion and lioness from 450–425 is exceptional. Its function is not quite clear, but almost certainly sepulchral. A relief with a horse's head, cat. V 242, Akr. 1340 (525–500), considered architectural by some, may be an elaborate marble version of the terracotta plaques with various decorations which were common in the late sixth century.

914 Cat. G 107, NMA 86. For references cf. Richter AGA, 40 no. 54, figs. 137, 208; Harrison 1956, 34, 44; IG I 1230; Kaltsas 2001, 60 no. 70.

periods (pls. 35c–d, 36a). Human figures are popular both in archaic sculpture and in later reliefs. On votive reliefs, various deities are naturally common, although Athenian patrons had a favourite in the pantheon in their patron deity. The idealised dead populate many grave reliefs from both centuries. In short, there is some continuity from the archaic to the classical period, both in the iconography of reliefs proper and in the transference of in-the-round genres into relief sculpture. Still, many aspects of the appearance of fifth-century reliefs differ from earlier ones, which are mostly tall and narrow and have few figures, especially in the funerary variant. Classical grave reliefs become lower and squatter in shape and can be modest or monumental in size. By contrast, votive reliefs from the archaic period are generally smaller and wider than early grave stelai. They often have crowded scenes, and this only changes late in the fifth century. Grave reliefs show a reverse trend: those with many figures appear more often in the late fifth century than in archaic times.

An explanation for this development may lie in the purposes of the reliefs. In the sixth century, reliefs with many figures – as a rule requiring more horizontal space than one or two figures – are often dedicated to Hermes or the Nymphs, who are depicted in them (pl. 36c). Perhaps the shape of the archaic votive reliefs differed from grave stelai because such multi-figure scenes were popular for dedications, posing different demands to the composition. A similar case is an archaic relief with a pig sacrifice to Athena; the crowd

---

916 Compare cat. G 39, AM S 1276a, fr. of stele with man and dog from c. 550–525; and cat. G 40, AM S 1276b of 525–500, with stelai from the final quarter of the fifth century: of Polyeuktos (cat. G 43, NMA 773), or cat. G 61, NMA 2894 where two men shake hands while a dog joins the younger man.

917 Cf. below, p. 219, and the next section for a discussion of deities.

918 The only grave reliefs from the first half of the sixth century which probably were wider than they appear now are NMA 1772, cat. G 95, of a spear thrower in action, and NMA 38, 83, cat. G 60, of a diskophoros stepping out for a throw. The 'Marathon runner' probably is performing a ritual dance (Neumann (1979) 31, 39): cf. pelike in Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (1973.88). Its sepulchral function is not certain, but mostly agreed on.

919 E.g. cat. V 132, Akr. 586–587, see n. 921 below; cat. V 215, Akr. 622, fr. of Hermes rel. (both 575–550); the former has four figures, the latter is badly damaged and only Hermes is recognisable. Cat. V 209, Akr. 637, male head from rel.; and cat. V 216, Akr. 3705, incised st. (550–525) are too fragmentary to determine the original proportions or the iconography. Cat. V 241, Akr. 6866 (rel. with horse and charioteer?) could have been a metope, but there is no connection to a building, so it is considered a votive.

920 The representational worth of the count of figures on reliefs is problematic, since it is impossible to take broken reliefs into account. Therefore, this part of the data is not further mentioned.

921 Cat. V 132, Akr. 586–7, rel. with the Graces (cf. n. 919); also cat. V 115, Akr. 702, a rel. to the Graces with no less than seven figures.
consists of the entire family of the dedicant, approaching the altar to worship the goddess (pl. 36d). This relief shows what appears to be an innovation in the archaic sculpture of Athens: the goddess and her worshippers are depicted together, in the same space and communicating directly.

After a transitional period in the mid-fifth century, the grave reliefs in this study re-emerge along two lines. Some classical reliefs contrast with the tall and narrow monuments of the sixth century in their greater width. The examples from the second half of the fifth century are often of high quality, as illustrated by a double relief with lions, or the stele of Eupheros (pls. 36b, 37a), and frequently depict two or more figures. Among them are relatively many seated women such as, for example, Ampharete (pl. 37c). Sixth-century grave reliefs usually had had one standing figure and perhaps a small decoration in the predella or on the base. Similarly monumental are sepulchral lekythoi from the late fifth century. At the other end of the spectrum are many grave reliefs produced in or after the second quarter of the fifth century, modest in appearance as well as in execution (pl. 37b). These small stelai often are no more than little pillars with superficially smoothed surfaces and one or more inscribed names. In the last quarter of the fifth century, the differences

---


923 Palagia 1995, who argues that the scene depicts the goddess attending the Apaturia, the festival of enrollment of the children in the phratry. Cf. below p. 249. An exception may be NMA 36, cat. V 147 (c. 500–475); this may depict Athena and a girl worshipping, or another goddess, or two women. Some suggest it is a gravestone (e.g. Friis-Johansen 1951, 139–40 fig. 72; Neumann 1979, 35 pl. 18b; Schmaltz 1983, 161 n. 383, pl. 3,2), but the iconography is uncommon for grave monuments of the archaic period.

924 Tracing the changes in this period is complicated by low preservation rates.

925 Cat. G 76, NMA 2687, the Gorgon stele, has a sculpted Gorgon below the deceased’s feet (575–550 (pl. 34b–c); cat. G 90, NMA 5826, relief with athlete (550–525); and cat. G 84, NMA 31, relief with man (525–500) has a horseman in paint in the bottom part of the front face.

926 Cat. G 46, KM P 1169 (Eupheros); cat. G 8, NMA 3709 (Lions).

927 The stele of Ampharete, KM P 695, cat. G 56: although the other person is the baby who is her grandchild, the fact that she is seated also requires a wider space. Cf. for interpretations of women on classical grave stelai: Humphreys 1980, passim; Leader 1997; Stewart 1997, 118–29; Blok, forthcoming.

928 For bases decorated with carved reliefs, see ns. 370 and 954. For decorated and sculpted predellas of stelai: above n. 925.

929 E.g. cat. G 31, NMA 835 (pl. 30a); cat. G 7, NMA 1044, cat. G 123, NMA 1698 (pl. 25c); and cat. G 124, KM Mag. 14, all painted with floral motifs and perhaps more.

between these modest grave reliefs and the more lavish types become more distinct (pls. 37c–d). That is not to say that there was nothing between the two extremes: reliefs of various sizes, complexity and expense fill the gap.

Votive reliefs become popular in Athens at a relatively late date, and their rise runs parallel to an increasing preference to depict Athena. At the end of the sixth century, the goddess as a recipient of reliefs becomes iconographically (and epigraphically) prominent in the sculpture record for the first time (tables 7a–b, 10a). The Potter’s Relief (pl. 38a) was dedicated to Athena but does not depict her: it is one of the most monumental votives from this period. Yet there are also smaller dedications, for example, a relief showing Athena in her armour. At the same time, her iconography becomes more varied. In the relief with the pig sacrifice mentioned earlier, a family sacrifices a victim in the presence of the goddess herself. Other scenes in which Athena is depicted in the late archaic period are a gianтомachie, stepping into a chariot, or striding fervently towards a horse. Her more peaceful role of patron of crafts is represented from the beginning of the fifth century onwards. Of the 13 reliefs of this period (table 5a), six can be identified more or less certainly as Athena’s, most often because she is present in the relief (table 7b). The

---

932 Stele of Ampharete, KM P 695, cat. G 56 (pl. 37c); the poor one is of Chareas of Pale, cat. G 74, EM 10221 (pls. 37d–e). Other prominent stelai e.g.: cat. G 55, BM 628 (1805.7–3.183), of Xanthis; cat. G 66, ML ma 3063 (MNC 2193), of Erasippos and Meixias. Caution in interpreting this material is due: larger gravestones were probably more easily discovered – a circumstance illustrated by the examples from many museum collections. Much poorer were the stelai of Zogros, cat. G 153, EM 11049; of Xenon and Thoga, cat. G 155, EM 487; of Eumares, cat. G 161, NMA 1795; and of Apollodoros, cat. G 169, EM 496.
933 Moderate could be considered the st. of Polyeuktos, cat. G 43, NMA 773, pl. 36a; or the st. of Hermodoros, Mika and Kallistratos, cat. G 58, NMA 885, KM P 287 (Lekythenstele); cat. G 30, NMA 17751, painted st.; cat. G 54, NMA 713, st. of Chairestrate and Lysandros; and cat. G 70, AM S 499, st. of Leandros and Mnesistrate.
934 Cat. V 164, Akr. 1332 / AM I 4571.
935 Cat. V 125, Akr. 121.
936 Giant, cat. V 161, Akr. 120; chariot cat. V 213, Akr. 290–290a, 3532; promachos, although the identification is based on convention rather than attributes. With horse (only a hoof preserved): cat. V 244, Akr. 289.
937 Cat. V 227, Akr. V 577, scene with Athena and a craftsman. Like in the relief of the pig sacrifice (above n. 923), moral and divine realms are intermingled in this relief; the difference is that Athena’s presence in the workshop could be symbolic rather than literal, while in the pig sacrifice she is receiving the offering directly.
938 See ns. 936 and 937; also cat.V 214, Akr. 191, 290b.
goddess thus becomes the most depicted deity in Athenian votive reliefs quite suddenly between the final quarter of the sixth century and the end of the archaic period.

In the second and third quarters of the fifth century, little seems to change in reliefs, although damage often hampers identification of the scenes. The average size of reliefs decreases and the figures shrink along with their backgrounds. It is not until the final quarter of the fifth century that the iconography of reliefs really takes a different direction. Athena is no longer alone in her dominance of the reliefs: she is overtaken by Asklepios and Hygieia (pls. 38c-d). Most of their votive stelai are from the Akropolis or the Asklepieion (map 6a), and almost all of them are in Pentelic marble.

Among the other immortals depicted in the early fifth century, Herakles is one: he is carrying a boar upside down, its legs kicking in indignation (pl. 38b). Whether he himself was the recipient of the votive is uncertain. Later reliefs show Asklepios, Demeter and Kore (table 7b). The two goddesses appear together or individually on reliefs from the second quarter of the fifth century onwards. Artemis features several times on votive reliefs too, and the nymps return in the final quarter of the fifth century, three quarters of a century

---

939 Classical reliefs with Athena: cat. V 158, Akr. 695, ‘Mourning Athena’ relief, c. 475–450; cat. V 251, Akr. 2508, with Athena, c. 450–425. Also e.g. cat. V 245, NMA 4802, with banquet scene, 475–450; cat. V 249, NMA 2544 XD, with woman; cat. V 252, Akr. 2478, with goddess (all 450–425) do not even certainly represent goddesses. The article of Vikela (2005) mentions more votive reliefs from the Akropolis which date around c. 400 BC. Whether these should be included in this study is doubtful, since most other authors date them to the early fourth century. However, if Vikela’s dates are correct, Athena would maintain her advantage over Asklepios at the end of the fifth century. The pieces listed by Vlassopoulou 2005 should also be considered: the overall impression is that Athena remained popular.

940 Hygieia alone, on one broken example: NMA 1356, cat. V 234 (pls. 38d); Asklepios alone; cat. V 225, NMA 1841; on cat. V 176, NMA 1357 with an unidentified god. On cat. V 261, a double relief at the Martin von Wagner Museum in Würzburg, Asklepios; on the reverse, Artemis. Asklepios and Hygieia together six times; e.g. relief cat. V 232, Akr. 1340, with the worshipper (pl. 38c); once the inscription names Asklepios as recipient, not Hygieia (NMA 1341, cat. V 233). Other deities and heroes occur with Asklepios on cat. V 243, NMA 1348 (Epione); and on cat. V 263, NMA 1388 (hero). Recently, G. Despinis (AM 2008, 268–99) has made the tantalising suggestion that the so-called Olympias Albani should be identified with a statue of Hygieia described by Pausanias as on the Akropolis.

941 The marble of one relief in the national museum, NMA 1841, cat. V 225, is fine-grained and white, and listed as Other Marble.

942 Cat. V 178, NMA 43, with Herakles. Cat. V 147, NMA 36, with a woman and a girl, may possibly depict a goddess with a worshipper: cf. n. 923. The identity of the figures is uncertain.

943 Cat. V 324, NMA 3572, relief with Demeter and Kore; cat. V 172, Akr. 1348; cat. V 270, AM S 1013 (pl. 6a), both reliefs with Demeter, Kore and Triptolemos; and cat. V 272, AM S 1045, with Demeter and Triptolemos.
after their appearances on archaic reliefs.944 One elaborate, large relief shows Pan in his cave watching them (pl. 7c).945 Whether Epione should be considered a nymph or a goddess is unclear; she occasionally joins Asklepios and Hygieia on reliefs (pl. 39a).946 Heroes on fifth-century reliefs are Triptolemos, who is joined by Demeter and Kore and does not occur on his own, and perhaps Kephalos, the Athenian hunter who according to myth accidentally killed his wife Prokris.947 He may be the rural hero depicted on a relief, seated on a rock, a worshipper standing before him.948

Gods are relatively scarce on votive reliefs, with only 20 appearances against 52 reliefs featuring female divinities in the sixth and fifth centuries (table 7b). Many male deities on reliefs, e.g. Zeus, Apollo, or Ares occur only once in the record.949 Hermes appears twice on gravestones, leading the souls of the dead to the underworld.950 Divine beings such as sphinxes, nymphs and heroes, appear on votive reliefs a total of 90 times, of which 29 are male and 61 female. Of the heroes, Triptolemos is the only one who is depicted more than once.951 So, by any standards, mythical men are less popular in relief sculpture than their female counterparts. This is also reflected by the most favoured individual deities: Athena leads, followed by Asklepios and Hygieia.952 In this light, the absence of Nike on reliefs is a

---

944 Cat. V 239, Akr. 2674, with Artemis; cat. V 257, Akr. 3649, double rel. with Artemis and a man?; cat. V 261 (cf. n. 940); cat. V 271, Berlin Staatl. Mus. 941, with Artemis; cat. V 325, NMA 1389, with Artemis, Apollo and Leto. For the nymphs see next note.

945 Cat. V 231, NMA 1329, rel. to Pan and nymphs: for the type see Van Straten 1992, 266. The patron was a man named Archandros (Larson 2001, 130). Archandros as a hero (see Dates table ca. 231) is uncertain. Cat. V 194, AM S 1948, is a rel. with youth.

946 Cat. V 233, NMA 1341; and cat. 243, NMA 1348.

947 Cat. V 332, NMA 1460; LIMC VI, 1–6, s.v. Kephalos (E. Simantoni-Bournia) with this myth and an alternative where Kephalos is abducted by the goddess Eos.

948 The original suggestion that Kephalos is depicted came from Svoronos (1908) II 462–3 no. 158; others have agreed since (e.g. Karouzou 1968, 132–3 no. 1460).


950 Cat. G 50, NMA 1680. the stele of Aristomache, where she is (probably) led away by Hermes; and cat. G 59, NMA 4485, the so-called Myrrhine lekythos, where the larger figure of Myrrhine is led away from her family by Hermes Psychopompus. Four reliefs with Hermes from a small tomb building in the Kerameikos were not included because of they are architectural. The reliefs are now in the Kerameikos and National Museum (KM P 789; NMA 89, 2823, 2826): Karusu 1961, 105–6; Kaltsas 2001, 76 no. 117; Bumke 2004, 73 n. 396.

951 For the relevant reliefs see n. 943.

952 Athena, 17 instances; Asklepios 11; Hygieia nine (the latter all 425–400).
great surprise, since she had been extremely popular in statuary of the sixth century.\footnote{953} Why she is missing from classical votive reliefs is unclear.

Equestrian images are as much favoured in fifth-century relief iconography as they had been in the sixth century, but apart from a few bases which once carried bronze horses, their iconography is limited to reliefs in the later fifth century. Horsemen, charioteers and an occasional single horse appear on 13 votive reliefs and three grave reliefs (table 10b): more than half of these date from the second half of the fifth century. Admittedly, several bases of the archaic period had been decorated with images of horses or horsemen (pls. 39b–c).\footnote{954} But all in all, the frequency with which horsemen occur as an iconographic motif in the monuments of this study remains more or less the same in the two centuries. It is interesting that the iconography remains in use, even if marble equestrian statuary was no longer made.

In short, the great diversity of genres in the late archaic period is replaced by a predominance of reliefs and (painted) stelai in the fifth century; yet it should be noted that many of the subjects continue to exist in the iconography of reliefs, and some new subjects for reliefs are added in the classical period.

\section*{Mortals and Deities, Men and Women}

Immortal and mortal realms are iconographically divided in sculpture, whether in the round or in relief. Sometimes, the boundaries are fluid: a woman without attributes performing libation could be mortal as well as divine. Still, there are usually reasonable arguments for one or the other. Thus, 72 figures on votive reliefs can be considered mortals (table 7c) and so can 123 on grave reliefs.\footnote{955} The higher number of mortals on funerary monuments and of

\footnote{953} For the popularity of Nike in sculpture in the round, below p. 221. Nike may appear once on a votive relief in the Palermo Mus. Civ. 768 (cat. V 248, 425–400). However, the identification is uncertain: it may be Eros, since the other figures on the relief are Aphrodite and Ares.


\footnote{955} A problem is the fragmentary state of many reliefs, discussed above, n. 920. For the purpose of the present analysis, figures have been counted as they are, not as they once were; though this distorts the image, many reliefs have enough left for reconstruction.
deities on votives is a matter of course. On the latter, a majority belongs to the divine realm, including mythical creatures like sphinxes, giants or satyrs such as Marsyas (table 7b).956

The presence of deities on gravestones was precluded by beliefs on the miasmic nature of the dead: many deities were to refrain from attending death or the dying.957 Hermes, the guide of souls, is one of the exceptions. One grave relief may depict Aphrodite, although it is also possible that the deceased is depicted as the goddess; in any case, the figure seems to be alone in the relief (pl. 40a).958 Most funerary scenes leave no room for the presence of gods: goodbyes are taken from surviving members of a family, for example by shaking hands with the deceased, or with a moment of quiet contemplation over a child, a pet or some precious possession.959 The setting is the mortal world, even if the protagonists no longer belong to it.

From an iconographical perspective, reliefs stay more or less the same during the fifth century: mortals’ farewells on gravestones and worship of deities on votives. The latter can take many forms. If the woman offering a libation (pl. 40b) is indeed Athena, the ritual makes her close to the mortal world and so perhaps more accessible. Compared to the giant-slaying Promachos of the sixth century, the classical Athena is more down to earth. Admittedly, in the archaic period she was also shown receiving sacrifice from ordinary families or watching over the work of a mortal craftsman.960 Still, post-Persian portrayals of Athena in votive reliefs are often more contemplative than earlier ones (pl. 40c).

---

956 Most of these are on votives. Each figure has been counted separately, also if they are depicted in a group on one relief. Examples are the giant on cat. V 161, Akr. 121; Marsyas on cat. V 221, Third Ephoria M 3112; and a sphinx on Akr. 3702, cat. V 210.


958 Hermes: cat. G 50, NMA 1680; and cat. G 59, NMA 4485, the funerary lekythos of Myrrhine. Aphrodite, who may be paired with Hermes in the relief: cat. G 51, NMA 3891. One might expect Hermes to appear on gravestones more frequently than he does in the material, considering his role of Psychopompos.


Other deities can hardly be compared to Athena, because apart from Hermes and Nike, none of the Olympic gods appear in the sculpture record before the later fifth century.\(^{961}\) Only the position of Asklepios is perhaps comparable to the ease with which Athena moves in mortal circles on fifth-century reliefs (table 7b). As was mentioned earlier, the same applies to statuary: here too, goddesses occur more often than male deities (table 7a). For example, a seated Kybele dates to the second quarter of the sixth century, a period from which no sculpted gods survive in Athens.\(^{962}\)

Of 22 freestanding statues of goddesses from the archaic period, 15 are Nikai, all of them in Nike’s distinctive running or flying pose (pls. 41a–b; table 7a).\(^{963}\) Two heads belonged to statues of Athena, and a seated Athena by the hand of Endoios (pl. 17c) is described by Pausanias.\(^{964}\) Some Nikai may have been akroteria rather than votives, but either way Nike statues were very popular dedications in the sixth century, even more so than Athenas.\(^{965}\) Other in-the-round votive goddesses are lacking among the few votives of the

---

\(^{961}\) Cat. V 132, Akr. 586, 587, a relief with the Graces, and cat. V 215, Akr. 622, fr. of a relief with Hermes are dated 575–550; cat. V 115, Akr. 702, a relief with the Graces is dated 525–500. The very active, running or flying Nikai of the archaic period do not appear in any votives reliefs in evidence; but Nike too is depicted in more tranquil situations in the classical period: cf. *LIMC* VI, s.v. Nike, 850–904 (A. Moustaka for the archaic period, A. Goulaki-Voutina for the classical).

\(^{962}\) Nine statues represent gods and six or seven of those are herms, whose characteristic shape sets them apart (pl. 40d). Of goddesses, 29 are preserved. From 525–500: cat. V 206, Akr. 638, Herakles; cat. V 175, NMA 3711, seated Dionysos; cat. V 320, AM S 3477, herm; cat. V 144, Akr. 642, head of herm; cat. V 211, Akr. 170, fr. of herm. From 500–475: cat. V 321, AM S 211, herm; cat. V 322, Akr. no. ?, miniature Herm; cat. G 323, AM S 730, small bearded head (of herm?). From 475–450 cat. V 250, AM S 218, small bearded head; and from 450–425: cat. V 319, AM S 2452, herm. Several groups also have divine figures: Theseus and Prokrustes (cat. V 119, Akr. 145, 370); a plinth with possibly Herakles and Kerberos (cat. V 207, Akr. 431); the hippocletrion and rider (cat. V 127, Akr. 597). The dice game played in Akr. 161 (cat. 146) can possibly be included, if the players are Achilles and Ajax. All three date 525–500, bringing the total of divine males from that period to 13.

\(^{963}\) Cat. V 56, AM S 1351. This is excluding a striding figure, which might be an Athena Promachos.


early fifth century. After a gap in the middle of the century, the third and final quarter once more produce goddesses: four statues of Athena, probably one of Aphrodite (pl. 30d) and perhaps an Artemis. With these six examples, this is the only genre in votives to continue into the late fifth century. The unbroken manufacture of goddesses from the sixth to the fifth centuries, the many sculptures in the round of goddesses from the archaic period and their frequent appearances on reliefs in the fifth century in comparison to gods testify to their unwavering popularity; of course, this applies in particular to Athena.

What is true for the divine, however, does not necessarily apply to the mortals in sculpture. In terms of quantity, the types of statuary which influence the gender ratio of mortals the most are kouroi and korai (tables 5a, 7d). Their divine or mortal nature has been much debated over time. It has been convincingly argued that in principle, neither korai nor

---


967 From 450–425 date cat. V 5, AM S 1232, torso of Athena; and cat. V 155, Akr. 635, head of Athena. Cat. V 278, AM S 2094, is a head of a goddess, which one is unclear, but the hair is arranged similarly to the Artemis of Arriccia (Harrison 1965, 369–70). From 425–400: cat. V 220, AM S 654, Athena; cat. V 255, AM S 1882, a goddess commonly interpreted as Aphrodite (cf. among other scholars Harrison 1960, 373–4, pl. 82; Despinis 1971, 188; Ridgway 1981, 111–2; Rolley 1999, 142 fig. 126); cat. V 327, Akr. 3027, statuette of Athena. Although Nike no longer appeared in sculpted votives in the round of the late fifth century, architectural decorations such as those of the temple of Athena Nike on the Akropolis compensated on a grand scale for this loss (Schultz 2001, passim).

968 Cat. V 9338, EM 6058, frs. of a diskos; and cat. V 160, Akr. 599, archer listed as youth, both date 475–450. Cat. V 163, Akr. 699, head of youth listed as kouro; and cat. V 165, Akr. 1358, Prokne group, both of c. 450–425; cat. V 256, Akr. 1310, girl listed as a kore, 425–400. All are single instances of their genre. G. Despinis has argued convincingly that several fifth-century fragments from the Akropolis (Akr. 7310, 927, 18017 and 3246) would be part of a monument involving an altar and the figures of Io and Kallisto (Io being the original of the figure known as the ‘Schutzflehende Barberini’, from which the Akropolis fragments would come). Despinis links this monument to a treaty between Athens, the Arkadians and the Eleans in c. 420 BC, brokered by Alkibiades. Since this would make it a public dedication, the fragments in question have not been included in this study.

969 On the reliefs from 425–400, female immortals are depicted 45 times, but male deities 23 times (table 7b). As explained earlier, the most momentous periods for deities in the round are 525–500, with 15 goddesses and nine gods; and 500–475, with nine female deities and 4 male ones. What the three bronze statues from 425–400 on the bases cat. B 104, AM I 3398; cat. B 143, EM 6296; cat. B 146, EM 6297 would have added to the male or female side cannot be established.

970 See above, n. 895. Vlasssopoulou’s 11 statues or statuettes of Athena from the later fifth century mentioned earlier confirm that in-the-round sculpture of goddesses, especially of Athena, is the one exception to the monopoly of reliefs of the late fifth century.
kouroi represent divinities. If this is accepted, the combined statues of mortals (youths and girls, horsemen, seated figures and in all likelihood some other sculpted figures) outnumber deities in both sepulchral and in votive statuary. Among these mortals, korai are most popular in the archaic period: their large numbers bring mortal women to 109, while only 57 figures are male in the sixth and fifth centuries. If the deities, notably Athena and Nike, are added, the advantage remains with the female figures in the sixth century. By the end of the fifth century, however, female and male figures end up at a similar level. Considering that only very few goddesses are preserved in the classical period, the increase in numbers of male figures must originate in the iconography of reliefs.

Especially in the sixth century, relief iconography had been a male affair (table 7c), and this pre-eminence stemmed mainly from the gravestones of Athens: all but one of these depict men. The lack of women on grave reliefs does not necessarily mean, however, that women were not honoured with memorials. For example, their grave markers may have been made in clay, like the loutrophoroi which were set up on graves of those who had died unmarried. Interestingly, after the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, the gender ratio on reliefs is fairly equal. This equilibrium could reflect a shift in practice in the fifth century. Women might not have been recipients of gravestones before, but might only have become so in the classical period, explaining their more frequent depiction on classical than on archaic gravestones. Alternatively, the iconographic tradition could simply have changed, in that women became the subjects of gravestones, where previously men had been customary, regardless of who was buried in the grave. In the latter view, both women and men would have been buried in the plot of their families. The choice of setting up a stone marker was

---


972 Children have been counted as a separate category, regardless of their sex, since it is often difficult to establish whether a child is a boy or girl on the reliefs. In rare cases where an inscription gives additional information, the children are still listed just as such; but this does not significantly effect the overall result.

973 Cat. G 113, KM P 1265, is a fragment of an incised stele by Aristokles, depicting a seated woman.


975 Garland 1985, 72–4, 87–8 also sketches the gaps in our understanding of this tradition. Cf. Rehm 1994, 27, 35–6; Oakley and Sinos 1993, 6. Also D. 44.18, 44.30.

optional for the deceased women, as it was for the male dead – or perhaps more so, judging by the rare gravestones for women from the archaic period.\textsuperscript{977}

In conclusion, the main trend in sculptural genres of the sixth and fifth centuries is one of decreasing variation, but two factors mitigate this conclusion. First, bases show that some genres were in the fifth century still made in bronze, when previously they had been carved in marble.\textsuperscript{978} Second, preserved reliefs depict a range of figures derived from in-the-round statuary. Even so, the difference in overall effect of the votive sculpture of the sixth and of the fifth centuries must have been unmistakable for contemporary Athenians. In the archaic period, brightly coloured statues had crowded the Akropolis, many of them high up on columns and pillars or towering by their sheer size. In the fifth century there were large gleaming bronzes, flanked by marble reliefs and small offerings in terracotta, metal, or other materials. There are some exceptions to this pattern: the fact that some marble votives dedicated to female deities are preserved shows that for gifts to goddesses, it remained an appropriate material in the later fifth century. Furthermore, the iconography of reliefs shows that Asklepios was a main recipient of this type of dedication in marble at the end of the fifth century, too, and they continued to be offered in his cult.

In cemeteries, it was mostly the shape and size of grave stelai which changed; the in-the-round genres disappeared there too, but bronze was apparently deemed an unsuitable alternative. Female figures occur on fifth-century gravestones conspicuously more often than in the archaic period, but the overall balance of male and female figures on reliefs is quite even in the late fifth century (table 7c). Paradoxically, the increasing number of women on classical gravestones does not lead to a real majority, as an equally rising number of men in grave reliefs redresses the balance.

A gender count of archaic sculpture in the record in general (table 7d) shows more female than male figures, largely thanks to korai and archaic images of goddesses. The loss of these female statues from the archaic period takes away the advantage of women in sculpture. Thus, from a wider iconographic perspective, numbers of depictions of women in sculpture as a whole do not increase from the archaic period to the classical, but even slightly

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{977} This phenomenon is related to disjunctive representation in dedications. Cf. below. p. 254.
\item \textsuperscript{978} The bases which are not preserved would undoubtedly have changed the picture further, but there is no point in speculating about this.
\end{itemize}
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fall. In contrast, male figures, whether mortals or gods, occur more frequently in the sculpture of the late fifth century, evening out the numbers.

A final remark regards the korai. They are numerically the second largest genre in Athenian sculpture from the sixth and fifth centuries, appearing exclusively as votives in the material of this study. Their influence on the gender ratio is noteworthy. If they are indeed idealised mortal girls, they bring the statues of mortal women to almost twice the number of male statues (table 7d). All this happens before the second quarter of the fifth century, after which no korai are preserved. Yet without them, female statues would not be a third of those which represent men.979 The Athenian korai are clearly exceptional and their popularity among the – mostly male – patrons of Athens in the late archaic era is remarkable. This raises the question whom the korai represent, who offered them and whom they depict; questions which depend on the relations between patrons, genres and the recipient deities.

4 NAMES AND THE STATUS OF PATRONS

For anyone appreciating the quality of Greek sculpture, it may be hard to imagine someone other than a refined, wealthy Solonic or Periklean patron behind the exquisite votives and grave stones of Athens. But besides patrons from the political, social or religious elites of Athens, there are those who do not to belong to elevated circles: some monuments were erected by individuals who – judging from the available historical sources – seem to have been of marginal importance in Athenian society. The question is whether Perikles’ peers dedicated other kinds of votives and set up different grave stones than others did, who were poorer or less influential, or who did not qualify for citizenship. Votive and sepulchral inscriptions may reflect such differences in status among the families, the non-related groups, or the individual men and women who ordered and set up sculpture in archaic and early-classical Athens. This section offers an overview of the social backgrounds of patrons,

979 E.g. sculpture from 525–500, discounting the korai: six women, 18 men; 500–475: two women, 11 men. Even in genres the men have a slight advantage, since mortal women were rarely depicted on horseback, except in the case of amazons; but no sixth or fifth-century examples have been found in Athens.
based on votive and grave inscriptions in the data record of this study, followed by a brief comparison of epigraphic and iconographic renderings of the patrons of sculpture.\footnote{The epigraphic material in this study only serves comparative purposes. No attempt has been made to collect every inscription available. The criterion for selection is the type of statue which the base once carried. The evidence thus collected is for qualitative analysis only, i.e. a presentation of individual examples. An estimated overview of trends in total numbers is added where this is necessary. See above, Introduction, p. 10 and further.}

An important criterion with regard to social (as distinct from economic) status in sixth and fifth-century Athens was the question whether or not one qualified for citizenship. Citizenship was based on birth from citizen parents, until Perikles’ citizenship law of 451/0 one (usually the father), and after that date from two Athenian parents. Non-citizens were excluded from certain activities of the Athenian community, especially political participation, ownership of real property, most cultic activities and independent action in court. Metics, the long–term residents in Athens among whom may have been some of the sculptors discussed earlier, had a specific position of their own. Besides their valuable economic contribution, they were allowed to participate in important aspects of life in Athens, notably burial rites and religious festivals.\footnote{For recent overviews of the social status of metics, xenoi and women, and the definition of these groups in ancient Athens, see e.g. Patterson 2006; Blok 2009 and forthcoming; Wijma 2010.} Xenoi were not seen as members of the Athenian community at all. The position of women was equally complex: they were citizens and held important religious functions, but they did not serve in political or judicial office. Besides the divide of citizens and non-citizens, other sets of boundaries ran along lines of wealth (as established by Solon, to designate access to polis offices); of religious privileges, such as the right, based on birth, to serve in certain priesthoods; or of social distinction, notably descent from aristocratic families which exerted informal influence on political prominence.

For this study, two questions are relevant with regard to these various groups in Athenian society. The first is the following: can any of them be seen to exhibit characteristic behaviour as sculpture patrons? In other words, can any subgroup of those who lived in Athens be identified because their sculpted votives or gravestones or the corresponding inscriptions stand out from the rest? The second and subsequent question is this: did those who belonged to an elite, be it based on wealth, descent, or other criteria, use sculptural display to compete with their peers, or to impress those below them in social rank?

At this point, some remarks on the various types of names in inscriptions are in order. The name types which were recorded for this study include single names, ethnica, patronymics
and demotics. Much more complicated than establishing the presence of these types is any attempt to draw conclusions from them. In principle, demotics only became worth referring to in name inscriptions with the institution of demes as organisational units by Kleisthenes in the late sixth century. Once the demes assumed their new role, demotics would usually indicate citizen status. However, the precise procedure of bestowing citizenship in Athens is unclear. Recently, a persuasive argument has been made that apart from the deme, other official bodies played major roles in Athenian citizenship.

An inscribed patronymic says nothing at all about the owner’s civic status, since patronymics are not a uniquely Athenian, but a normal Greek practice. Only by means of prosopography can patronymics help to pinpoint people’s identities, and only as a result of this can their citizen status (or lack thereof) be established. Ethnica, which in the material of the present study mostly indicate that the person in question came from outside of Athens, are less ambiguous. That being said, they cannot be considered straightforward markers of metic status. The persons in question might be xenoi, or on the other hand, some might be of foreign descent but with privileges, such as the ambassador-like position of a proxenos.

These examples of the ambiguities of ancient name types show the difficulties in submitting the data in this study to a prosopographic analysis. As was mentioned in the introduction of this study, a numerical investigation of the name types in the record would be purely comparative and qualitative, not only because of the difficulties of this part of the material, but also because of the selection criteria. That being said, the identity of patrons, including their civic status and their traceability in Athenian history, can shed light on their behaviour in the art world. Moreover, even a rough outline of trends in the epigraphic material is useful in combination with the developments in sculptural genres described above. Thus, despite the caveat which this part of the investigation requires, some name-related data will be discussed here, followed by a number of individual cases of those who ordered sculpture in sixth and fifth-century Athens.

---

982 Even if they existed in some form before then: see Whitehead 1986; and Wijma 2010, 173–8 for an overview of pre-Kleisthenic demes and the changes which Kleisthenes made. See also Blok, forthcoming; and the thesis of D. Kretschmann of the University of Utrecht.
983 The phratries but also the gene: Lambert 1993; Blok 2009, 132–3; ditto 2010.
984 Patterson 2006, 268–70; Blok 2007, 324–5; Wijma 2010, 256–7, 268, for the example of Pythagoras of Selymbria; cf. also above n. 208.
In the inscriptions of Athenian patrons or deceased in the material of this study, 96 names can reasonably be attributed to citizens (table 9, chart 9). Of the names inscribed in bases, all but one are on votives; the most prolific periods are the first and second quarters of the fifth century. Non-Athenians appear less often than would perhaps be expected, considering the city’s appeal for craftsmen and traders from elsewhere. However, the status of patrons is often unclear and metics are undoubtedly among these cases. Only 28 persons are certainly of foreign descent, again mostly on votives: only six non-Athenians are on sepulchral bases. The base of Anaxilas of Naxos (pl. 50a) or the gravestone of Archetimos of Thasos (pl. 50b), may have been set up by metic families as well as by Athenian citizens who were not related to the deceased. Most metics seem to have been buried by their kin: the gravestones of Aischro, daughter of Zoillos of Samos, or the one for Alexos of Delos, for example, do not mention any external patron who commissioned the sculpture. Lampito (pl. 42c) was buried ‘far from the land of her forefathers’. In short, it is clear that Athenian

---

985 Of these 77 are on bases, 13 on votives and six on gravestones. The evaluation of citizen status was based on LGPN and PAA vol. I-XVI. Only the primary person was counted, so in the case of a votive set up in someone’s name, that person’s status is listed, not the status of the person who fulfilled the pledge for him or her. Similarly, of the gravestone it is the deceased who is counted, although the real patrons are likely to have been others in most cases. For patrons of gravestones: below p. 233. See also the Personalia field in the database.

986 Funerary inscription from a base dated 550–525: cat. 125, EM 10642, IG I 1211, for Xenophantes son of Kleibolos.


988 Anaxilas son of Aristion of Naxos by Timomachos (Cat. B 16, KM I 388, IG I 1357): his epigram suggests that honour had been bestowed on him by the Athenians on previous occasions, too: Ναξιοῦ ὁ τειχεῖος Αθηναίος μετασκότης ἐχοσχότα σοφόστατες ἑνκεκεν ἐν ἄρτετες (…the Naxian whom the Athenians used to honour for his prudence and wisdom; IG I 1357). Archetimos (cat. G 121, EM 12842) was in fact a hostage when he died, one of the Thasians who had to ensure Thasos’ cooperation in the Delian–Attic League after the island attempted to withdraw in 421: Salta 1991, 169 n. 1718, 171 n. 1742, 181 n. 1854.

989 Aischro, daughter of Zoillos of Samos (pl. 1e: cat. B 12, KM I 1189) and Alexos of Delos (cat. B 249, KM I 426). The latter carried a stele; Aischro’s base may be the only to have carried a funerary kore in Athens (pl. 43b).

990 Cat. B 126, EM 10643, IG I 1380: Φίλος ἢ μεῖος θείος — c. 10 — ὁ κατεσθεκε θεοῦσαν / Α([μιτ]) ἢ ἀλάζην γένις ἀσ- ὁ πατροίσι ; / Ἑνδοῖος ἐποίησεν. ‘Here, Phil— was laid chaste Lampito in the earth, far from land of her forefathers / Endoios made it.’
metics were allowed to bury their deceased relatives in the city’s cemeteries and erect memorials in their honour.  

Demotics are not clearly attested on the gravestones in this study until the final quarter of the fifth century (table 9). By then, this situation reverses: 13 citizens out of a total of 19 appear on gravestones in this period. Citizen status is implied in demotics, but the lack of one does not always mean the person in question lacks citizenship. Some patrons may have preferred a single name on their votive or gravestone (tables 9a–b).

Trends in patronymics and demotics on votives and grave monuments are similar to the patterns in the material as a whole. The great majority of patronymics appears on votive bases in the first quarter of the fifth century, as well as on some basins (table 9a, chart 9a.1). Demotics on votives also peak in this period, but on a much smaller scale; and demotics sustain a similar number in the second quarter of the fifth century. On grave monuments, patronymics peak modestly at two moments: in the final quarter of the sixth century and at the end of the fifth century (table 9b, chart 9b.1). Demotics in sepulchral inscriptions are usually on grave stelai in the later fifth century. The latter are also the main source of ethnica.

---

991 For the issue of how they obtained the land for the grave, see the next section.

992 As noted in a votive context by e.g. Aleshire 1992, 86 (in the Asklepieion at Athens, mainly late-classical to hellenistic). See also LGPN; Traill PAA.


994 On gravestones: 13 citizens from 425–400; 20 non–Athenians of which 13 from the same period and 7 from 450–425. The only sculpted reliefs set up for non–Athenians in this period are that of Emporion, cat. G 115, EM 6197, with a lekythos and a lyre player on it; and that of Onomastos of Megara and another man, cat. G 127, AM I 2473, depicting the two men in himatia.
The record of this study contains only very few certain ethnica on votives. One place where ethnica are more common are sculptors' signatures: six of these on votive bases and one on a funerary base name the sculptor as well as his place of birth, most often Chios and Paros. Most examples are from the archaic period, which in light of the presumed travelling habits of archaic sculptors discussed earlier, is to be expected. A patron from the deme Acharnai, obviously a citizen, allowed the Chiot sculptor of his votive, possibly Archermos, to sign the work with his name and ethnic. According to the (rather overly optimistic) reconstruction by Raubitschek, one sculptor called himself the Athenian. It would be an odd thing to do if he was a citizen.

Not surprisingly, the evidence suggests that demotics were used less often, for only 41 of them appear on extant votives (table 9a) and seven on grave monuments. The difference mainly stems from the peak in patronymics on votives at the end of the archaic period (chart 9a.1). Of course, the demotic was a late-comer compared to other name types. From the second quarter of the fifth century onward, however, patronymics and demotics follow a parallel downward trend. Since most inscriptions are on the bases which

995 Cat. B 84, Akr. 13262, fr. of base of Alkibios the kytharoidos (IG I² 666) dates 500–475. The identification as a metic is uncertain. Cf. DAA 89–90 no. 84; PAA II, 40 no. 121720; Kissas 2000, 101–2 no. 25. The other two are cat. B 243, EM 6265, fr. of base for Poly[----] son of Cheimerpes (525–500), and cat. B 255, EM 8169, fr. of pillar for Aristomache, Charikleia, daughters of Claukinos of Argos (475–450).


997 Cat. B 9, Akr. 6962, see n. 996. This requires further investigation, also beyond Athens. It would be interesting to know whether this was exceptional generosity of the Acharnian patron, or common leeway given to well-respected sculptors, or even to sculptors in general in the archaic period.


999 The official status of metics was probably introduced in the 470s BC. See above n. 981.

1000 Both name types have three examples in the final quarter: two of these have both also the patronymics: cat. B 176, Akr. 13264, of Chairedemos son of Euangelos of Koile; and cat. B 177, Akr. no. ?, fr. of base for bronze group of the son of Chaires of the deme Cholarges. Cf. n. 993.
all but disappear in the late fifth century, such decreasing numbers are to be expected. Inscriptions on reliefs and stelai compensate somewhat, especially in sepulchral inscriptions. Inscriptions sometimes show something of the relations between those mentioned, in particular the ratio of male and female patrons and beneficiaries. Women at first glance seem to have dedicated only rarely on the Athenian Akropolis or in other sanctuaries of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries. Only 15 votive inscriptions in the record mention a female dedicant (table 9, chart 9a.2). However, though this number is small, it is not negligible in comparison to other groups. Most of the dedicatory inscriptions of Athenian women date to around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, with four examples from the late sixth century and eight from the first quarter of the fifth. An example is the pillar for a small bronze offered by Heido (pl. 41c). Other female patrons from the final decades of the archaic period include Iphidike, who set up the impressive Nike Ak. 693 on a column (pl. 20a); Phileia, the daughter of Chairedemos of Athmonon who dedicated a bronze statue as a tithe 'of the land' to Athena; Kallikrite, whose first fruit was paid for from her own business (pl. 26d); Phryne and Smikythe, who together set up a bronze statue to Athena; and Kallisto and another Smikythe (or perhaps the same), two washerwomen whose earnings paid for dedications of basins.

1003 Bases dedicated by women in 525–500: cat. B 232, Akr. 9955, by Ergokieia, frs. of pillar for bronze statue (animal); cat. B81, EM 6250, of Psakythe, fr. of base for bronze group (statuettes); cat. B77, D EM 6242, of Thearis daughter of Kortynios (or Thraichs, his son: cf. LGPN, 227 (2); DAA 82–3 no. 77; PAA IX, 40 no. 501960; cf. vol. IX 323 no. 516200), fr. of base for bronze statue (horseman?). Of 500–475: cat. B 250, Akr. 6502, of Heido, fr. of pillar for bronze statue; cat. B 201, EM 6401, of Myrrhine, daughter of [-----]dio?, fr. of pillar for marble statue. Cat. B 79, EM 6301, of Aristomache and Archestrate by their father Kynarbos son of Li---- ?, fr. of base for bronze group (two statuettes) is dubious: Kynarbos may have fulfilled a vow for his daughters: listed here as the women's. Cf. Kissas 2000, 99–100 no. 22; LGPN, 58 (2), 69 (1), 277 (1); DAA 84–5 no. 79; PAA III, 169 no. 172325 (Arist.), ibid. 352 no. 210755 (Arch.); vol. X, 639 no. 588705 (Kyn.).
1004 Cat. B 3, EM 6241, Iphidike (Nike: cat. V 97, Ak. 693, 525–500; base: cat. B 3 EM 6241, IG I3 683); cat. B 191, EM 6385, Phileia; cat. B 38, Akr. 607, Smikythe. The latter may of course be the same as: cat. B 93, EM 12780 (a), 6383 (b), Phryne and Smikythe. All except Iphidike's dated 500–475. Kallisto's basin, cat. V 279, EM 6527; and cat. V 299, EM 6541, 5503, 13389, of Kallikrite, have the same date. The latter's first fruit (cf. IG I3 921) is intriguing because it suggests she had an independent profession. The inscription on Phileia's monument (IG I3 800) is somewhat dubious: ἀνεσκεδάς δεκατάχθων χρόνων Ἀθήναιν may refer to a tithe of the land, Athmonothen being simply an admittedly early demotic, but it could also mean 'the land at Athmonon', i.e. a geographical indication. The archaic form of chorioo points at the eastern Greek sphere.
In the fifth century, especially after the first quarter, few female dedicants feature in votive inscriptions (chart 9a.2).\textsuperscript{1005} One may record a metronymic: a base for a marble statue offered by Myrrhine daughter of [-----]drio.\textsuperscript{1006} The use of cases, the state of preservation and the lettering prevent a certain reconstruction, but if some of these are indeed entirely female offerings, the ladies must have had ample means at their disposal. In fact, none of the women’s dedications are below par in any way; only their numbers are small.

Family inscriptions often include women, and many votives are joint gifts by husbands and wives or other family members.\textsuperscript{1007} They offer a unique insight in the personal side of votive practices: if the occasion arose, vows had to be fulfilled by relations, whether the rest of the family had agreed in advance to do so or not.\textsuperscript{1008} Kynarbas set up a votive after a vow by his daughters (pls. 48a–c), while Etearchos complied with a promise made by his father, and erected a bronze horse or horseman on a pillar.\textsuperscript{1009} A bronze tripod was offered by Kedeides and Kleisthenes for their father Autokrates, and a marble statue by the children of a man called Chromonides or Chromon (pl. 42a).\textsuperscript{1010} In gravestones such monuments are more frequent (table 9b, chart 9b.2), in particular because families were legally required to give their deceased a proper burial.\textsuperscript{1011} It is perhaps not very likely that...
gravestones were thought of as a mandatory part of the arrangements, since more of them would probably have been preserved in that case.\footnote{1012} Most grave inscriptions which explicitly declare that someone set them up for another person or other persons date from the sixth century.\footnote{1013} Considering that this must have been common in gravestones – many deceased may not have made arrangements in advance – the number is surprisingly low. Perhaps the need to mention the patron of a gravestone in its inscription was not felt by everyone. Especially when children died, inscriptions can poignantly express the parents’ grief. Smikyths was evidently a young child when he died, for ‘by dying, he killed a loved one and the hope of good’.\footnote{1014} Passers-by of Tettichos’ grave are called upon to reflect on the misery of losing him and act well in compensation (pl. 42b).\footnote{1015}

Deceased and patron are not always related by blood, however. There are a few cases in which a friend or partner donated the gravestone. The inscription on the gravestone set up by Philtiades of Samos or Paros to commemorate Lampito, for example, does not clarify the relation (pl. 42c). Perhaps he was her husband and the Athenian of the two. This could explain why the epigram says that Lampito was buried ‘far from the land of her forefathers’.\footnote{1016} An endearing case is a small gravestone from the final quarter of the fifth century

\footnote{1012} This will be further discussed in the next section.

\footnote{1013} Eight from the sixth c., one from the fifth. For Chairedemos, set up by his father (cat. B 188, NYMM 16.174.6, with st. NYMM 12.158, 575–550). Of 550–525: cat. B 125, EM 10642, Xenophonos by his father Kleibolos, probably a kowros; cat. B 159, KM I 1424, st. for Aisimides by his mother (!). Four from 525–500: cat. B 16, KM I 1388, seated fig. for Anaxilas son of Aristion of Naxos, by Timomachos; cat. B 126, EM 10643, st. for Lampito by Philtiades of Samos or Paros; cat. B 153, EM 6691, st. for Xenophonos by his father. Cat. B 134, Third Ephoria no., is a base for seated figure for Oinanthe, daughter of Apsynthos? Hede/ Apsinthie, by her husband or father Opsiros: the relations are difficult to establish. For cat. B 12, KM I 1189, below n. 1019.

\footnote{1014} Cat. B 142, KM I 327, IG I 3 1219, b. for a stele: οἰκτήρο προσορ[ν] / παιδός τάδε σέιμα θανόντος / Σμικύθος[ε], ήος τε φιλόν ὀλέσε-. / ν ἔλπι' ἀγαθεῖν. ‘This nearby monument is of the lamentable deceased child, Smikyths, who (by dying) killed a loved one and the hope of good.’

\footnote{1015} Cat. B 29, KM I 10650, IG I 3 1194bis, b. for a stele: [ἐπε άστο]ς τις ἀνερ ἐπε χένος / ἀλάθιν / ἔλθων: ‘Τέτιχον οἰκτήρας ἁμάρ' ἀγαθῶν παρτί παρτί: / ἐν πολέμῳ φθίμενον, νεαραν ἡβεν ὀλέσαυτα: / ταυτ' ἀποδιώραμεν νέσθε ἐπί πράζθì ἀγαθον: ‘Whether coming as a citizen or as a stranger from somewhere else, let anyone pass after having lamented Tetticohos, a good man, who died in battle, after having lost tender youth. Once you have lamented all this, apply yourself to something good.’

century, which one Euthylla set up for a Biote: the epigram relates that Euthylla and Biote were good friends and that the dead woman will be missed dearly; yet they were not blood relations (pl. 42d).\textsuperscript{1017}

Two more women’s names on grave monuments, Kleito (pl. 43a) and Melissa, date from the third quarter of the sixth century\textsuperscript{1018} and from the final quarter are another two women’s memorials, one of which was for Aischro, set up by Zoilos of Samos, probably the girl’s father.\textsuperscript{1019} Interestingly, this is the only base from the city of Athens for a woman where the gravestone may have been a kore (pl. 43b). A monument to a woman named Menestho was erected in the third quarter of the fifth century, but only at the end of the fifth century do women’s names occur in substantial numbers on gravestones (table 9b).\textsuperscript{1020} However, compared to other categories of names in the record, such as single names of men (without patronymics or demotics), the number of women’s names on gravestones is quite large early on (table 9b, chart 9b.2). The increasing frequency of women’s names in the later fifth century is paired with their more regular appearance on grave reliefs. Moreover, Euthylla’s stele for Biote suggests that some women were independent patrons of sepulchral sculpture. It may not have been common, but it did happen.

Besides the occasional woman setting up a gravestone for another woman, a few examples of women commemorating men also survive. Such cases are the grave stele of Aisimides, and one of an unknown Olympic victor, whose name is too damaged to restore. Both were set up by the men’s mothers.\textsuperscript{1021} The gravestone for the Olympic victor (pls. 43c–

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Cat. G 149, EM 8852. Πιστὴς ἡδείας τε χαρι-ν φιλότητος ἑταίρα / Εὐθυλλά στήλην τῆνδ’ ἐπέθηκε τάφοι σοί, Βιοτή μημὴν γὰρ άει δακρυστόν ἔχοσα / ἡλικίας τῆς σῆς κλαίει ἀποθημενής. Because of your true and sweet love, your companion, Euthylla, has placed this stele on your grave, Biote; she remembers you forever in her tears and weeps for the youth you lost.

  \item Cat. B 154, EM 13486 for Kleito (the name is contested: it could theoretically be the genitive of a man’s name; because there is only one word, it may well a genetive as well as a nominative: Jeffery 1962, 131 n. 27; \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 1209; \textit{LGPN}, 265 (1); \textit{PAA X}, 436 no. 576250; Kissas 2000, 38–9 no. 3). Melissa’s monument is cat. B 265, KM no. ?, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 1205. Both are bases for stelai.

  \item Cat. B 12, KM I 1189, pl. 1e, for Aischro daughter of Zoilos of Samos, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 1366, had a marble statue. Of cat. B 134, a base at the Third Ephoria no.? for Oinanthe (?), the family relations are much debated. See Clairmont, \textit{GE} 15 n. 13; Viviers 1992, 133–9); Ridgway ASGS, 294–5; \textit{LGPN}, 348 (1), 85 (1), 355 (2); \textit{PAA XIII}, no. 740735 (Oin.), 552 no. 751295 (Op.).

  \item Namely, 30 times in 425–400. Menestho’s monument is cat. B 128, EM 10254. It had a statue of uncertain material and genre. Menestho may also be the genetive of Menesthos, in which case the deceased would be a man. \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{1} 1302; \textit{LGPN} II, 307 (2); Traill \textit{PAA XII}, 234 no. 645225.

  \item Aisimides: cat. B 159, KM I 424, b. for stele. The reconstruction of the name is not entirely certain, and it could perhaps have had a female ending as well; but the mother’s role is

\end{enumerate}
d) should be seen in light of the high status of such victories. In fact, it is surprising that there are not more gravestones which mention athletic victories in the record. Memorials for successful athletes in other (or unspecified) games are preserved in somewhat larger quantities. The dedication of presumably Kroisos and of Alkmeonides, the sons of Alkmion, offers thanks to Athena for a victory in horse-racing (pl. 44a). They were probably members of the illustrious family of the Alkmionidai, although there is no definite proof for this. Other famous victors in the fifth century are Pronapes of Prasiai, whose career will be discussed further down, and the two Kallias: the son of Hipponikos, whose family was so wealthy it aroused suspicion, and the son of Didymias, who offered a large circular base for a victory in the Panathenaia. He is also known from an honorary inscription in

Athletic dedications are cat. B 225, EM 6222, fr. of base for bronze vessel, by Kroisos and Alkmeonides, sons of Alkmion, 550–525, for pentathlon and horse racing; perhaps cat. B 120, Akr. 13248, for Epicharinos son of Opholoides; and cat. B 174, Akr. 13172, for Pronapes of Prasiai son of Pronapides. Many votive or grave reliefs of which the beneficiary is no longer known have images with sports attributes and may well represent athletic victors. E.g. of 575–550, cat. G 60, NMA 38, 83 relief with a diskophoros. Of 550–525: cat. G 90, NMA 5826, relief with an athlete (holding an aryballos). Eupheros (cat. G 46, KM P 1169, c. 450–425) holds a strigilis, which could also be a sign of sportsmanship. The ball–player base (cat. B 27, NMA 3476), which carried a kouros, is of course sports–related. It carried a kouros, and if it was for an olympianikos, kouroi may have served as funerary monuments for athletes too. See below p. 265.

The reconstruction of the inscription is stretched, but not unlikely. Willemsen has suggested that a gravestone discussed below (n. 1046) would be for Megakles, the father of Alkmion. Date–wise this is possible, but Davies (APF 372) criticises the lack of evidence. Cf. DAA 338–40 no. 317; LGPN, 274 (1); PAA X, 597 no. 586056 (K.), vol. II, 53 no. 122480 (A.). Another dedication of Alkmionides son of Alkmion in the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos in Boeotia commemorates a victory in a chariot race at the Panathenaia: Jeffery (LSAG 73) suggests that he lacked time to set up a votive in Athens because he was forced to leave after Peisistratos’ accession in 546 BC; though tempting, this cannot be proven. Cf. Friednländer 1948, 154 no. 167.

See also below ns. 1058–1059.

Cat. B 164, Akr. 13255. DAA 181–4 no. 164; IG I 893; Kyle 1987, 202–3 A29; LGPN, 245 (13), 114 (1); PAA X, 53 no. 553780. No APF listing; but he was probably ostracised at some point which might explain the loss of wealth and power. The base may have been set up close the place where it was found, near the Propylaia on the Akropolis, for an incision in the ground exactly matches its diameter.
Olympia, where he won in pankration. The bronze statue celebrating this victory he had made by an Athenian sculptor named Mikon.  

Victory dedications are private in the sense that individuals donated them and often paid the cost, but at the same time they had a high public visibility. The right to set up a monument with the winner’s name was part of the prize. A similar construction applied to military commanders who were successful in battle, for example, the hipparchoi of Athens, and to choregoi who had won first prizes with their plays in one of the dramatic festivals of Athens. A memorial in the latter category is a base for a tripod dated to the first quarter of the fifth century; its epigram has caused much debate. In the hexameters, the dedicant honours the talent of the men of the chorus, who either were ‘of various tribes in Athens’, or from ‘outside of the tribes’, that is, non–Athenians. This may suggest that metics who had participated in a theatrical festival at Athens could commemorate their victory with a public offering, like Athenians could; but such flexibility on their part is not confirmed by ancient sources. The interpretation of the men from the text as ‘from many tribes’ ties in with

---

1027 IG I 1473, dates the Olympian inscription tentatively c. 470–460. That would be early to match cat. B 164, as Raubitschek (DAA 183–4) notes, but it not impossible. Cf. above n. 790.

1028 Kyle 1996, 106–7; Osborne 2004, 217, 207 (for cash prizes at the Panathenaia); also Slings 2005, 46–7 (‘prizes’ in the choral agon); Smith 2007, 95 (Olympia).

1029 Tripods won in a dramatic contest were dedicated to Dionysos at the victor’s cost (Csapo and Slater 1995, 141; Slings 2005, 43–7). For an overview of choreic dedications in classical times see Goette 2007, 122–30. Also Osborne 2004, 217; Wilson 2000, on the choregia in general.

1030 Cat. B 202, EM 6395, 6694, 13254, frs. of support for bronze the tripod mentioned in the inscription, dated 475–450. Cf. DAA 345–6 no. 323; IG I 833bis.

1031 The victor’s name is too damaged for reconstruction: [...]αες ἡν...5...τοιν Ἀθηνεσι[ν χοροὶ] ἀνέδρα[ν]/[...]τες σοφ[ι]κες τόνδ’ ἀνέθεκε[ν] ἥδον / [ευχημενο]ς πικέστος δὲ [χιρο]ς ἐξ[σ]ο κατα φύλακα / [ἀνδρόν] νι[κί]σαι φαιν περι τρίποδος. ‘The victor has dedicated this marker, having promised it, [as a reminder] of the talent of the men of the chorus at Athens. He has won the contest for the tripod among very many men’s choruses outside of (echo) the organization in tribes.’ Or: ‘...among very many men’s choruses of outsiders, tribe by tribe, to have won the contest for the tripod’ (Slings 2005). The interpretation hinges on ἐχοσ κατα φύλακα. Regarding the epigram’s authorship and metre, see Slings 2005, 57–8. Contra Papalexandrou 2005, 10 [his translation listed in the database, Bases table].

1032 What little evidence for foreign participation in the Attic choregia exists is problematic, and often late. Metics were allowed to perform certain choregai or sing in the chorus (Whitehead 1977, 70; Csapo and Slater 1995, 138–9), but not at all festivals. The Lenaia permitted foreigners to serve as choregoi (Kindermann 1979, 17), but at which time this was instigated is unclear (Pickard–Cambridge 1988, 40–1 ref. to Schol. Ar. Plu. 953, but he explains that in another source (Ar. Ach. 504), the Lenaia had ‘no strangers or allies present’. Several authors cite a rule that anyone may ‘remove any foreigner participating in a chorus’, let alone acting as choregoi (Wijma 2010, 124; Csapo and Slater 1995, 153 no. 105: And. 4.20–1, Against Alkibiades), which is perhaps a later
later choregic dedications, such as one offered by Kleisthenes of Aigeis and Kedeides of the
tribe Erechtheis (pls. 44b–c),\textsuperscript{1033} and a very fragmentary inscription for the \textit{choregoi}
of Antiochis, Aristeides and Archestratos.\textsuperscript{1034}

Choregic monuments celebrate a common victory through sculpture. They advertise
cooporation between people from different political units even in the face of fierce tribal
competition which apparently characterised the \textit{choregia}.\textsuperscript{1035} These inscriptions convey some
socio-political awareness: the contributing tribes set aside their differences to win a choregic
competition, and they commemorated this in sculpted and inscribed monuments.\textsuperscript{1036}

Among the best preserved dedications of \textit{hipparchoi}, the leaders of the Athenian
cavalry,\textsuperscript{1037} is the base of Lakedaimonios, Xenophon and Pronapes, in office some time in the
third quarter of the fifth century: a bronze group of a man leading a horse.\textsuperscript{1038} The first
dedicant, Lakedaimonios of Lakiadai, was the ominously named son of Kimon. He also
appears in a public inscription from the third quarter of the fifth century, and according to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1033} Cat. B 105, EM 10330, IG I\textsuperscript{3} 965: Κλεισθένης ἔχορευε Ἀὐτοκράτος / Ἐρέχθειδι Αἰγίδι / Κήδειδης ἔδιος. It dates c. 475–450; this is admittedly earlier than the other preserved
choregic inscriptions are dated.
\item \textsuperscript{1034} Cat. B 104, AM I 3398, IG I\textsuperscript{3} 962 (cf. IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3027), 425–400. The reconstruction is derived from a
literary source rather than legible in the remains of the inscription, namely of the fifteenth-
century AD author Cyriacus of Ancona, who describes the piece and lists as winners Aristeides
and Archestratos of the tribe (? ) Antiochis, and as the musician a man called [-----]stratos. Cf. 
\textit{LGPN}, 52 (89); Meritt 1954, 249–50; \textit{PAA} III, 360–1 no. 211315 (Archestratos). There are further
examples of choregic monuments not included in the database because they lacked information
on the statue, e.g. IG I\textsuperscript{3} 511, 957–968 and IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3027–3063.
\item \textsuperscript{1035} As, for example, described in Plu. \textit{Cim.} 8.7. Cf. Wijma 2010, 124.
\item \textsuperscript{1036} Later, the appointment of \textit{choregoi} was no longer performed by the archon but by the tribal
\item \textsuperscript{1037} Cat. B 141, EM 5527 (450–425), was probably the monument of a \textit{hipparchos}, but its fragmentary
state leaves little to go on. It carried a bronze vessel or tripod, and was set up in on the Akropolis.
\item \textsuperscript{1038} Cat. B 135, Akr. no. ? The dedication of Lakedaimonios, Xenophon and Pronapes is IG I\textsuperscript{3} 511;
Davies APF 306, no. 8429 XIII, 199 no. 5951, 471 no. 12250; \textit{LGPN} II, 267 (3), 347 (35), 380–1
(3); \textit{DAA} 146–7 no. 135. The occasion for the offering of ‘the spolia of the enemy’, is unclear. For
the translation see database, Bases table.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Plutarch, he was *hipparchos* in the 450s or 440s, and later became a general. He was *hipparchos* in the 450s or 440s, and later became a general. **Xenophon** of Melite is mentioned by Thucydides: he became a general in 441/0 BC and served at Samos in the following year as well as at Potidaia. Pronapes of Prasiai not only dedicated this monument but possibly also a base for a bronze four-horse chariot. Apparently he was a passionate horse-breeder, an occupation for which notoriously large resources were required. He won prestigious races at Nemea, Isthmia and at the Panathenaia, and may have been among the prosecutors of Themistokles in c. 470 BC. The monument of these three *hipparchoi* is prominently signed by the sculptor, including his demotic: Lykios of Eleutherai, son of the sculptor Myron and an Athenian citizen himself. That public figures of high stature allowed the sculptor such a conspicuous signature is interesting.

Dedications by identifiable patrons from the liturgical class occur neatly distributed over time, once it becomes possible to trace them around the mid-sixth century. Of about 30 monuments in the record, the patrons might be from liturgical families, in most cases *pentakosiomedimnoi*. Apart from the two offerings involving the families of Xenophon,

---

1039 IG I 3 48bis line 12, 364.8; Plu. Per. 19.1; general in 433/2.
1040 Thuc. 2.70; 2.79.1–7. He may be the Xenophon son of Euripides mentioned in IG I 3 48 line 45. He died in 429.
1041 Cat. B 174, Ak. 13172, IG II 880, above no. 1023. He and his family are discussed in APF 471 no. 12250; also DAA 205–7 no. 174; Jacob–Felsch 1969, 179 cat. II no. 71, 52 n. 157; LGPN, 380–1 (3); PAA XIV, 451 no. 789555 (possibly 789545, 789550 and 78575 as well).
1042 When his children had inherited his – considerably diminished – fortune, they defended him to the Athenian *demos*: although a fanatical horse racer and a decadent, he spent nine talents and two thousand drachmai on liturgies and another seven talents on trierarchies (Lys. 19.19). His role as prosecutor of Themistokles may be what is referred to in the apocryphal letters of Themistokles, Themist. Ep. 8. See Rosenmeyer 2006, 63.
1043 See also above p. 163.
1045 This out of a total of out of 96 names of citizens in inscriptions. Of these 30, 23 dedicatory inscriptions on bases probably name patrons who belonged to the liturgical class; four appear on votive basins, namely cat. V 287, EM 6529, fr. of basin of Kominides; cat. V 333, EM 5529, st. or plaque of [Hab]ronichos; cat. V 332, NMA 1460, st. of Demokrates; cat. V 233, NMA 1341, rel. to Asklepios, by Antimedes. On grave stones, all of 425–400, three women from prominent families are: cat. G 59, NMA 4485, Myrrhine’s lekythos; cat. G 62, NMA 3624, Hegeso rel.; cat. 166, AM I 1392, for […] wife of K[…] of Oio of the phyle Hippo[tho[n]tideis]?; *cippus* stele: she was from a
Lakedaimonios and Pronapes, at least fifteen votives by leisure-class Athenians appear in the material, almost all of them from the Akropolis. The first dedicants of which historical records exist are Alkmeonides and Kroisos, mentioned earlier. From the next quarter century is the statue of a scribe (pl. 44d–e) set up by Alkimachos son of Chairion. He was probably the treasurer of Athena around 550 BC, but unfortunately little is known about him or his family except for the pride in his father’s name expressed in the inscription, and that he was wealthy enough to fulfil this office. Mechanion *grammateus*, another secretary, dedicated a basin in the second quarter of the fifth century, of which the pedestal remains (pl. 46b). *Grammateus* most likely refers to an office perhaps also in the service of Athena. If so, this is the fifth-century version of the dedication of Chairion. Yet Mechanion’s basin is a much simpler type of votive than Chairion’s statue of a scribe.

From the final quarter of the sixth century is the votive of Mnesiades the potter and Andokides, a pillar with a bronze statue on the top. The former is unknown, but Andokides may have been a *pentakosiomedimnos*, a *tamias* to Athena around the middle of the sixth century. If this is true, the combination with a potter is very odd, and perhaps the deme...

---

1046 See above p. 235. Cat. B 225, EM 6222: the names are over-restored, but if correct, Alkmeonides’ father Alkmeon is the son of Megakles (I), who was archon in the late seventh century. The gravestone KM 1 322 (cat. B 263, above n. 1021) has also been attributed to this family, namely to Megakles himself (Willemsen 1963, 105, 110–1 no. 2; *APF* 372–3) but since only –kles is preserved, the restoration is too uncertain (Davies points out further relevant objections to the identification). Cf. *DAA* 338–40 no. 317; *LGPN* II, 274 (1); *PAA* X, 597 no. 586056 (Kroisos), vol. II, 53 no. 122480 (Alkmeonides).

1047 Cat. B 6, Akr. 124, 629: frs. of a column with a marble statue of a scribe, or *tamias* (cat. V 70). Cf. *DAA* 10–1 no. 6; Raubitschek *BSA* XL (1943) 17–8; Friedländer 1948, 50–1 no. 48; Jacob–Felsch 1969, 119–20 cat. I no. 18, 35 n. 107; Brouskari 1979, 52 fig. 124 (column); *APF* 13–4; *IG* I 618; Kissas 2000, 194–5 no. 152. The connection between the base and statue of the scribe is not entirely certain. Cf. *LGPN*, 23 (1); *PAA* II, 44 no. 121912; Personalia field in the Bases table.


1049 Cat. B 178, Akr. 6971; *IG* I 620. Cf. *IG* I 510; *APF* 28, no. 282 III. He is also tentatively identified with Andokides the vase painter, because of κρεομείς (cf. Stissi 2002, 156, 159; Keesling 2005, 399; *contra* Vickers 1985, 125); possible *kalos* inscriptions for him appears on hydria by Timagoras and Taleides (c. 540, *PAA* XII, no. 127245; *ABV* 174.7). Davies suggests that a discrepancy of *pentakosiomedimnos* and vase painter could be solved by the circumstance that trades were practiced in this family later on, too. The family of Andokides whose brother was Leagoras rose to great heights through the sixth and fifth centuries, fighting against Peisistratos and producing several generals and *choregoi*. A potter Mnesiades of approximately the same time is known from another hydria with *Aristomenes kalos* (*ABV* p. 314; Keesling 2005, 398).
Kerameis is meant. In the final quarter of the sixth century, more votives of the elite appear in the record: nine are of liturgical patrons, mostly bases for bronzes dedicated to Athena. One base was offered to the Twelve Gods: its dedicate, Leagros son of Glaukon, might be Leagros kalos, whose beauty is celebrated in dozens of late-archaic inscriptions on pottery.

In the early fifth century, most of these families apparently chose for bronzes. Among those who did not follow this trend is Kiron, who dedicated a marble kore in the fifth century; the sad remnants of his wealth are the subject of a fourth-century court case. After the early decades of the fifth century, elite patrons were Timotheos of Anaphlystos, whose father Konon may have been archon in 462/1; Simylos and Dorotheos of the deme.

---


1052 Cat. B 108, AM I 1597, for a bronze st.: see next note. Cf. Merritt 1936, 358 no. 2; Kissas 2000, 89 no. 10. It was found close to the altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora.

1053 ABV 669; ARV² 1591–4; PAA XI, 50–1 no. 602645. He was born into a high-ranking family around 525. A possible sister may have married Kritias (APF 90–1 no. 3027 (ref.) and no. 8792 VII); his son Glaukos (II) had a daughter who perhaps married Kallias (III) of Alopeke in the late 420s (APF 91), grandson of cat. B 111 and cat. B 136 (see also below ns. 1058–1059). Cf. AM 106 (1991) 152 (the name on ostraka); LGPN, 280 (1).

1054 Choregoi were obviously part of the (economic) elite: cf. Kedeides and Kleisthenes son of Autokrates (cat. B 105, EM 10330), as discussed above, n. 1033.

1055 The base is cat. B 14, Akr. 3763 (a–b), EM 6484 (c), frs. of column for cat. V 188, Akr. 497. Only her feet and a part of the plinth are preserved, and show traces of burning (DAA 21–2 no. 14; Jacob–Felsch 1969, 126 cat. I no. 29, 37 n. 150–2; Kissas 2000, 219 no. 171). For Kiron see APF 313 no. 8442; LGPN, 261 (1); PAA, 344 no. 570105. The speech, Is. 8, dates between c. 383 and 363.; the estate was by then in the hands of a grandson and had become modest. Another votive from this period, cat. B 35, EM 6327, a pedestal for marble basin, was set up by Eune[uus] and Kir[ ?]. The iota in Kir– is uncertain. If correct, more than one reconstruction of the name is still possible. The suggestion that this is another of Kiron’s dedications is rejected (APF 313 no. 8443; cf. DAA 408–9 no. 382; Pimpl 1997, 187 no. 93; PAA VII, 373 no. 439833). Cat. B 251, EM 6344, fr. of pillar, by Kir[on/1ias?] may be related (DAA 289 no. 260; Kissas 2000, 154–6 no. 92). The reconstruction is uncertain but it may be Kiron’s: APF 313 no. 8442; cf. PAA X, 343 no. 570037.

1056 Cat. B 47, EM 6375, Timotheos son of Kon[on] of Anaphlusty[s], base for a bronze statue. IG I² 863 suggests it is a victor’s monument, which would fit his age (he was probably born before c.
Potamos, probably two brothers from a well-to-do family which produced officials and military men throughout the fifth century BC.\textsuperscript{1057} The votive base of Kallias of Alopeke, son of Hipponikos, dates from the third quarter of the century, its marble statue made by Kalamis.\textsuperscript{1058} Kallias was a famous character in Athenian politics in the first half of the fifth century: an Olympic victor, flamboyant politician and diplomat. Although an in-depth discussion of his long career would be too much of a digression here, this marble dedication and another one which might be his provide a glimpse of this exceptional life.\textsuperscript{1059}

Evidently, the reasons for setting up votives are often success in office or military service, or a choregic victory. However, sometimes the motivation is less clear. For example, a bronze statue was dedicated on the Akropolis by five Athenians, but partly due to the damaged state of the base, their reasons remain obscure.\textsuperscript{1060} Two of the dedicants can be identified in other inscriptions from the period. Idomeneus of Kephisia was probably the father of Philoneus of Kephisia, a treasurer to Athena between 445 and 442 BC.\textsuperscript{1061} Epiteles might be one of the dedicators of Akr. 136, a marble statue of Athena on a column (pls. 2a–b).\textsuperscript{1062} Interestingly, the bronze votive statue commissioned by these five men and the marble Athena which Epiteles ordered were both made by Pythis. It would seem that their cooperation worked out.

Another intriguing patron, possibly of a very wealthy and prominent Athenian family, is Strombichos son of Strombichides: generations after his son Diotimos apparently produced

---

\textsuperscript{1057} Cat. B 114, EM 433, fr. of base for bronze statue, \textit{DAA} 118–9 no. 114; \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 834. See \textit{APF} 142–3 no. 3721; \textit{LGPN}, 137 (99), 398 (6=17); \textit{PAA} VI, 144 no. 376980.

\textsuperscript{1058} Cat. B 136, AM I 5128, fr. of base for probably a marble statue, by [Kal]lias; \textit{DAA} 152–3 no. 136; \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 876. Cf. \textit{APF} 258 no. 7826 V; \textit{LGPN}, 245 (82); \textit{PAA} X, 63–4 no. 554480. For Kalamis, p. 163.

\textsuperscript{1059} The second dedication possibly by Kallias is cat. B 111, Akr. 7898: \textit{DAA} no. 111, \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 835, c. 500–475. It was a bronze youth on a pedestal, and possibly commemorated (according to Raubitschek) a hat trick of Olympic racing victories in the early fifth century. If this votive is indeed by Kallias son of Hipponikos as well, he must have offered it just before his death in 446. His fortune seems to have been astronomical, but his notorious family lost it afterwards, for in fourth–century liturgical records they no longer appear. Cf. e.g. Plu. \textit{Arist.} 7–8.

\textsuperscript{1060} Cat. B 90, EM 6266 (a), 6463 (b), fr. of base for bronze statue, c. 500–475, by: Hippos[th]enes, Al[kidam]as L[---], Epit[ele,s, Glauk[.....] Idom[eneus]. \textit{DAA} 98–9 no. 90; Kissas 2000, 279 no. 66. The inscription is in too poor a state to establish the identities of all the patrons: Hippothenes, Alkidamas or Clauk--.

\textsuperscript{1061} Cat. B 90, EM 6266 (a), 6463 (b). \textit{APF} 181, no. 4859. Cf. \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 455 line 10.

\textsuperscript{1062} Cat. B 10, Akr. 136, 4346 (a–b), 6506 (c–d); cat. V 138. See \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 680.
great politicians into the fourth century BC. However, the identification of the Strombichos who offered a bronze votive statue with the father of Diotimos is uncertain: the name occurs more frequently in this period, also outside of the family. For example, a man by the name of Strombichos was a secretary of the Hellenotamiai in the year 444/3. An eminent patron from the early fifth century was Onetor, who offered a bronze statue on a pillar on behalf of himself and his children. A bronze statue, dedicated by Timotheos son of Konon of Anaphlystos deserves particular attention. He came from a powerful family, probably served in office in the mid-fifth century, and his grandson, Timotheos II, became a famous general. The statue dedicated by two brothers, Dorotheos and Simylos, was a first fruit offering, perhaps paid for by spolia from the Persian Wars. Their family is one of the few which can be traced well into the later fifth century. Simylos became a treasurer to Athena in 444 BC, and in the third quarter of the fifth century, a marble relief was offered by Demokrates and Demochares, the sons of Simylos. Apparently, this family continued to prosper for some generations.

---

1063 Cat. B 102, EM 6223, IG I 3 792: fr. of base for bronze? statue, c. 500–475. This may be APF 161 no. 4386; LGPN II, 408 (2). Cf. DAA 106–7 no. 102; PAA XV, 456 no. 842240. See next note.

1064 Strombichos I (see previous note); or Strombichos of Cholleidai, the secretary: IG I 3 439 (line 73–4). The same office was held by the son of Gnathios, dedicant of a bronze Athena Promachos. Cf. cat. B 112, Akr. 13232, 13171, fr. of base for bronze statue, c. 500–475, by Mneson of Leukonoe and his sons Thrasyllos and Gnathios (DAA 116–7 no. 112; IG I 3 833; APF 43–4, no. 1395; PAA IX, 353 no. 517760. The descendants inherited liturgical estates (some with difficulty: e.g. Is. 8) until well into the fourth century.

1065 Cat. B 256, EM 6359, fr. of pillar, c. 500–475 (IG I 3 706; DAA 302–3 no. 282; Kissas 2000, 134 no. 68). He may be either the father or husband of Hipylla, who dedicated a bronze mirror to Artemis at Brauron around c. 475 (IG I 3 985). The family later produced some staunch democrats (APF 421, no. 11473 D); cf. LGPN, 354 (2). A number of kalos inscription with names from this family (Philon, Onetorides, Onetor) occur on vases by a/o. Exekias (ABV 672, 693 foot; 671 foot, no. 1) suggesting an aristocratic background.

1066 Cat. B 47, EM 6375, fr. of column for bronze statue: IG I 3 863; DAA 49 no. 47. The patron may have been the secretary of the epistatai in 443/2 BC (IG I 3 440 line 11: but no patronymic or demotic can be established there): see also APF 507, no. 13700; LGPN, 430 (31); PAA XVI, 363 no. 886170. Reconstruction IG: Τιμόθεους Κόνωνος ἄνεθηκεν[?] / ἄνακλοτος[?] ---?].

1067 See also above p. 240. Cat. B 114, EM 433, base for bronze statue (DAA 118–9 no. 114). IG I 3 834; APF 142–3 no. 3721; LGPN, 137 (99), 398 (6=17); PAA VI, 144 no. 376980. Δορόθεος καὶ Σμύλος ἄνεθεν ἄνακλοτος[?].

1068 Cat. V 332, NMA 1460. APF 142 no. 3721; LGPN, 110 (63), 113 (39), 398 (6); PAA V, 218 no. 316785, 288 no. 322025. Demochares as treasurer: IG I 2 954, 455 lines 14–5. Similos’ office was in 445/4 or 444/3. The family did not maintain their position. After a trierarchy in the early fourth century (APF 142–3 no. 3721; IG II 1607: [—]ῆς Πολύμνος, the only possible descendant in the epigraphic record is a shopkeeper (the link is uncertain).
The evidence discussed so far in this section has confirmed that office-holders and wealthy landowners commissioned sculpted monuments to honour their memory. But it has also shown that not all of them chose equally lavish sculpture, and that there were patrons from other social backgrounds as well. Both citizens and non-citizens ordered votive and sepulchral monuments in marble and had them set up in the main sanctuaries and burial grounds of the city. Lack of Athenian citizen status did not prevent anyone from being a patron of sculpture. Moreover, women also appear in the record as dedicants of votive sculpture and as patrons who commissioned grave monuments. If their position in Athens was as poor as is often assumed, this is unexpected. In short, the patrons of Athenian sculpture in the sixth and fifth centuries do not always confirm to the common image referred to at the beginning of this section: that of Solon or Perikles, of male upper-class Athenian citizens.

**PROFESSIONAL DISPLAY AND CRAFTSMEN AS PATRONS**

Marble monuments in the sanctuaries and cemeteries of Athens were also set up by less fortunate inhabitants of Athens, by those who held no public offices and were not successful generals. Nonetheless, their income must have been enough to pay for sculpture. One group of patrons who were not necessarily rich, but still owned enough to offer votives and in some cases set up gravestones consisted of craftsmen (tables 9a–b, charts 9a.3–b.3).

A variety of professions can be found in inscriptions. The first example, from the third quarter of the sixth century, is the dedication of a builder whose name is no longer preserved. He set up an impressive monument of two pillars on a base, which carried an architrave with a statue on top (pl. 45a). Of the same period is the gravestone of Xenokles the spearman, probably an ordinary Athenian serving in the military rather than a professional soldier. His family must have been quite well-off, in view of the monumental kouros with which they honoured him.

---

1069 Cat. B 196, EM 6446; τέκτον. Only part of the base now remains. The inscription (in first person) was on the pillars’ capitals. DAA 231–2 no. 196; IG I² 606.

1070 Cat B 185, KM I 425: IG I3 1200; Jeffery 1962, 118–9 n. 3; Kissas 2000, 39–40 no. 4; Peek, Ker. III n. 22a, pls. 7.1–2; PAA XIII, 363 no. 731885.
Although craftsmen constitute a relatively sizeable group of patrons, inscriptions which specifically mention the profession of the dedicant are few, and their preservation is often poor (tables 9a–b). The craft which seems to occur most frequently (or more precisely, least infrequently) in the votive material of the final quarter of the sixth century are pottery or vase–painting.\footnote{1071} Among potential potters–patrons of the final quarter of the sixth century may be Peikon (pl. 45b), Aischines, Mnesiades and possibly Andokides, whose case was discussed above. Their names appear among the patrons on the Akropolis, and they may have been potters.\footnote{1072} Nearchos’ majestic kore still commands respect (pl. 19b–c), but the potter by that name worked much earlier than the date of the kore. If the man in the inscription and the potter are the same man, it must have been his son who set up the votive on behalf of his father.\footnote{1073} Of these dedicants, only one chose to offer a bronze statue. However, the marble sculptures commissioned by the others are in most cases impressive to say the least.

Three further professions from the late sixth century are represented by Alkibios the kithara–player, a tanner named Smikros, and Polyxenos son of Mneson, a fuller who set up a

\footnote{1071} This is not to say that the numbers of potters which Raubitschek construed as patrons of marble votives in late–archaic Athens are considered reliable here. For a discussion of this problem of the inscriptions: Scheibler 1979, \textit{passim}; Wagner 2000; Stissi 2002, 151–60 (with extensive lit. until 2002); Keesling 2005, 415–21.


\footnote{1073} The Antenor kore, Akr. 681 (cat. V 11; B 197), named after its sculptor Antenor, son of Eumares, was dedicated by a man called Nearchos (\textit{DAA} 232–3 no. 197; Jacob–Felsch 1969, 118–9 cat. I no. 16, 41, 47 n. 150–3; Kissas 2000, 116–7 no. 45; Scheibler 1979, 9–10 and 1983, 124; Keesling 2003, 210, 214). The identification of Nearchos with the potter cannot be verified: for the problematic dates see the Personalia field in the database, cat. B 197. The suggestion is that it was a retirement dedication, made possible by Nearchos’ son Tleson working at the end of the sixth century (Beazley 1944, 21; Scheibler 1983, 125–6; Stissi 2002, 153–4, 160). For the individuals involved see \textit{LGPN}, 328 (2=17); \textit{PAA} XIII, 49 no. 703100 (and possibly 703105).
marble basin (pl. 45c). In the first quarter of the fifth century, inscriptions containing professions continue to be used, for example, in the votive base of a kithara-player, Opsios, or one of a fuller called Simon. A kore was possibly set up by a fisherman after a great catch (pl. 46a), although the inscription could also refer to an auspicious find from the sea by a sailor, or even someone who simply happened to be travelling by sea. A washerwoman by the name of Smikythe is among the professionals offering dedications on the Akropolis in this period, too, as is a messenger or keryx called Oinobios. 

Potters seem to be dedicating less at beginning of the fifth century, with the possible exception of one highly conspicuous patron: Onesimos son of Smikythos offered at least seven basins to Athena in the first quarter of the fifth century, either in consecutive years, or (more likely) in one go (pls. 46c–d). This lavish dedicant is identified with the red–figure cup painter of the late sixth and early fifth centuries. It is hard to imagine the

1074 Alkibios offered a bronze statue: cat. B 84, Akr. 13262. See IG I 3 606; DAA 89–90 no. 84; PAA II, 40 no. 121720; Kissas 2000, 101–2 no. 25. Smikros the tanner: cat. B 51, Akr. 6972. See IG I 3 646; DAA 59–60 no. 58; 501–2; PAA XV, 310 no. 825685. In IG the lettering is compared with several other inscriptions e.g. IG I 3 627–629 and 646–664 and it is suggested all were done by the same letter–cutter. If correct, this workshop would have done the lettering for many sculptors, including Eumares, Antenor, Euthykles, Thebades, Hermippos and Pollias. However, from such a renowned letter–cutter it would be somewhat surprising that skylodephs is spelled skylodesphos here. Polyxenos knapheus: cat. V 293, EM 6535 (+6555?).

1075 Pl. 23d: cat. B 49, Akr. 150, EM 6248, fr. of capital for kore, possibly Akr. 429 (cat. V 335), by Simon knapheus, the fuller. Cat. B 86, EM 6346b (a), 6357 (c), frs. of base for bronze vessel (although dowel holes are not described anywhere), by Opsios the kytharoidos. It may have been a prize vessel won for some musical competition, although one would expect a more elaborate inscription in that case (IG I 3 754).

1076 Cat. B 229, EM 6431, frs. of pillar for a small kore by [−−]lochos the fisherman. IG I 3 828: Τώθε κόρεν ἀνέθηκεν ἄπορχεν / [Ναυ?]λοχὸς ἄγρας · ἐν αἱ ποινομέθη[ν] χρυσοφί[λ]'] ἔπορεν. ‘This figure of a kore Naulochos dedicated as a first fruit of the treasure which the ruler of the deep with the golden trident provided.’


1078 Cat. B 73, EM 6412a, fr. of base for marble seated figure or group was dedicated by Kephaleus or Kephisieus, or by someone kerameus. Interesting is IG I 3 824, DAA no. 24, offered by the potter Euphronios (c. 475). It was excluded because it does not match the selecton criteria; but it would add to the potters’ votives of this time.


officials of the sanctuaries on the Akropolis happy over such a booming collection of basins, but a man fulfilling his religious obligation of first fruit offerings could hardly be rebuked for his piety. Onesimos’ son Theodoros offered two bronze statuettes, perhaps of Athena Promachos, to the goddess in the same period. These may have been a joint dedication with his father, or additions to a votive set up by Onesimos. The good fortune of the family apparently continued in the fifth century, for Theodoros seems to be the dedicator of a votive of around 470 BC as well. From later in the fifth century, no professional names on votives are preserved. Even if fewer private inscriptions from the later fifth century are preserved, the decrease of patrons’ professions in post–archaic inscriptions is notable.

As was discussed in the previous section, iconography can also shed light on a patron’s profession. A rather large relief from the first quarter of the fifth century shows a craftsman at work, while Athena Ergane watches over him. A basin on a tripod in between them could either be for heating metal, or it could be an example of the man’s high–quality work, perhaps a votive. Another example is a relief with a man wearing a cap next to his horse–drawn cart, worshipping Asklepios, Hygieia and Epione. The dedicant may have made his living as a farmer or in transport; it is less likely that the cart was depicted solely for decoration. The only other occupation presented on votive reliefs from the sixth or fifth centuries is soldiering. Many of the stelai with horses and chariots may refer to the Athenian cavalry, or to horse–racing. There are two non–equestrian reliefs with clear military connotations, both from the second half of the fifth century: the relief of Demokrates and

---

1081 Cat. B 217, Akr. 4148. Raubitschek (DAA 246–8 no. 217) suggests it may be a re–dedication of the basins after the Persian Wars. Keesling (2005, 402) shows this is unlikely because of the find context, which she dates before 480. Whichever the case, a separate votive was set upon the base by the son as well; and the difference in lettering proves that father and son had their separate votives. Keesling (ibid. 403) suggests convincingly that the dowel holes allow for a number of striding figures, possibly four similar ones of Athena Promachos. Cf. IG II 699; Beazley 1944, 23 n. 1; LGPN, 215 (6), 352 (2), 401 (1); PAA XIII, 138 no. 506445 (Theod.), 490–1 no. 746660 (Ones.); Kissas 2000, 123–4 no. 52. Beazley 1994, 23 n. 1; IG I–3 930; LGPN II, 352 (2), 401 (1); DAA 387–9 no. 353; PAA XIII, 490–1 no. 746660.

1082 Cat. B 217, Akr. 4184: Beazley 1944, 23 n. 1; DAA 246–8 no. 217; Kissas 2000, 123–4 no. 52; Keesling 2005, 401–3; LGPN II, 215 (6), 352 (2), 401 (1); PAA XIII, 138 no. 506445: IG II 699B.


1084 Cat. B 233, NMA 1341, see pl. 39d: Mitropoulou 1977, 67 no. 134, fig. 194.

Demochares has been discussed above;\footnote{1086} the other is a small relief showing Athena next to a tropaion, perhaps about to offer a libation (pl. 47a).\footnote{1087} Even these two cannot be labelled soldiers’ dedications for certain, but a military theme is clearly present.

Gravestones, on the other hand, frequently portray soldiers.\footnote{1088} Without an inscription, these depictions are most likely to be for Athenian citizens who fell in battle. In Athens in the later fifth century, there was certainly enough occasion for such themes. A further difference between professions on votives or on gravestones is that the latter continue to depict the craftsmen themselves in the fifth century. A wonderful example of this is the relief of Euktitos the physician, commended for always having taken good care of his patients in a rather lengthy inscription on a small relief (pl. 47b).\footnote{1089}

The cobbler Xanthippos is at work on his grave relief, showing his last to two girls who are probably his daughters (pl. 47c).\footnote{1090} Cobblers were depicted relatively often on classical gravestones in Attika, perhaps because great demand for shoes had drawn many shoemakers to the city.\footnote{1091} That Xanthippos was well off is clear from this large grave monument, but his civic status is uncertain.\footnote{1092} Whether he was the owner of a workshop or earned enough for this gravestone by making and fixing shoes himself, remains obscure.

\footnote{1086} Above n. 1068. It shows a chlamys-clad man with a spear, who is standing in front of a hero (Kephalos?): cat. V 332.
\footnote{1087} Cat. V 174, NMA 2454.
\footnote{1089} Cat. G 117, NMA 8866, IG II² 11429a; Peek 1942, 124–5 no. 264; LGPN, 176 (1); PAA, VII, 352 no. 438455. Salta 1991, 247 with n. 2597 notes that the name indicates Ionian origins; she also argues that that physicians occur relatively frequently on gravestones because of their special standing in society.
\footnote{1090} Cat. G 55, BM 628 (1805.7–3.183). Smith 1892 III.1, 310–1 no. 628, pl. XI fig. 2; Dohrn 1957, 141–2 no. 51, pls. 23a, 27b; Stupperich 1977, 178 no. 455, 89 n. 1, 94, 95, 112 n. 3 and 5, 123; Neumann 1979, 448 n. 43; Clairmont CAT I, 402–4 no. 1.630. Smith suggested that the cobbler’s last is a foot model once dedicated for a cure; but this seems unlikely in a gravestone.
\footnote{1091} Salta 1991, 255–6: the large number of shoemakers can among others be derived from the level of specialisations within the craft: some seem to have made only a narrow range of shoe types.
\footnote{1092} Cf. IG I² 1282bis; Salta 1991, 255 n. 2682, 256; LGPN, 344 (21); PAA XIII, 339 no. 730315. Salta notes the absence of the patronymic, which for an adult citizen of means would be unlikely.
pride with which he presents his work to his children is evident and the idiosyncrasy of his monument makes one wonder whether he ordered the relief before his death, perhaps to make life easier for his daughters and the guardian they would get when their father died.

Music and weaving are two further crafts mentioned on gravestones from the late fifth century. A lyre player who had won a contest apparently wished to depict his finest hour on his memorial, but how Mynno’s supposedly domestic weaving made it to her gravestone is somewhat more dubious. It has been suggested that the great quantity of weaving women on fourth-century gravestones suggests professional rather than domestic activity; if this is true, Mynno could be an early exponent. Professional female weavers may have been a result of the Peloponnesian war, when people fled from rural Attika to the city. With many men away fighting the war, women had to take on work for a living, like weaving or washing laundry. Such work out of necessity may seem incongruous with a marble gravestone, but in the late sixth century washing had been sufficiently well-paid to allow for offerings like marble basins. For whatever reason such businesses were set up, there is no reason why they would not have done well.

These votive inscriptions – and some depictions – which display professional pride and the excellence of craftsmen quite often mention their foreign origins. At the end of the fifth century a grave relief was set up for Mannes, a woodman from Orymaia in Phrygia who lived in Athens. The epigram mentions his death in battle and offers lavish praise, or to be precise, self-praise. Although the inscription says little about his identity, this Mannes may have been the same as a freed slave of that name who lived in the deme Acharnai, also known as Little Phrygia. In this case, a show of professional success might have been more than piety alone: craftsmen who were able to afford grand dedications not only showed

---

1093  Cat. G 49, Berlin St. M. 737 (K 23), the stele of Mynno showing her with spindle, distaff and kalathos; and cat. G 115, NMA 6197, the stele of Emporion, showing a lekythos in relief on which the lyre-player was painted.
1096  Iphidike the washerwomen: above n. 1004. According to some statistics, 17% of metic labourers in Athens were women (Salta 1991, 259).
1097  Cat. G 159, ML mnd 1795: IG I 1371.
their wealth and fulfilled a religious custom, they also put their skill on display. The subtext for visitors of sanctuaries was to employ these men or women, whose high-quality services had enabled them to dedicate. The fact that most professions occur on votives rather than gravestones supports this: there was little point in advertising for a deceased craftsman.

**NON-ATHENIANS AND CITIZENS**

It may be understandable why foreign craftsmen used ethnics in the inscriptions on their monuments, but as we have seen, most ethnica in grave inscriptions cannot be connected to any craft. The late-archaic gravestone of Anaxagora of Syracuse, for example, shows no sign of her having been a tradeswoman.1099 This raises the question what the motive for including the ethnic might have been. It is hard to see why ethnica appear on votives or gravestones at all, except on monuments for *proxenoi* and other official foreign relations.1100

In theory, before Perikles’ citizenship law the use of an ethnic is not so surprising, if a patron had married into an Athenian family. Children of a foreign mother and an Athenian father could become citizens by enrolling them in their father’s phratry.1101 Even if the Athenian parent was the mother rather than the father, there was a possibility to give the children citizen status, although no examples of this practice survive.1102 An enrolment in the phratry may be what is depicted in the relief with a pig sacrifice mentioned above.1103 However, after Perikles’ citizenship law was passed, ‘display’, if it can be called that, of

---

1099 Cat. G 150, EM 9187, a small stele. *IG* I 3 1361; Jeffery LSAG, 275 no. 10.

1100 Funke 2006, 3–4 points out that in Athens, an effort was made to include non-citizen residents, even slaves, in state cults and festivals, to strengthen their ties to Athens and promote the bonds of the members of the Delian League. In light of this is it odd that ethnica occur on gravestones far more often than on votives, especially in the fifth century: apparently dedication was not part of the Athenians’ attempts at ritual unity. See also Mora 2006, *passim* for strangers at Pan-Hellenic sanctuaries, in oracles and in mystery cults.

1101 See Blok 2009, 158; cf. Blok 20091, 132–3 and 2010, *passim*. This applies to female children as well, since they probably could be enrolled in the same manner. Cf. also Palagia 1995, 497; and Blok 2007, 326.

1102 Namely through adoption of the child by the mother’s father (Blok 2009, 158). She notes that there are no surviving examples of this possibility, and that it is furthermore unlikely to have been common. Most participants in the polis would have refrained from such marriages since they were considered to undermine the cohesion of society.

foreign origins of patrons seems less understandable. Why is it in the second half of the fifth century that most ethnica appear, especially on gravestones?

Along with the quantity of monuments in general, numbers of all name types on votives (single names, patronymics, demotics and ethnica) fall steeply in the second quarter of the fifth century (table 9a). In contrast, all name types on gravestones increase in numbers, especially in the final quarter of the fifth century (table 9b). Part of the upward trend in ethnica is undoubtedly the result of this general development in sculpture, particularly the grave reliefs of this period. Along with their quantities, those of the inscriptions rise. Other name types on gravestones, notably single names and patronymics, confirm this relation with the total numbers, for they follow a similar pattern (chart 9b.1).

While much of the development in name types therefore seems to rely on the overall numbers of preserved sculpture, some aspects remain unexplained by this. First, on votives, most name types peak at the time of the greatest proliferation of material, around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century. The exception to this are ethnica, which hardly feature on votives at all (table 9a): the pillar of Kriton the Skythian (pl. 41c) may be a case. The votive of Charikleia and Aristomache, daughters of Glaukinos of Argos is a certain example of an ethnic, dating to the second quarter of the fifth century. Yet whether this indicates the girls’ lack of citizenship is not even sure. They are the children of a resident alien; but if their mother was an Athenian, they could have been considered citizens. Thus, even for this votive the status of its patrons is not straightforward.

A second point is the disappearance of women’s names on votives in the fifth century. Where on gravestones, these become markedly more numerous in the second half of

---

1104 The only ethnic on a votive after the archaic period is (the not entirely certain) case of Glaukinos of Argos, Aristomache and Charikleia (cat. B 255, EM 8169). Cf. above n. 1005. Demotics in 425–400: cat. B 143, EM 6296, frs. of base for bronze statue, by a man from Alopeke; cat. B 176, Akr. 13264, fr. of base for bronze (Trojan?) horse, by Chairedemos son of Euangelos of Koile; cat. B 177, Akr. no. ?, fr. of base for bronze group (chariot?), by the son of Chaires of Cholarges. The latter two also have patronymics; cat. V 325, NMA 1389, a relief dedicated by the son of Bakchios is the third patronymic from this period.

1105 From the final quarter of the fifth century, 11 patronymics survive, 10 ethnica and 7 demotics: all are from gravestones, not bases.

1106 Cat. B 220, EM 6264, IG II 658. The ethnic could also be a patronymic, ‚son of Skythes’. Cf. DAA, 250–1 no. 220; Kissas 2000, 118–9 no. 47; LGPN II, 274 (41); PAA X, 593 no. 585765; PA 8820.

1107 Cat. B 255, EM 8169, IG II 858; cf. DAA 320–1 no. 297; PAA III, 171 no. 172445 (A.), vol. IV, 267 no. 275730 (G.). For other, similar cases which fall outside the selection criteria of this study, see most recently Wijma 2010.
the fifth century, on votives they practically disappear from the record. In short, women’s names could be said to move from votives to gravestones, whereas ethnica seem to be more of a sepulchral than a votive phenomenon in both centuries. The great increase in gravestones from the second half of the fifth century comes with larger quantities of most name types, but more conspicuously so for women and for non-Athenians.

Thus, women and foreigners stand out in the funerary inscriptions of the later fifth century. For the former, this is also traceable in the iconography of the grave reliefs (table 7c). As has been discussed in the previous section, numbers of male figures on gravestones increase as well, producing similar numbers of male and female mortals on the memorials from this period. It goes too far to try and quantify how many of the male figures on these grave reliefs might be non-Athenians. Only the presence of an inscription can identify a person as an Athenian citizen or not. But the lack of civic distinction in the iconography of gravestones is in itself interesting, for it offers a glimpse of the self-image of the deceased and their families.

In the late fifth century, non-Athenians who commissioned gravestones did not have themselves or their deceased friends or kin represented any different from citizens, with the exception of adding an ethnic to the inscription instead of a demotic. Neither can Athenian women be distinguished from foreign ones in the iconography of gravestones; and in their case, even inscriptions are not always explicit. How should the iconographic uniformity of these reliefs be interpreted? Does it reflect an attempt to be unobtrusive, to keep a low profile as a foreigner in the polis? If this were the case, the presence of ethnica in inscriptions is inexplicable. In the grave inscriptions of the later fifth century, it appears fairly unproblematic to present one’s non-Athenian roots. This presents of a paradox with the exclusion of non-Athenians from citizenship in the Periklean law of 451/0.

In a recent study on Athenian citizenship and the status of metics, J. Blok has argued that it is unlikely that the Athenians were oblivious to the dangers of excluding resident foreigners from the community altogether. To view the citizenship law as an enforcement of such exclusivity seems at odds with the practical circumstances in Athens in the decades

---

1108  Salta 1991, 169–97, and passim discusses foreigners on gravestones from all of Attika.
1109  The implications of the citizenship law for women and the iconographic and epigraphic evidence will be discussed in section 5 of this chapter.
1110  For a discussion of previous scholarship on this see Blok 2009, 141–58.
1111  Blok 2007, 311.
leading up to 451/0, with numerous casualties of war among male citizens and a considerable part of the workforce consisting of metics.\textsuperscript{1112} Probably from 470 BC onwards, metics took part in the Panathenaia, for example by walking in the procession.\textsuperscript{1113} It has recently been suggested that the formal setting of the Panathenaic festival was in fact one of the first where metics were recognised as a separate group, and one which was entitled to some participation in the city's \textit{hiera}, its rituals and sacrifices.\textsuperscript{1114} This privilege, if it can be regarded so, was of course not equal to the roles of those who were of ‘better’ ancestry, but it shows that metics were an acknowledged group of residents who were awarded some share of public, in this case religious, life in Athens in the fifth century.

Another sphere where metics seem to have been included in the polis to a certain degree is that of the burial rites of the war dead. Athenian citizens and non-citizens were mentioned in the Athenian casualty lists and were buried together. Here too, metics can be viewed as members – albeit of low rank – of the polis community, at least from the second quarter of the fifth century on.\textsuperscript{1115} If this is accepted, the appearance of ethnica on grave reliefs whose iconography looks exactly like depictions on those of Athenian citizens becomes more understandable. The sculpture was Athenian (although as was shown earlier, the stone and the sculptor were not always so) and the ethnic indicated membership of one of the social groups which Athenian society acknowledged as part of its community. Since this group was not considered a threat and its contribution was recognised by the Athenians, there is very little reason why patrons of votives or gravestones would avoid mentioning their non-Athenian descent.

Women are the other group with which Perikles’ citizenship law is explicitly concerned. In order to put sculpture into the context of this aspect of Athenian law, it is necessary to take earlier evidence into account. Recent studies have shown that in late–archaic vase paintings which depict various aspects of cult, such as libations or sacrifices, the ratio of men and women as worshippers is much more even than the epigraphical evidence

\textsuperscript{1112} Blok 2007, 323.
\textsuperscript{1113} Ibid. 316. Cf. also Simon 1983, 28–9, 93; Kron 1992, 164; Wijma 2010, 29. However, metic participation in some cults cannot be taken for granted: Parker 1996, 161; for a detailed survey see Wijma 2010.
\textsuperscript{1114} Wijma 2010, 27–8; cf. also Parker 2005, 258–61; Funke 2006, 3; Blok 2009, 161. For an in–depth discussion of the evidence for metic participation in the Panathenaic festivals, see Wijma 2010, 29–61, and especially 54–61. Parker 1996, 266, argues that cooperation of citizens and metics in cult was rare (using an example from the fourth century).
would suggest.\textsuperscript{1116} Similarly to these vase–paintings, the iconography of votive reliefs of the final quarter of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth century presents relatively even number of male and female figures (excluding deities: table 7c), even if overall numbers are admittedly low. Blok has interpreted the relatively even balance of men and women offering sacrifice on vases as an acknowledgement of the roles of both men and women in the civic organisation instituted by Kleisthenes.\textsuperscript{1117} As was the case for Athenian residents of foreign descent, these roles of citizens of both sexes were expressed through participation in the city’s \textit{hiera} and \textit{hosia}. This is what is reflected in the vase–paintings as well as on the few late–archaic votive reliefs, such as the relief with the pig sacrifice or one with the Graces.\textsuperscript{1118}

This interpretation of the material leads to the notion that although the role of women is not explicitly reflected in state functions or documents, it should by no means be underestimated. In Blok’s view, the 451/0 citizenship law aimed to promote descent as a criterion of citizenship by Solonic property classes, which divided the Athenian citizenry.\textsuperscript{1119} The requirement of citizen status of women to produce Athenian citizens elevated their value in the system of polis participation.\textsuperscript{1120} This may explain the relatively frequent appearance of women on grave reliefs of the second half of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{1121} In favour of this possibility is the fact that numbers of male figures also increase on grave reliefs from the final quarter of the fifth century (table 7c). This balance coincides with the qualification of Athenian women as providing half of the descent which was necessary to qualify for full citizenship.\textsuperscript{1122}

The patterns of names in the fifth century suggest that democratic legislation such as Perikles’ citizenship law had little effect on the choice of an inscription. Mannes the woodman, for one, seems quite oblivious to the issue: his self–esteem is clearly unimpaired. If he was a freed slave, he had left behind any insecurity about his former status; and if he had always been free, his lack of citizenship does not seem to bother him. His professional skill was a great deal more important. Some monuments, like this one, show pride of the

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1117} Blok 2009, 134; id. 2010.
\textsuperscript{1118} Akr. 581, above n. 922; and Akr. 702, above n. 921.
\textsuperscript{1119} Blok 2009, 159; cf. also Blok, forthcoming.
\textsuperscript{1120} Blok 2005, 20 and Blok 2009, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{1121} As, for example, suggested by Leader 1997 (with modifications: see next section); Shapiro 1991; Stewart 1997, especially 118–28; Osborne 2004.
\textsuperscript{1122} The fact that women remain underrepresented in votive reliefs of the late fifth century is somewhat of a problem in this view, but this is addressed in the next section of this chapter.
\end{footnotes}
patron’s life or work, be it that that person had won an Olympic event, a dramatic competition, because they were excellent carpenters, washerwomen, or a kind physician. Other inscriptions veer towards advertisement. But apart from the appearance of demotics in the early fifth century, there are few trends which can be regarded as reflections of group identity. Ethnica may be an exception to this. Yet even there, metics could opt to leave their origins obscure. In present-day scholarship this would put them in the anonymous category of single-name inscriptions, thus making their foreign identity practically untraceable.

5 REPRESENTING THE LIVING AND THE DEAD

Votive and sepulchral sculpture in the sixth and fifth centuries was evidently not only characterised by a wide range of genres; the social background of its patrons also varied a great deal. That being said, ‘epigraphic group behaviour’ could not be established in the material of this study. The question is whether the iconography shows more consistent connections between the social backgrounds and the sculptural choices of patrons. Do the genres and iconography of votive and grave monuments represent specific groups in Athenian society? In other words, is the patron’s identity (or that of the deceased) directly reflected in the sculpture? Or does, on the other hand, the occasion dictate the appearance of the statue or the stele, for example, the deity to which it was donated or the cause of death of the commemorated person?

Relations between the patron of a grave monument and the deceased for whom it was set up must often have been close. Many of these monuments would have been ordered by the family rather than by the person whom they lost. This divergence between the patron and the beneficiary of the gravestone adds a complication to the process of setting up monuments. Is, for example, one of the figures in a grave relief to be seen as a portrait of the deceased? If so, are kouroi on archaic graves also portraits? Votive sculpture is in this respect slightly more direct: they are certainly not portraits of their donors, for many inscriptions which indicate male dedicants belong to pedestals which carried korai or goddesses. This phenomenon is called disjunctive representation, where the patron’s identity is not reflected in the gift directly but only indirectly, through symbolism.\footnote{Keesling 2003, 16–21, 97. Also Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 29–32.} The question is whether korai
were seen as more appropriate than images of the worshippers who set up the offerings? A first step towards answering these questions is to establish the relation between the recipients of sculpture, its patrons and its types and iconography.

In the city of Athena, most votives were dedicated to her: 84 inscriptions on votive bases of many different kinds address the goddess directly and an additional 23 on basins (table 10a). Another 26 votive sculptures depict her, and so it can be assumed that they were hers. That being said, the many statues of Nike may have been dedicated to Nike herself, but also to Athena: she could be regaled with a statue of another goddess. Thus, a depiction of one god or goddess does not always justify the conclusion that the recipient deity was the same. In the Athenian material, however, inscriptions show the predominance of votives offered to the goddess, and the common relation between statues of her, with inscriptions which prove her to be the recipient.

Athena features on monuments or is mentioned in inscriptions in 151 examples in the record of this study (table 10a). It is likely that many votives whose recipient deity can no longer be determined were hers as well, and no other deity comes close in the city.

---

1124 Two bases carried bronze Athenas, judging by the dowel holes (cat. B 270, Akr. Mag. 3827, pillar base, 525–500; cat. B 172, Akr. no. ?, fr. of base (475–450). They are not included in the inscriptions here. Cat. B 176, Akr. 13264 (IG I 3 895) carried a horse: if it is the Trojan horse described by Pausanias, it was from the precinct of Artemis, and is therefore most likely to have been offered to her (Paus. I.23.8).


1127 For the phenomenon of ‘visiting gods’ in Greek sanctuaries, see Alroth 1987.

1128 Inscriptions with Athena on bases with a preserved sculpture have been counted as one instance. Excluding bases with a preserved statue, the monuments of this research come to a total of 778.

1129 E.g. horsemen could be particularly suitable gifts for Athena, whose mythology includes the invention of the bridle (Athena Chalinitis, ‘bridling’: Paus. 2.4.1; P. Ol. 13.65; cf. Yalouris 1950, passim; Burkert 1985, 141. The iconography of deities on reliefs has been discussed above, p. 216–17. A seated figure, possibly Dionysos, (cat. V 175, NMA 3711), found near the Erian gate has therefore been interpreted as a gravestone and a votive. He is listed here as Dionysos; the identification is not quite certain since the head is missing. It would be the only sixth-century seated Dionysos known from the city of Athens (parallels from Attika exist).
Two votives to Poseidon are therefore exceptional, though they fit the occasions: one is a joint dedication from the second quarter of the fifth century, which addresses the god with his typically Athenian epithet *Erechtheus*. The most wonderful example of an unanticipated windfall resulting in an offering to Poseidon is a small kore on a pillar, dedicated by Naulochos the fisherman (pl. 46a). Hermes features in three dedicatory inscriptions (pls. 47d–e). Aphrodite is addressed in one inscription, which includes a curiously vehement curse directed at those tarnishing the patron’s good name (pl. 7a). Votives of first fruits and tithes, *aparchai* and *dekatai*, seem to have been typical gifts to a city’s main deity, since they were linked to sedentary activities, notably agriculture. Of the 41 tithes in this study, 22 are dedicated to Athena. Only one can certainly be attributed to another god, Apollo. *Aparche* offerings are also mostly for Athena. However, first fruit...
offerings to Aphrodite and Poseidon\textsuperscript{1137} show that other deities – in this case worshipped in the same sacred precinct as Athena – could also receive votives of this kind. The word \textit{aparche} was commonly used for the deity’s share of the tribute which the members of the Delian League paid, and \textit{dekatai} were mostly spoils of war.\textsuperscript{1138} However, neither meaning is used exclusively for these cases. The value of a \textit{deKate} is a tenth of the gain that gave rise to the dedication, but the proportional value of \textit{aparchai} can vary and reasons for donating one include harvest, success in trade or inheritance.\textsuperscript{1139}

Dedications could be presented to the gods as the result of vows, of unexpected windfalls (especially financial ones) or in praise of a deity for granting a victory.\textsuperscript{1140} An example of fulfilment of a vow is the column set up by the \textit{tamias} Alkimachos son of Chairion (pls. 44d–e).\textsuperscript{1141} It carried the statue of a scribe which may well refer directly to Alkimachos’ office. The votive column offered to Athena by Telesinos of Kettos is more personal, as was discussed at the beginning of this study.\textsuperscript{1142} A similar request was made by Menandros, son of Demetrios, who had promised Athena a gift if his wealth was preserved. The goddess must have done so, for the bronze statue was set up.\textsuperscript{1143}

\textit{Aparchai} and \textit{dekatai} cannot always be clearly separated. Both terms appear in inscriptions on a variety of votive monuments: from Smikythe the washerwoman’s marble basin, to a kore by Lysias and Euarchis, or a bronze statue of Hierokleides, the son of Glaukias (pl. 48d).\textsuperscript{1144} In eight of the tithes and in 11 of the \textit{aparchai}, dedicants seem to be

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Aparchai} for Aphrodite and Poseidon see above ns. 1130 and 1133.
  \item Burkert 1985, 69; id.1987, 46; Parker 1996, 143; Keesling 2001, 7.
  \item Crops: perhaps cat. B 191, EM 6385 (\textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 800), although usually \textit{χορῷς} is interpreted as ‘owning land in’ (\textit{DAA} 225–6 no. 191; \textit{LGPN} II, 447 (2), 469 (17); Kissas 2000, 133 no. 65). Trade: cat. B 229, EM 6431 (a–f), \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 828, for a catch of fish (or some other catch from the sea), cf. above n. 1076; or cat. B 44, EM 12750, \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 633, for Peikon the potter (pl. 46a). Inheritance: Hdt. 1.92.1–4, Kroisos at Delphi. Cf. Keesling 2001, 7.
  \item In some cases these types mix, e.g. in the spoils of a battle or if athletes had beforehand vowed a dedication if they won. Cf. Burkert 1987, 68–9.
  \item Cat. B 6, Akr. 124, \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 618.
  \item Cat. B 40, Akr. 6505, \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 728. Athena is addressed with the vocative Pharthene (Parthene) as it is usually interpreted: \textit{DAA} 43 no. 40; Brousakari 1979, 48 (suggests the statues was a kore and is the one addressed in the inscription); Kissas 2000, 232–3 no. 186.
  \item Cat. B 218, EM 6353, \textit{IG} \textit{I} \textit{3} 872.
\end{itemize}
citizens, or daughters or wives of citizens. Furthermore, eight aparchai are joint offerings (pl. 48e), by family members, associates, or by people whose relation is unclear (table 9a). Neither of the types of votives shows a preference for certain materials or genres. In short, any inhabitant of Athens might choose to donate a tithe or first-fruit, and was free to give it whatever form he or she liked; the only other conclusions which the material permits are that most patrons who could afford sculpture, whether male or female, preferred Athena.

Among the occasions which were suitable for the dedication of sculpture, there are few likely candidates. As was mentioned earlier, the relief on the Akropolis which shows a family about to sacrifice a pig to Athena, may be a rendering of the Apatouria festival. A part of this festival which has been established with certainty was the enrolment of boys, and perhaps also girls, in the phratry of their father. Olga Palagia has connected the relief to the Apatouria because of the presence of children and because the victim is a sow. Regardless of whether the interpretation of the scene is justified, it is not self-evident that this votive was dedicated during the festival which it depicted. Unlike other types of sacrifice,


1149 An extensive overview of the festival’s characteristics in Parker 2005, 458–61.

1150 Palagia 1995, 495–7 argues that this is a suitable gift for Athena in various roles, including that of Athena Phratria. Cf. Parker 2005, 458–61.
marble sculptures were not prescribed as offerings on specific occasions, contrary to gifts such as, for example, clothes which women in some places offered to Artemis after childbirth.\textsuperscript{1151} Sculpture does not appear in sacrificial calendars or other descriptions of rites. It is possible, though not at all certain, that festivals were moments \textit{par excellence} to set up sculpted votives.\textsuperscript{1152} However, a connection between any specific festival (or any specific deity, for that matter) and dedications of sculpture cannot be established.\textsuperscript{1153}

An issue briefly touched upon above is the relation between patrons and the most popular archaic votives: korai, and to a lesser extent, kouroi and horsemen.\textsuperscript{1154} These genres in all likelihood represent mortals, and perhaps because of this they are often considered expressions of the aristocratic ideals of their dedicants, whose continuous competition for status is generally accepted.\textsuperscript{1155} As a form of conspicuous consumption, these votives are emphatically public, even though the display was to benefit private individuals.\textsuperscript{1156} However, inscriptions show that not all patrons of sculpted monuments in Athens belonged to the landowning elite, so the meaning of these statue types cannot be defined in terms of aristocratic competition alone. A builder who set up an equestrian statue on the Akropolis in

\textsuperscript{1151} Guettel Cole 2004, 212.

\textsuperscript{1152} As proposed by Sinn (1996) in respect to ordering sculpture; Van Straten (pers. comm.) has informed me there seem to be no official moments for dedicating sculpture according to the literary or epigraphic testimonia.

\textsuperscript{1153} A possible exception to this might be the dedication of prizes won for various kinds of contests. But even here, the exact time of dedication (during the same festival, or at some later time?) cannot be ascertained. Cf. also Kyle 1996; and more specifically De Polignac 2005, 20–1 (seventh and sixth centuries BC).

\textsuperscript{1154} Above, section IV.2, p. 207–210, 223.


\textsuperscript{1156} Most discussions in the previous note imply this argument or accept it outright. Exceptions a/o.: Sourvinou–Inwood 1998, 289–92; Keesling 2003, 90; Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 31. For a succinct discussion of the publicness of such display, see De Polignac 2005 (for slightly earlier votives); Blok 2005, 20 (for gravestones); ead. 2009\textsuperscript{1}, 132–3; ead. 2010.
the third quarter of the sixth century (pl. 45a), may have emulated the aristocracy. Alternatively, his wealth may have allowed him to rear horses, participate in games and to set up a statue to commemorate a victory. Then again, he may simply have liked statues of horses, regardless of their aristocratic connotations. Whichever the case, in many respects he did not belong to the Athenian elite.

For korai, the question why so many Athenian patrons chose them as votives has everything to do with whom they represent. Should they be interpreted as goddesses, as real priestesses or as girls who once walked the streets of Athens, as portraits of some kind, or as symbols of sexual or political power? It is possible that some korai are goddesses: for example, the Peplos Kore may represent Artemis (pl. 49a). However, it is unlikely that all are divine: neither the details of their dresses nor their gestures belong exclusively to deities. Alternatively, the Athenian korai could represent daughters of marriageable age from the upper echelons of the Athenian citizenry. Their value would then lie in their capacity to marry and form strategic alliances among well-born families. This capital is transferred symbolically onto the korai, who are then offered to Athena.

---

1157 Cat. B 196, EM 6466, IG II 606; DAA 231–2 no. 196. If tekton should be interpreted as architect, this could (but does not have to) alter the patron’s perceived status somewhat. For example, Coulton 1977, 15–30.


1160 E.g. Pedley 2005, 107; Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 25–7. The suggestion that korai are girls who performed rituals on the Akropolis is rejected by the latter, because no extant korai hold cult paraphernalia. Only the arrephoroi would qualify, but they were younger than the korai. Keesling 2003, 99–110; 107–10, keeps open the possibility that some korai portray real women.

1161 Robertson 1985, 168; Brinkmann and Briër, 47–55; Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 19–25 (korai as Athenas); 22 (Artemis). Since the identification is not certain (the drill holes for golden rays could be for a meniskos or other head gear, and the hole for an arrow in her hand could also have been for a metal wreath, or even a flower), she is listed as a kore. The painted embroideries on the dress are interesting: an investigation of colour on more korai may offer evidence on dresses and divinity. Ridgway 1982, 123–7 argues that korai are nymphs. For a concise overview of common iconography of korai and goddesses, see Keesling 2003, 122–61.

1162 The discussion, with the most important recent exponents Ridgway 1993, Keesling 2003 and Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, is summarised in detail in the latter, 22–3.


Even if the korai should be interpreted in terms of such marriage exchange among the landed elite, it is problematic because korai were also offered by craftsmen. The symbolic, political capital of the daughters of Athens’ nobility, through which bonds between powerful families could be forged, would hardly apply to the children of craftsmen, however wealthy they may have been. To assume that the daughter of a craftsman could have married into the aristocracy with the purpose of liaising between the two families of such diverse social status does not fit the idea of upper-class attitudes which is a prerequisite for the same theory.

In a more general version of the symbolic interpretation of the korai, they represent the general prosperity of the oikos rather than a means of strategic alliance or an image of one particular daughter. Maidens, beautifully dressed, gracefully presenting their rich clothes, shyly looking down on the beholder, echo talents like weaving and dancing, characteristics such as modesty and kindness (pls. 49b–d). Already in Homer the value of women is measured in their beauty, but also in their skills, grace and good character.

The need for so strict a social identification of the korai is perhaps surprising in view of their obvious charm: the question why they were so popular could simply be answered by pointing out that they are marvellous. But the discrepancy between mostly male patrons and female statues is a more serious problem. The interpretation of the korai as symbols of prosperity works in that it clearly shows their appeal to patrons from all parts of society. This suggests that the choice for a kore was determined by personal reasons of the patron, relating almost entirely to social or economic station and hardly to religious motivations. Whether such an a-religious view is justified is doubtful. Outside of Athens, korai are offered to other goddesses such as Artemis, Demeter and Hera, but in general, no dedications of korai were made with certainty to male deities in sixth or fifth-century Greece. Thus, the

1165 Above ns. 1072–1073. Aristocrats dedicating korai: Kiron, cat. B 14, cat. V 188, kore Akr. 497 and base Akr. 3763 (a–b), EM 6484 (c) (IG I1 787). It is not entirely certain that this is an ancestor of the wealthy Kiron of whom Isaeus (8) speaks, but the name is rare. Cf. APF 313 no. 8442; LGPN II, 261(1); PAA X, 344 no. 570105. Another is possibly Ameinias, if he was a trierarch at Salamis (Hdt. 8.84): cat. B 5, cat. V 64, Akr 611 and base EM 6243, Akr. 3850. Cf. APF 25, no. 683, LGPN II 24 (1); PAA II, 66 no. 123080. For doubts about how often the powerful Athenian families formed such alliances outside the city through marriage, Blok 2009, 149–50.

1166 E.g. Schneider 1975, 34–6.

1167 Il. 23.259–61; Queen Arete and Penelope in the Odyssey. Cf. Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 37.

1168 Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 33–7 and map 4. The kore of Naulochos the fisherman (cat. B 229, above n. 1076) seems to be an undeniable exception to this, even though the actual statue of the kore is not preserved.
nature of the recipient deity seems to have carried some weight in the patron’s choice of a kore; social considerations played a part, but were not decisive.\textsuperscript{1169}

Specifically in Athens, the suitability of korai for Athena is firmly rooted in the kore-aspect of the goddess herself: the daughter of Zeus is a \textit{parthenos} forever, a kore as opposed to the adult wife and mother.\textsuperscript{1170} Her only offspring (of sorts) is Erichthonios, the first king of Athens, the result of a failed assault by Hephaistos.\textsuperscript{1171} Athena’s virginity is unaffected by this birth, but the story underlines the fundamental tie between the goddess and the Athenians. Less virginal deities than Athena would receive korai for other reasons. Because of the particular connection between the kore Athena and the Athenians, she is given votive korai more often than other female deities.\textsuperscript{1172} Their abundance on the Akropolis can partly be explained by the cultic myths of Athens, the role of the goddess in them, and the strong link between the maiden Athena and the korai.\textsuperscript{1173} In this sense, korai are an embodiment of the relation between the goddess and her Athenian worshippers.

Still, Athena was also given other types of sculpted dedications in archaic and early-classical Athens, and with these she apparently had no special cultic or mythological bond like that of the korai. Moreover, not all genres evoke the same depth of meaning as figurative sculpture, and some have elicited few attempts at symbolic explanation. For example, basins were mainly functional, in daily life as well as in cult. They often stood at the entrances of sanctuaries for ritual purification, and inscriptions are necessary to determine whether a basin is a votive or a \textit{louterion}.\textsuperscript{1174} Yet the votive basins reached a popularity similar to that of the korai in the first quarter of the fifth century (table 5), and most are offerings to Athena.

\textsuperscript{1169} As formulated by Meyer (Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 32): ‘…\textit{die Wahl einer Kore as Weihgeschenk [wird] nicht durch den Bezug der Stifter, sondern durch den Bezug zur Gottheit zu erklären sein.}’

\textsuperscript{1170} As suggested by Meyer in Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 42–6.

\textsuperscript{1171} Erichthonios was born after Athena refused the avances of Hephaistos; his semen fell to the earth via her thigh, and impregnated Gaia. Apollod. 3.188; Paus. 3.18.13. Cf. Burkert 1985, 143; Carpenter 1991, 74, fig. 111. Sourvinou-Inwood (1998, 249–52) proposes a similar argument for grave korai and Persephone. Cf. next note.

\textsuperscript{1172} Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 35–7.

\textsuperscript{1173} Cf. the myths of the daughters (\textit{parthenoi}) of Kekrops, who were the caretakers of Erichthonios and one of which was made the first priestess of Athena; and the daughter or daughters of Erechtheus, who sacrificed themselves for the city in a war with Eleusis. Connelly 1996, \textit{passim}; Shapiro 1998, \textit{passim}; Blok 2009, 150–4.

too. If the korai were so fundamentally connected to Athena and her city, it is surprising that here, of all places, this type was almost overtaken by a simple genre like basins.

In light of the functionality of basins, any explanation of their rise in the early fifth century veers towards the practical. But putting their religious status aside, a notable characteristic is that they are simpler to carve than human figures; therefore, they took less time to produce, which would have reduced their cost. The question is whether this means that they were, so to speak, the cheap ones among the marble votives. Are they, for example, made of low-cost local marble, or were patrons of basins less wealthy or of lower social status than those of the more expensive votives?

The answers to these questions are mostly negative. Basins are usually in island marble, the same material as the majority of korai. A few dedicants of basins are craftsmen; one is perhaps an upper-class official. Again they belong to similar groups as the dedicants of korai. The patrons of the latter rarely have names listed among the pentakosiomedimnoi either, and quite a few of them are craftsmen (table 9a). In short, the peak in basins in the early fifth century may look like a promising change in attitude of the dedicants, but on closer inspection, similar patrons are setting up votives in similar materials.

If demand from the patrons did not fuel the popularity of basins, more practical aspects may lie at its root. A sculptor or workshop specialising in marble basins could have settled in Athens around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century and created somewhat of a hype in dedication practices. It is tempting to suggest that Philon, son of Emporion, was the driving force in this hypothetical scenario: he is the only sculptor with a preserved signature for a basin (pl. 20c). The argument must remain conjectural since the birthplaces of Philon and his parents are unknown, but adopting it for a moment may be enlightening. Although the depth of meaning of korai and basins cannot be compared, both genres – and others, from equestrian statues to marble lamps – belonged to the votive religion of Athens, and so their functions at least partly overlapped. This reduces the likelihood that differences

1175 The Persian Wars are often considered a turning point, after which many genres disappeared because the social context which had produced them disappeared. E.g. Shapiro 2001, 10–11.
1177 The restoration of the name of Satyros (cat. B 315, EM 6536) is uncertain, and the basin is admittedly dated to 475–450. A Satyros was hellenotamias in 443/2. Craftsmen: Onesimos son of Smikythos, above p. 245, n. 1079; Polyxenos the fuller, cat. B 293, EM 6535 (+6555?).
1178 Cat. B 36, EM 6267, IGII 777. The signature is on the pedestal of a lost basin, dating 500–475.
between these genres are based in religion. In this case, something as mundane as the presence of one or a few specialised sculptors might have caused the upsurge in this particular sculptural genre.

Display of status has often been considered an important reason for setting up votive or sepulchral sculpture. However, a patron’s motivation for ordering a gravestone in some respects differed from his reasons to get a votive sculpture, and this functional distinction can be traced in iconography and genres. In Attika, kouroi are the funerary genre in the archaic period. However, their popularity in the Attic countryside is not matched by the material from the city. From the first three quarters of the sixth century, a few more sepulchral than votive kouroi survive, but later, votive kouroi from the city take a slight advantage (table 5a).

A counterpart to korai, kouroi have been considered expressions of aristocratic values throughout the archaic period; but kouroi and korai in sanctuaries differ from their sepulchral equivalents with regard to the person whom they represent. A funerary kore is likely to reflect the deceased over whose grave she is initially erected, in sex if in nothing else, and the same applies to funerary kouroi. Inscribed bases confirm this: references to deceased men are on bases which (as far as the record shows) all carried kouroi or reliefs, the latter presumably with male iconography. No funerary korai from Athens itself are preserved, and examples from the Attic countryside are rare. The propensity to erect kouroi on graves, but offer korai to Athena is typical of archaic Athens. Other areas, such

---


1180 Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, maps 3–5. Only few youths were set up as dedications at this time (cf. also the following).

1181 Ibid. maps 6–7. It depends on whether early-classical youths, some in non-kouros poses or with attributes are counted as kouroi, as was done in this study.

1182 See above n. 1155.

1183 If only because women on grave reliefs are so rare in the archaic period. See, for example, the base of Anaxilas (cat. B 16, KM I 388) for a kouros; the base of Chairedemos for a stele with a youth (cat. B 188, NYMM 16.174.6, the base for stele cat. G 34, NYMM 12.158); or thre one of Xenophantes set up by his father Sophilos (cat. B 4, KM I 389) for a horse or horseman.

1184 Phrasikleia (NMA 4889), Meyer and Brüggemann 2007, 67 no. 98 (with ref.); four, possibly six more from burial grounds in Attika, ibid. nos. 94–7, among which the monument for Phile (NMA 81, IG I1 1251). An exception may be the monument of Aischro, daughter of Zoilos of Samos (pl. 1e: cat. B 12, KM I 189).

as Boeotia, prefer kouroi as votives – to Apollo, a fitting recipient of such gifts – while at the Heraion on Samos kouroi appear as votives side by side with korai.\footnote{1186}

Another respect in which the representations in funerary sculpture differ from those in votive sculpture is the degree to which personal characteristics have been rendered in marble. Korai, kouroi and horsemen hardly ever show features which refer to a person’s life, except in the most general terms, such as the richness of the attire of the korai.\footnote{1187} By contrast, some grave reliefs of the archaic period show a remarkable degree of realism: the athlete on the Boxer Stele (pl. 50b)\footnote{1188} is scarred by many fights, his nose broken and his ear swollen. At first glance this seems to defy the ideal of the \textit{kalos k’ agathos}. But if he had won his victory at Olympia or other Panhellenic games, the state of his face would have been proof of his honour, a hallmark of his excellence.\footnote{1189} The variety of sports on gravestones – \textit{diskos} or javelin throwing, boxing, running – shows how widely spread such ideals were (pls. 50b–d, 51a–b).\footnote{1190} The only certain grave monument for an Olympic victor (pls. 43c–d) does not preserve a name, only that he won: his mother set up the inscribed base which once carried a stele and possibly two small columns on which statues were placed.\footnote{1191} A monument like this portraits the deceased in a way befitting the ideals of leisureed life in archaic Athens:\footnote{1192} to bring glory to himself and his city by winning the greatest races of his time. This small degree of realism in the service of honour is specific to gravestones. In this respect, then,

\begin{enumerate}
\item One possible source for the korai and kouroi as votives is the sanctuaries of Apollo Ptoös and the Samian Heraion: cf. Meyer and Brüggemann 2007.
\item Cf. Ridgway 1982; \textit{contra} Stieber 2004, ch. I. The latter sees each kore as an individual. Although the point is valid, it must be noted that the idea of a richly clad girl applies to each example in equal measure.
\item Kyle 1996, \textit{passim}; Smith 2007, esp. 83–4, 94–5, 100–1. Ridgway 1982, 118–23 discusses a cauliflower ear in the Rayet head (Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek 418, cat. G 100), which is otherwise considered an aristocratic monument. The explanation may be the same. Cf. also Robertson 1985, 169–70 for the suggestion that statues would be of higher religious standing than reliefs, which in his view are of a more personal nature.
\item E.g. of 575–550, cat. G 60, NMA 38, 83 rel. with diskophoros (pl. 51b). Of 550–525: cat. G 90, NMA 5826, relief with athlete and aryballos (pl. 50d); cat. G 95, NMA 1772, relief with a man throwing a javelin (pl. 51a).
\item Cat. B 263, KM I 322, \textit{IG} I 1213. It seems to suggest that the mother set up the statue; there is some conjecture about Megakles being the victor in question. See above n. 1024. Another stele, KM P 747 (cat. G 92) shows a young man with a wreath who might of course be a victor; but since wreathes were also common cult attire, and the inscription is lost, this cannot be ascertained.
\item Osborne 2004, 213–5; Smith 2007, 94 and others in Hornblower and Morgan 2007 on Pindar and patronage.
\end{enumerate}
dedicated and sepulchral sculpture differed. It seems likely that those who commissioned the sculpture had the most influence on this. The occurrence of realism, even if only in its generic form (cauliflower ear equals boxer), suggests that a direct reference to the deceased’s life on a gravestone was acceptable, while in votives it was not.

One would expect display in cemeteries to be complemented by votives of the Archaic Akropolis, but as it has turned out, this is hardly the case. The relevant votives are from different groups in society, and only the patron’s wealth can be more or less measured by their votives, not their social status.\footnote{For votives of victors, see e.g. Eckstein 1969; Semmlinger 1974; Kyle 1996, 102–23.} The only exception to this are the iconographic renderings of patrons’ crafts on dedications, in general of the late–archaic period. Higher social rank, such as that of winners of contests from Olympic Games to the choregia, is seldom clear from votives or grave memorials.\footnote{Kyle 1996, 115–6; Wijma 2010, 30. So could women, but only in a few events (for example, the Heraia at Olympia).} After all, any man who was good enough could take part in athletic contests, if he could afford it.\footnote{The Dionysian competitions were performed by citizens (Ath. Pol. 56.3); in the choral agon, the Kleisthenic tribes competed (Burkert 1996, 58–60; Slings 2005, 49); cf. Osborne 2004\textsuperscript{2}, 216; Wijma 2010, \textit{passim}; and above ns. 1030–1031.} By contrast, some competitions like the dithyramb or certain dramatic festivals were more exclusive for citizens and their prizes confirm the status as well as the affluence of those performing the liturgy.\footnote{For the cost of sculpture, above pp. 193 ff.}

Prices of sculpture put a limit on the number of people in Athens who could order marble statues or stelai for themselves. Citizen status or a lack thereof did not prevent anyone from dedicating votives or setting up gravestones; nor did it cause any trends in, for example, iconography. Moreover, it is at the very least unlikely that any genres were the exclusive domain of the leisured citizens of Athens. Apparently, neither dedicating to the city’s patron goddess, nor presenting her with korai, nor erecting these on the Akropolis were activities restricted exclusively to Athenians. Just the fact that ethnica were used relatively freely is an indication that Athenian citizenship was not a major factor in the types of monuments which patrons chose to set up. Furthermore, some patrons of sculpture worked in various crafts. Clearly, not all of these men and women belonged to the upper two Solonic property classes. Thus, no connection can be established between the social background of patrons and their choices in genres, iconography or the occasions at which they set up their sculpture. But even though their gravestones and votives thus seem very far
removed from the city’s political organisation, some formal restrictions were imposed on the conditions for erecting sculpture.

6 LAWS AND RELIGIOUS REGULATIONS

In the lifespan of sculptures, many moments were emphatically religious in nature. A statue or stele was either the subject of ritual, or its instrument. The practice of setting up votive and grave monuments had the intention of communication: between gods and worshippers or the living and the dead. Since sanctuaries and burial grounds were public places, communication also took place between the living and the living, and regulation was needed to ensure that the sacred was treated appropriately. Thus, sanctuaries could set out rules about dedication, and the expenditure on funerary ritual was sometimes curbed by the city’s authorities. The nature of these restrictions on ritual practices changed over time, for each of the three types of communication, and this is reflected in the sculpture record.

When erecting offerings at sanctuaries, procedure is of particular relevance to status display: if a dedication and its inscription were difficult to see, it would not be noticed, let alone impress one’s fellow-Athenians.\textsuperscript{1197} The size of the votive would help, but a good spot in a sanctuary was important.\textsuperscript{1198} However, how much official attention this display aspect of placement received is doubtful. The few sacred regulations which survive from ancient Greece address far more mundane problems: a third-century decree from Rhodes targets problems caused by a multitude of requests to place votives in the sanctuary of Asklepios; in Miletus, enthusiastic dedicants apparently had to be stopped from nailing their votive plaques to the columns and walls of the Apollo temple, and by doing so damaging them.\textsuperscript{1199} For sixth and fifth-century Athens, there is no contemporary evidence about the practical organisation of dedicatory activity, but it is reasonable to assume that there were rules, and that they

\textsuperscript{1197} For an analysis of the visibility of writing on various types of votives, see De Polignac 2005.
\textsuperscript{1198} ‘Good’ being a flexible term: in Delphi, a good location could be the one further from the temple, but close to the votive of a rivalling polis (Pedley 2005, 150). Cf. Aleshire 1992, 92; Scott forthcoming, ch. 2.
\textsuperscript{1199} LSS 107 (Rhodes); 123 (Miletus). Cf. Lupu 2005, 31.
addressed similar problems as later sacred laws did: the protection and placement of votives and the conditions under which their reuse was acceptable.

The Akropolis of the late-archaic era must have presented an overwhelming sight, a forest of bronze, marble and possibly terracotta statues on bases, or raised on columns, in all kinds of shapes, poses, colours and, one would hope, grouped together in certain areas rather than just spread over the hilltop at the dedicants’ discretion. The crowdedness of the temenos could partly be remedied by recasting bronze votives, especially when damaged, to create new sculpture or cult equipment. Since marble could not be reused within the limitations of the deity’s sacred ownership, stone offerings must have filled up many a sanctuary, especially relatively small sites, for example, the Athenian Asklepieion (map 6a). Moreover, large bronze groups like the quadriga of Pronapes could only have been admitted onto the sanctuary in limited numbers, to ensure sufficient access to worshippers during sacrifices and festivals. It was probably the mass of cheap, small donations which cluttered sanctuaries most, inciting the irritation of Plato and undoubtedly exasperating those in charge of organising the sanctuary space. In the case of the Athenian Akropolis, where a great many activities were strictly regulated, the choice of location for votives was probably not left to the patrons.

---

1200 Cf. Neer 2001; id. 2004; and Scott 2007, for the politics of placement at Delphi.
1202 Van Straten 1992, 248–53 argues that smaller reliefs also must have stood on pillars. In depictions of reliefs e.g. on vases, this usually is true, but few pillars from the fifth century show signs of having carried stelai, and those that do date c. 500–450: cat. B 199, EM 6303, fr. of pillar, son of Lysippos; cat. B 255, EM 8169, fr. of pillar, Aristomache and Chariklea; cat. B 244, Akr. no.?, fr. of base, Phaidros son of Prothymides of Kephale; cat. B 203, EM 6253, fr. of pillar, Mikythe. The small number of supports for marble sculpture from the late fifth century is curious, if marble stelai were so generally put on pillars as Van Straten suggests.
1203 Thuc. 2.13.2–5; Linders 1987, passim (in particular for the use of sacred statues in times of economic duress in Athens, under the condition that would return them later on); id. 1991, 115–8; id. 1996, 122; Aleshire 1991, 83, 104–5; 1992, 97–98; Lupu 2005, 32 (the example is from the third century BC).
1204 Linders 1987, 115, 120–1. It remains uncertain whether the Athenians would have removed the marble dedications of the archaic period to build new temples, had the Persians not damaged them. For cleaning operations (in the Athenian Asklepieion) see Aleshire 1991, 104–8.
1205 Pl. Leg. X. 909e–910a. An additional problem was that they did not add to the sanctuaries’ wealth.
1206 Németh 1994, passim for sanctuary regulations. Scott forthcoming, ch. 2 suggests that at Delphi, the officials of the sanctuaries must have had the right to approve placement of dedications. Cf. Jacquemin 1999, 101–3.
Once a statue was set up, the question of its upkeep arose. One or two early-classical votive sculptures from the Akropolis were repaired or rededicated, as illustrated by fragments of a pillar for a bronze statue by Theodoros and Onesimos son of Smikythos, but in general it seems that rededicating marble sculpture only became common practice in later times.\footnote{Akr. 4184, cat. B 21 (cf. above p. 1). The rededication was not necessarily the result of damage in the Persian wars. Cf. Beazley 1944, 23 n. 1; Kissas 2000, 123–4 no. 52, Keesling 2005, 401–3. For later practices cf. Lupu 2005, 32–3.}

Ancient authors sometimes mention involvement of wealthy individuals (or groups) in maintenance or restoration, but this usually is with regard to buildings.\footnote{Plu. Mor. 852b, on Lykourgos’ restoration not only of buildings but also of votives in the second half of the fourth century. Cf. Linders 1996, 123. A fourth-century decree from Chios stipulates that an oikos will be built by the phratry of the Klytidai, to house statues and/or cultic implements previously kept in private houses (Lupu 2005, 37: Sokolowski, LSCG 118). Closer to the research period: Telemachos founded Asklepios’s cult (Clinton 1994; Camp 2001, 122); Themistokles built a shrine to Artemis Aristoboule (Plu. Them. 22.1–2; Camp 2001, 61–2; Umholtz 2002, 287–8).} In sculpture, cult statues are most common to receive special maintenance. A possible, though late example regards the festival of Aphrodite Pandemos: her shrine had to be cleaned and painted, and the ἐδώ (cult statues) washed.\footnote{Lupu 2005, 39; Sokolowski LSCG 39. Cf. also Bettinetti 2001, 52–4 (ἐδώς) and 147 (Aphrodite).}

In the sanctuary of Artemis ἐν Νήσῳ on Delos in Hellenistic times, the cult statue was washed with water and saltpetre and rubbed with oil, after which it was perfumed with rose essence.\footnote{Bettinetti 2001, 144–5 quotes IG XI.2, 161, lines 92 and 95–6 of the early third century BC.} Like the careful cleaning and attiring of the statue of Athena Polias at the annual Plynteria festival, these are first and foremost cultic activities.\footnote{Xen. HELL. I.4.1.2; Plu. Alc. 34.1. Cf. Simon 1983, 46–8; Burkert 1985, 79, 226; Parker 1996, 307–8 (for the Plynteria and Kallynteria): Bettinetti 2001, 147–53. The day when the statue was undressed, cleaned and veiled, awaiting a clean peplos or chiton, was an unlucky day on which no business should be conducted. For the performance of the ritual, two girls from the genos of the Praxiergidae were appointed. Similarly, in Olympia, the descendants of Phedias held the hereditary right to clean the cryselephantine Zeus. The office was called φαίδοντις: references in Bettinetti 2001, 143–4; a late example in Athens: Jeffery 1948, 92–3.}

Nevertheless, practical upkeep was in these cases included in the rites (painting the shrine, rubbing with oil), offering a glimpse of the care with which cult statues were kept in order.

Whether ordinary votives also were repainted and repaired is not known from ancient sources, but they are unlikely to have received such tender care as some cult statues did. The procedure applied to the statue of Artemis may also have aimed to preserve the paint on the statue, as Vitruvius’ describes in the beneficial effects of ganos. The treatment with heated wax and some oil would prevent vermillion from turning black ‘just as naked marble statues
are treated’. In many cases, the bright colours of archaic statues must have faded, thus impairing their appearance in the eyes of the public. If the Athenians wished to perpetuate their gift-giving to the deity, they should not let the statue deteriorate; but there is no evidence of obligations imposed by sanctuaries on the patrons or their heirs in this respect. It seems that contrary to bronzes and precious metals, marble votives could be left undisturbed in sanctuaries for a long time.

Votives and gravestones were embedded in their religious and public environments to a different extent. While dedications may have had to fulfill certain conditions set by the city or by sanctuaries, burial in Athens was less formal or official: for example, no priests presided over the burial grounds. Presumably, votives, or at least the location where they were to stand, required permission from the sanctuary, while no evidence suggests that there were limits on burial other than commonly accepted rules regarding piety, the polluting effect of death or the ritual traditions performed by family or friends. Graves had to be located outside the city and away from certain sanctuaries; the cemeteries along Athens’ main exit roads were known to every inhabitant of the city as a place of burial. Funerary rites, and perhaps also the care of grave monuments, had to comply with appropriate custom, but whether the fulfilment of these rites was checked and if so by whom and how is unknown. Once the grave was in place, the erection of a funeral marker over it seems to have been less constrained by regulations than that of a votive statue.

That being said, the scope of funerary practices was restricted several times in the history of Athens. Legislation targeted displays of wealth and alliance which, one has to assume, funerals were the setting of in the archaic period. Lavish burial rites are often

1212 Vit. *De arch.* VII.7.2–3. The use of the word naked is somewhat confusing, suggesting that the statues Vitruvius is referring to were not painted. This must be incorrect: there would be little point in comparing walls with sculpture if vermilion or other paint were not applied on the latter.

1213 Above n. 1208. Also Linders 1992 and 1996, and Sinn 1996 for the use of the gold Nikai from the Akropolis and precious metal vessels used in cult and during festivals, as a means of displaying the city’s power.

1214 Garland 1985, 121; id. 1989, 1.

1215 E.g. burial was not to take place within the city boundaries: Rohde 1961 (1897), 340; Young 1951; Burkert 1985, 79–80; Garland 1985, 38–48; id. 1989, *passim*; Patterson 2006, 53–6 (on the Kerameikos).

1216 For a discussion of the social implications of this position see e.g. Blok 2007.


considered an emphatically aristocratic phenomenon.\textsuperscript{1219} Traditionally, Solon – if the supposed laws are his – is thought to have limited expenditure on the trappings of funerals, such as sacrifice, numbers of flute-players and grave gifts, but apparently he regulated neither gravestones nor burials plots.\textsuperscript{1220} However, it has recently been suggested that the laws targeted religious pollution of the family or even the entire polis, rather than aristocratic display or attempts to rally for aristocratic factions among attendants of funerals.\textsuperscript{1221}

According to Cicero, ‘sometime after’ Solon’s intervention, a law was drawn up which did target grave markers, and stipulated that no more than ten men were allowed work on the monument for three days; and moreover, that it was not permitted ‘to place herms, as they call them, on the grave’.\textsuperscript{1222} Moreover, the dead were only to be praised at public funerals. This legislation, known as the post aliquanto law is problematic because it rings of the sumptuary laws passed by Demetrios of Phaleron in 317 BC. Cicero’s distance from the classical period and his own experience of Athens may have merged the two occasions to him.\textsuperscript{1223} If the post aliquanto law existed, its date remains problematic: suggestions run from the middle of the sixth century until the Persian Wars.\textsuperscript{1224}

It is tempting to try and connect the quantities of gravestones to funerary legislation.\textsuperscript{1225} If it was Peisistratos who tried to curb the expenditure on gravestones he was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1221} Blok 2006, esp. 229–33, 237–40. Men’s attendance at funerals was not restricted by Solonian legislation, whereas that of women was. This being the case, it seems unlikely that the aim of the law was to prevent factionalist strife emerging at funerals. In favour of political or status-related motivations of aristocrats: a/o. Garland 1989, 2–5, 15. Taking into account issues of pollution; Humphreys 1980, 99–101; Meyer 1993, 107, 118 (late–fifth c.); Stears 2000, 27–9. Cicero suggests that Solon also aimed to restrict excessive signs of grief by women in public (\textit{Leg.} II.59–66). To this view Meyer 1993, 106; \textit{contra} Morris 1992–3, 39; Blok 226–9.
\item \textsuperscript{1222} Cic. \textit{Leg.} 2.64–5.
\item \textsuperscript{1223} Blok 2006, 240. Bernhardt 2003, 75, argues that Plutarch (or his source) had already mixed up the funerary legislation by Solon and the restrictions on grave monuments by Demetrios of Phaleron, possibly adding an in–between stage that took elements from both earlier and later events.
\item \textsuperscript{1224} For an overview of the main directions of the discussion see Blok 2006, 240–3, esp. n. 167.
\item \textsuperscript{1225} Gradual enforcing of the post aliquanto law, of Kleisthenic or Themistoklean date: Shapiro 1991, 647 (with the nuance that public burial was of more consequence). Cf. Stears 2000.
\end{itemize}
ignored on a monumental scale, for in the third quarter of the sixth century, the total of marble grave sculptures and bases increases (table 1b). If it was Kleisthenes, many gravestones must have been set up before 508/507, for the total number of gravestones rises further in the final quarter of the sixth century. After the start of the fifth century, funerary monuments certainly decrease in numbers, yet they do not disappear completely (table 1). Considering that numbers of votives also fall in this period, there is no reason to assume that the lapse in gravestones must be caused by a law which exclusively targeted grave markers.

Cicero describes the post aliquanto law to state that no opus tectorium was permitted; this is commonly interpreted as referring to the mounds, or to the mudbrick structures which appeared in the Kerameikos in the sixth century. In fact, the idea of a law altogether prohibiting grave markers in Athens is unlikely. First, the archaeological evidence does not support it. Gravestones do not entirely disappear in any quarter of the fifth century. Their numbers are strongly reduced, but the record shows that not everyone settled for restraint. Some burials of the mid-fifth century, one of clearly Homeric overtones, reflect the same stance. Second, a compelling case has been made for a restrictive rather than prohibitive or prescriptive nature of Greek funerary laws.

---

1226 Peisistratean date: e.g. Richter 1961, 38–9; id. 1945, 152; Boardman 1955, 53; cf. Harrison 1956, 44–5; Shapiro 1991, 631; Bernhardt 2003, 81.
1228 Cat. G 81, KM P 1455, head of youth; and cat. G 87, KM 267, fr. of kouros. Both pieces were found quite recently. Other finds from c. 500–475 are a lion from the Agora (cat. G 106, AM S 1942), of which the funerary status is not entirely certain, and basins (cat. G 131, 132 and 134, all from the Kerameikos). Stears 2000, 31 lists four monuments of 475–450 (dates IG II). Two are dated later in the present study (IG II 1280, cat. G 147; and 1351, cat. G 145, based on arguments presented by Salta 1991, 169–72), one falls outside of the current topographical limits (IG I 1280, found between Athens and Piraeus). A public burial with a marble marker, of the proxenos Protagoras of Selymbria, dates to the 460s, but this is more a public monument (Kerameikos in situ, IG I 1154; Knigge 1988, 98; Morris 1992, 141–2; Wijma 2010, 256–7; also above n. 208).
1232 Garland 1989, 15; his argument is based on funerary legislation from Greece in general, not Athens alone. Interestingly Blok 2006, who is even more complete in her overview of ancient
Attic tombstones of the sixth and fifth centuries and especially of the fourth, show that the Athenians were, or became, quite fond of their sculpted grave markers in the course of this period.\textsuperscript{1233} Outright prohibition of gravestones would have aroused much resentment – more than what is reflected in those few ancient texts which mention the \textit{post aliquanto} law. Cicero’s is the only account of it as a separate event; the closest contemporary source is Plato. His references to regulation are utopian, and even then he refrains from outright prohibition: the \textit{Laws} allow for a mound and a stele with a four–line epigram.\textsuperscript{1234} Thus, the suggestion that the \textit{post aliquanto} law is an entanglement of sixth–century legislation and the more substantially documented sumptuary laws of Demetrios of Phaleron in the late fourth century is supported by literary evidence as well as the grave monuments in the present study.\textsuperscript{1235}

The development of dedications in this period provides an interesting comparison. Votive monuments are most numerous in the first quarter of the fifth century; gravestones reach their highest peak a quarter century before (chart 1d). Where votives in the first quarter of the fifth century still go up, they decrease by more than three quarters in the following quarter century (table 1b).\textsuperscript{1236} In gravestones, the main fall occurs earlier, in the first quarter of the fifth century; the timing and the absolute numbers are different, but the rate is similar. These trends bring to mind the varying rates of preservation of gravestones and votives, and the comparison of the Akropolis and other sixth and fifth–century find spots of sculpture in Athens, for example, the Themistoklean wall.\textsuperscript{1237} Many gravestones of Athens may as yet be undiscovered; many are lost. From this perspective, the presence of \textit{any} sepulchral sculpture from the period just after the Persian War must serve as a warning against the notion that there were funerary laws which had great influence, or that they were widely obeyed.

\begin{flushright}
Greek funerary legislation, but whose purpose is a different one, comes to a similar conclusion (see next note).
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{1233} Cf. also Meyer 1993, 117–8 for the effect which the actions of the Thirty Tyrants had on perceptions of death and commemoration as rights of the Athenian citizen, especially in oratory.

\textsuperscript{1234} Pl. \textit{Leg.} 958e–959a: \textquote{Χώμα δὲ μὴ χούν υψηλότερον πέντε ἄνδρῶν ἔργον, ἐν πένθος ἡμέραις ἀποτελούμενον λίθων δὲ ἐπιστήματα μὴ μείζον ποιεῖν ἢ δοσα δέχεσθαι τῶν τοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἔγκυροι βίου μὴ πλείον τεταχρον ἡμώικών. ‘The soil must not be piled higher than five men can manage by working five days. Stone slabs must not be made bigger than they need to be to accommodate a eulogy of the deceased’s career of not more than the usual hexameters.’} (transl. T. J. Saunders in Cooper and Hutchinson 1997).

\textsuperscript{1235} Stears 2001, 43, 47–8; Blok 2006, 243.

\textsuperscript{1236} From 201 in 500–475 to 39 in 475–450. Grave monuments: from 47 in 525–500 to 7 in 500–475.

\textsuperscript{1237} Above ch. II.2, p. 38 and further.
If laws cannot explain the development of sculpture, the social competition which it is supposed to have targeted may. The expenditure on grave monuments is linked to that of the contents of the graves: times of display in one usually alternate with the other. The most monumental mounds (pl. 51c, map 6b) in the Kerameikos were topped by tall stelai, crowned by sphinxes or anthemia; they date to the seventh and the first half of the sixth centuries. After this, mudbrick tombs were popular until the end of the sixth century. In the contents of the graves, lavishness gives way to a tide of restraint around the turn of the century. Exceptions, such as a mound for a single grave from the 490s, do exist, but generally burials were dug into existing mounds more and more often, for example, in Grabhügel G or the Sudhügel in the Kerameikos.

The mounds in the Kerameikos have been interpreted as burial grounds for male members of the elite, who provided funeral rites for each other within a circle of hetairai. In Attika, this custom of many burials in a mound arose at the same time when grave stelai first became popular. The deceased were bound to each other by guest friendship or symposiastic connections, and shared social values rather than genealogy: some may have been non-Athenians. Through common pursuits of athletics and warfare, this arrangement can be seen as a prefiguration of state burial later in the fifth century.

In view of the social setting of the burials in the Kerameikos, the prominence of war and athletics in funerary iconography is not surprising. Doubtlessly, the formalised competition at festivals and at Panhellenic games carried enormous weight in ancient Greece;

---

1240 Morris 1998, 64.
1243 Houby-Nielsen 1995, 160–1; contends that not all mounds were used by this kind of burial groups; others belonged to families (ibid. 159) or wider kin groups. Even then, the social value of the deceased is the common denominator in the clusters of burials, not their position in the family (ibid. 142–6; contra Humphreys 1980, 108). Periods of little activity just before and after the mid-sixth century, she explains by conflict arising from the aristocratic ideology, inherent to guest friendship among the upper classes of different poleis, which by default posed a threat to the coherence of the city-state. Cf. Buxton 1994, 29–30; also Kistler 1998, 106–12 for the early Iron Age; Blok 2007 and 2010; and Patterson 2006 for the classical period.
in Athens, sepulchral monuments confirm this. As was discussed above, athletics feature frequently on archaic gravestones, especially if kouroi are considered as symbols of this type of *agon*. Of the various competitions, horse-racing was the most prestigious. Thucydides describes how Alkibiades was charged for his expenditure on race-horses, because he used them to gain personal glory. Alkibiades retorted that his victories at Olympia had enhanced the stature of Athens rather than his own, and was acquitted. Ironically, his status of *olympianikos* swayed the public, thus proving the original charge correct.

Although the Athenians clearly appreciated the ideals of athletic prowess or excellence in war, not all extant grave monuments belong to this sphere. For example, a few gravestones from the sixth century depict women seated or enthroned. Contrary to kouroi or korai, they are adults. In fact, the iconography of women on archaic grave monuments is similar to that of the sculpture of the second half of the fifth century, with one difference: in the earlier period, seated women were sometimes carved in the round, too, while from the fifth century such figures have not been found. This is not necessarily an indication of decreasing status of women in the classical period: many marble genres in the round disappear from the fifth–century record, including seated (and mortal) men. Instead, the iconography is transferred to reliefs along with many other types.

---

1247 Thuc. 6.16.2–3; see also Davies 1984, 98–102; Kyle 1998, 118; Rhodes 2000, 470–1; Finley 2004, 163.
1248 Apart from two seated women which could theoretically be argued to have stood on men’s graves, though this is very unlikely (cat. G 86, NMA 7, c. 575–550; and cat. G 26, AM S 23, from 525–500, one fr. of a relief by Aristokles, cat. G 113, KM P 1265 probably with an enthroned woman, in analogy to a relief from Aegina (*IG* I 1229bis; Willemsen, AM 85 (1970) 36–41 pl. 15.2; Ridgway 1993, 244, 259 n. 6.40 no. 2). The idea that enthroned figures represent heroised dead seems unlikely (Houby-Nielsen 1995, 162). Two archaic bases for grave stelai are for women: cat. B 154, EM 13486 (Kleito); cat. B 265, KM no. 7 (Melissa).
1249 Contrary to korai, which are always young, and hardly ever grave markers in Attika. This division of adult women for gravestones and girls for votives seems to support the view that the former are more personal and the latter more generic or symbolic; and that grave sculpture therefore offers more personal choice in genre and iconography. One stele, probably a votive, shows an adult woman with a girl: NMA 36, cat. V 147.
1250 Osborne 2004, convincingly links high numbers of grave stele with women in 450–400 to the introduction of the Periklean citizen law. A similar argument about the role of women in religious rites, in Borgers 2008.
Among the recorded deceased of the sixth century, quite some are non-Athenians; they were
given not just sufficient, but expensive burial rites and monuments. In the fourth century,
sources attest that the family or (if there was no family) the demarch was responsible for
burial of the dead in his deme, though a gravestone was apparently not obligatory in these
cases.\textsuperscript{1251} Metics could only own land in Attika by special permission, the \textit{enktesis}, and thus
the burial plots of metics in the cemeteries around the city could not be purchased by them
or their families.\textsuperscript{1252} Nonetheless, since many non-Athenians were buried in Attic soil in the
sixth and fifth centuries, acquaintances who were citizens may have obtained the land for
them.\textsuperscript{1253} But it is more likely that the plot did not have to be bought: denying families the
right to bury their dead (especially if transport to their city of origin was difficult) would be in
severe breach of standards of piety at the time.\textsuperscript{1254} On the other hand, fourth-century court
cases make it clear that \textit{periboloi} were considered the property of the family who buried their
deceased relatives there, and could be used as evidence of citizenship in court cases.\textsuperscript{1255}
When precisely burial land and tombs became thus politically charged is uncertain. The name
inscriptions on archaic gravestones as well as Solonic funeral legislation might be early
examples of cases where the Athenians began to associate such meaning to burials and
sepulchral markers.\textsuperscript{1256} Care of tombstones is relatively well attested, especially in the classical period.
White-ground lekythoi offer evidence of visits to the tomb,\textsuperscript{1257} when stelai are cleaned and
decorated with coloured \textit{taenia}, and sometimes with other objects such as swords, lyres and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1251} D. 43.57–8; cf. \textit{Ath. Pol.} 55.3; D. 57.28. Cf. Garland 1985, 104; id. 1989, 4; Patterson 2006, 48–
52. Oliver 2000, 63 mentions a non–citizen who performed funerary duties (\textit{IG II^2} 1672), so this
was also possible.
\item \textsuperscript{1253} Beside the non–citizen war dead who were given public burials: Stupperich 1977, 4–12; Whitehead
\item \textsuperscript{1254} Blok 2007, 324.
\item \textsuperscript{1255} For an extensive overview of single–family burials in \textit{periboloi} of the Classical period, Humphreys
\item \textsuperscript{1256} If Houby–Nielsen’s view is accepted, burial groups of the archaic age can be seen as predecessors
to the arrangements for burial by the demarchs, as institutionalised in fourth–century
democracy. For justified criticism of the exclusivity of Athenian ‘citizen cemeteries’, cf. Patterson
2006. De Polignac 2005 for the possibility that earlier in the archaic period, patrons of votive
monuments were memorised by sanctuary staff.
\item \textsuperscript{1257} Cf. Burkert 1985, 193–4; Garland 1985, 115–8; Oakley 2004, \textit{passim}. Cf. also the analysis of
Helmis 2001 of rites at gravestones in cases of murder.
\end{itemize}
diskoi (pls. 52a–b). There is some evidence of annual washing and anointing of grave markers during the festivals of the dead.\textsuperscript{1258} Perhaps with these rites and the decoration of the stele also came maintenance of the paintwork.\textsuperscript{1259} Alternatively, the anointment may have been symbolic. In any case, if the decoration of a stele faded, especially one that was decorated in paint rather than in relief, the family to whom the peribolos belonged would have appeared negligent: a strong incentive for regular maintenance, especially if other family members died and had to be buried in the same grave mound or peribolos.

Practices like tending the grave and its tombstone do not appear in vase paintings of the archaic period. Instead, they show scenes of violent death, of the rites conducted during the funeral: mourning over the body, the ekphora, or funeral games.\textsuperscript{1260} Three archaic diskoi look like the ones attached to gravestones in scenes on the lekythoi; but there is a gap in time between the two. One diskos from the third quarter of the sixth century belonged to a certain Gnathon, while another one or perhaps two date to the final quarter of that century: these were ‘from the funeral games at Eria’ for a man called Telesarchos.\textsuperscript{1261} They may have been buried with him or fixed to his gravestone, as they appear in white-ground vase painting. The question is: were funerary diskoi handled differently in the sixth than in the fifth century, or did the iconography change? Are the details of scenes at the tomb on lekythoi to be taken literally?\textsuperscript{1262} More than the iconography, burial practice itself seems to change: funeral games for individuals disappeared in the fifth century, marble diskoi no longer occur in tombs, and vase painting shows the arrangement and decoration of monuments instead of funeral games or the activities of the dead.\textsuperscript{1263} If anything, it seems that gravestones become more important as focal points, while declining in monumentality. Someone must have kept the burial grounds of ancient Athens in order. It is unclear whether anyone was responsible for the placement of graves and thus of gravestones: perhaps the nomophylakes or law wardens, exercised some control over commemoration and

\textsuperscript{1258} Plu. Arist. 21.2–5 (at Plataia, the stele is washed and anointed with myrrh); Burkert 1985, 193–4; Garland 1985, 107–10, 115–20: cf. the washing of the statues of Aphrodite Pandemos, n. 1209.
\textsuperscript{1259} Garland 1985, 104, 115–6.
\textsuperscript{1260} Cf. Shapiro 1991; Pedrina 2001; Oakley 2004; Blok 2006.
\textsuperscript{1262} Oakley 2004, 191–214.
\textsuperscript{1263} Morris 1992–93, passim.
burial, if their office included this task.\textsuperscript{1264} Apparently, the practical organisation of burial grounds was not always regulated: the Kerameikos was used for more purposes than interments alone,\textsuperscript{1265} and other cemeteries must have been as well.\textsuperscript{1266} Perhaps this relative freedom in sepulchral matters created room for a disaster like the corpses left unburied during the Plague.\textsuperscript{1267} Less dramatically, it allowed patrons more freedom than they had in the dedication of votives. They used this space only in a few respects, such as the materials: in iconography and genre, their preferences were remarkably uniform, at least in the second half of the fifth century.

Dedication seems to have been more subject to regulation than setting up gravestones, not from the state, but from sanctuary authorities. Sacred laws are preserved mostly for the late-classical and Hellenistic period, but it is likely that similar rules existed before then. The appointment of a place to put one’s votive must have been under the control of sanctuary officials, even if information about the practicalities of dedication or subsequent maintenance of votives is meagre to say the least. In the latter, expenditure was obviously not limited by legislation: to the temples, sumptuous votives were welcome, and the fact that a deity was the recipient prevented criticism on the patrons’ self-expression which was also part of the dedication. In gravestones there may have been guidelines, but the existence of laws curbing the size or complexity of grave markers in Athens before Demetrios of Phaleron may well be incorrect. Neither the sculptural nor the epigraphic evidence in this study offer any support for the existence of such legislation, and certainly not for their efficacy. Although the sepulchral and the divine constituted two very different spheres, the ways in which the inhabitants of Athens handled the sculpted monuments belonging to each were similar in many respects.

\begin{thebibliography}
\item \textsuperscript{1264} Pl. Leg. 9.59d–e; also Xen. Oec. 9.14. Cf. Stears 2000, 47.
\item \textsuperscript{1265} Knigge 1988, e.g. 164–6; Patterson 2006, 56; cf. Stissi 2002, 39 for further references.
\item \textsuperscript{1266} A site–by–site discussion of grave monuments from cemeteries around Athens in Salta 1991; also Bergemann 1994; in general, Travlos 1971; Camp 2000.
\item \textsuperscript{1267} Thuc. 2.52.2–4. Cf. Humphreys 1980, 112; Shapiro 1991, 656; Stears 2000, 54.
\end{thebibliography}
The relation between patrons and their sculptural commissions was evidently complex, yet clear trends can be discerned in the use of genres and to some extent in iconography of votive and grave sculpture in the sixth and fifth centuries. Athenian patrons favoured votive korai in the approximately half century around the turn of the sixth to the fifth century, and reliefs dominated both for sepulchral and votive purposes in the second half of the fifth century. The famed beauty of these genres sometimes eclipses other types of sculpture, such as basins; yet these were almost as popular as korai in the first quarter of the fifth century.

The landed nobility of Athens was certainly not the only group of patrons of sculpture. In fact, rather few known members of Athens’ upper two or three property classes feature in the votive or grave inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries. Dedications were offered by tradesmen and some tradeswomen on the Akropolis from the mid-sixth century onwards. These marble dedications draw their materials, genres and complexity from the same stock as the gifts of aristocratic patrons. Their inscriptions show a professional pride that belies any self-consciousness on the part of the craftsmen.

In the fifth century, professions in inscriptions decline, but this may well be a result of a general decrease of name inscriptions on marble votive monuments at this time. The archaic (and a few classical) craftsmen who advertised their names in this way did just that, they advertised. Not only was an inscribed votive a means of fulfilling a religious custom, it also showed the patron’s skill and success.

Among these dedicators of first-fruits of manual labour could have been owners of workshops, who hardly did any manual work themselves. However, some inscriptions defy this explanation: Smikythe should more likely be pictured as an individual – if successful – washerwoman than as the head of a laundry emporium. After all, she could not legally own property in archaic and classical Athens. The lack of a father’s or husband’s name contradicts the notion that the votive was set up by a male relative on her behalf, or paid for by him. Thus, her considerable dedication on the city’s main sanctuary suggests that she made enough to procure this sculpture by the work of her own hands.

On gravestones the number of inscriptions grew throughout the two centuries, and contrary to votives they were usually cut into the gravestones themselves rather than their bases. Almost all fifth-century gravestones are reliefs or stelai, allowing for an inscription on the lower edge or below the tympanon. The reason for the shift in placement of funerary inscriptions could be the result of new practices of setting up votives and gravestones. The
latter in particular tend to be placed more on peribolos walls in the course of the fifth century, while cuttings in the ground could serve to stabilise votives in some sanctuaries. The grand votives, gravestones and bases which had been the norm in the archaic period were in early-classical times replaced by smaller memorials; a handful of exceptions aside, monumentality of sculpture decreases in the fifth century.

The deity to whom most votives in Athens were offered was of course Athena: only the final quarter of the fifth century brought serious competition with the arrival of Asklepios. The votives of Athena often took the form of a tithe or first fruit, the occasions for which varied greatly. Honorary monuments, especially in the fifth century, focussed on military and athletic, but mostly on choregic victories. The practice of liturgy, which was formally instated probably in the fifth century,1268 and the formalisation of competitive elements of festivals, such as the Dionysia, Lenaia or Panathenaia, explains the appearance of these monuments – although rather few are preserved considering the many victories that must have been celebrated in the fifth century. However, even if contenders won and earned the right to set up a monument, they apparently did not always do so. Some may not have been able to afford it after the expense of the contest or of the liturgy they had just performed, and some may not have wanted such a memorial.

In a sepulchral context not everyone was given a grave marker either, and some gravestones in practice became focal points for several graves which were dug into existing burial mounds, notably in the Kerameikos. In later times, periboloi served as more official and clearly labelled family graves, although there, too, burials rarely stretch over more than a generation or two and do not contain dozens of burials. Names were sometimes added to gravestones along with later burials, proclaiming the continuing presence of the family in the area. The otherwise landless metics seem to have had little trouble in finding plots for their graves; their sepulchral monuments are definitely there, in the sixth century and even more so in the later fifth.

One certain characteristic of Athenian sculpture patrons of the sixth and fifth centuries is their ability to afford a sculpture. They need not have been aristocrats or pentakosio-medimnoi, nor even citizens. Since men and women, citizens and non–citizens are among the names of those who set up sculpture, all of them must have acquired the

1268 See, for example, Davies 1984, 97.
resources to make commissions. Their status in society is a more complex matter, since each type of patron had its own limitations.

That the landed elite erected monuments is obvious: they could afford it and occasions ranged from holding office or a priesthood to gaining victory in athletic games, and from a successful generalship to fulfilling the liturgy of the *choregia*. Women, on the other hand, are generally assumed to have been bound to comply with the wishes of their legal guardians. Several votives offered by women in archaic and early classical Athens, however, suggest otherwise. There is no sign of a man in the gifts of, for example, Heido, Iphidike, Kleito or Euthylla. Metics and other non–citizens may have been excluded from such things as owning land or holding office: but nothing indicates that they were blocked in any way from erecting sculpture as votives or gravestones – rather the contrary. Even craftsmen, considered lowly *banausoi* by some, confidently present the fruits of their labour to the gods in the form of sculpted monuments, or (less often) commemorate their skill on funerary monuments. Thus, as the material testifies, everyone in Athens could have their sculpture if they could afford it.