

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Upon entering the Greek and Roman galleries in most major museums of art, one is invariably struck by the monumentality of the works of art on display. The Parthenon marbles at the British Museum and the Pergamon Altar at the Pergamon Museum in Berlin are two of the most renowned sculptural ensembles from the ancient Greek world and are notable not only for their beauty but also for their incredible physical presence. Monuments of similar size rarely survive the ravages of time intact and the excellent states of preservation of the Parthenon and Pergamon Altar are thus reminders of the vast cultural wealth of the Greek and Roman civilizations now lost to us. Much more prevalent are smaller works of art – vases, statuettes, weaponry, and jewelry – produced in larger quantities which, although typically less celebrated, never fail to capture a visitor's attention and imagination. These small items tend to elicit a more personal response from the viewer and evoke a greater awareness of individual lives from the Greek and Roman world. It is easier to envision a craftsman shaping a vessel, a child playing with a terracotta doll, or a woman admiring her jewelry than it is to relate to the sublime imagery of more stately monuments such as the Parthenon and the Altar of Zeus from Pergamon. The intimate quality of many of these items, in addition to their aesthetics and often expensive materials, are yet added reasons for their allure today.

Bronze statuettes in particular, though not as awe-inspiring as gold and silver objects or jewelry, frequently draw a considerable amount of attention. While scholars of ancient history often study such minor (i.e. small) bronze objects as a means of

understanding religious and social traditions in ancient societies, the average person is invariably drawn to small works of art for different reasons altogether. Although not always beautiful in the traditional sense,¹ small bronzes invariably attract notice because of the fine craftsmanship they exhibit *in combination with* their diminutive size. While visual aesthetics are a major component in the appreciation of small bronzes, there is perhaps another reason to their appeal. There appears to be an inherent desire among some individuals to collect small, often precious, objects. There are practical considerations in collecting small items; the smaller the object the more one can collect and display in a limited amount of space. The old adage “good things come in small packages,” however, reveals another reason behind many people's attraction to tiny objects. Typically the most valuable items, both in ancient and modern societies, are small in size: money (paper as well as gold and silver coins); jewelry, particularly that utilizing gold in combination with precious and semi-precious stones; as well as objects made from materials which naturally restrict their size: ivory, amber, jade etc. Collectors may also be drawn to certain objects because of their intimate nature, once having been personal possessions, particularly of famous individuals, which evoke visions of past glories and tragedies. Jewelry, works of art, arms and armour become all the more fascinating having once been owned by such famed personages as Alexander the Great, Augustus, Napoleon, and the Romanovs.

The desire to collect small precious objects, particularly those items that are well made and aesthetically pleasing, has been present in western societies for centuries. By

¹ Note the popularity of Hellenistic and Roman bronze statuettes depicting grotesques, subjects that are receiving renewed interest of late. A related subject is addressed in the article “The Beauty of the Ugly: Reflections of Comedy in the Fleischman Collection” from the catalogue [A Passion for Antiquities](#):

the 18th century, spurred by the discovery of the cities buried by the eruption of Vesuvius and the growing awareness of the immense artistic wealth of Greek and Roman civilizations, art connoisseurs increasingly turned their attentions to establishing their own classical art collections.² While numerous collectors were enamored of large marble statuary, a few, such as de Clerq and Fouquet, became fascinated with small bronze sculpture and assembled remarkable collections.³ In contrast to many modern collections of ancient art, the de Clerq and Fouquet collections were amassed in the countries in which the works of art were found, Syria and Egypt respectively, and not on the open art market.⁴ Most collections of bronze statuettes in major western European museums, however, offer an extensive but often confusing picture of classical bronzes as they were acquired from diverse sources and originated from a multitude of geographical regions. Their origins were rarely recorded, aside from the occasional "said to be from" or "purportedly from" found in many museum files and on quite a few museum labels, and the authenticity of a few remain in question as a number were acquired from unknown or unreliable sources.⁵

Confronted with this diverse array of bronze statuettes on display in public and private collections, as well as the increasing number excavated from Greek sanctuaries at

Ancient Art from the Collection of Barbara and Lawrence Fleischman (A Passion for Antiquities, pp. 15-27).

² Notable collections of antiquities were assembled by Sir Hans Sloane, the Comte de Caylus, Charles Townley, Cardinal Albani, Auguste Dutuit, and James Loeb. Information on collecting ancient art, both before and after the Renaissance, can be found in Haskell and Penny 1981, Gramaccini 1996, Scott 2003, and Antikensammlungen des europäischen Adels.

³ The collections were published by Ridder 1905 and Pedrizet 1911 respectively.

⁴ Subsequently, the de Clerq and Fouquet collections offer scholars at least a rudimentary understanding of the appearance and character of Hellenistic and Roman bronze statuettes from these two regions, based upon relatively good reliability of the country of origin.

⁵ The consequences of collecting antiquities, both on the open market and illegally, have received considerable attention of late. See in particular the publications of C. Chippendale and D.W.J. Gill (Chippendale and Gill 2000, and Gill and Chippendale 2002) and Elia 2001. The Illicit Antiquities

the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, it is not surprising that scholars, following in the footsteps of Winckelmann⁶ and Adolf Furtwängler,⁷ first directed their attention to the attribution and classification of this vast amount of material. While Geometric, Archaic and Classical bronze statuettes were studied and categorized with some degree of ease, distinguishing Hellenistic from Roman statuettes has proven to be more arduous.⁸ Until recently, research on bronze statuettes has focused predominantly on style and the corresponding search for identifying the works of art and artistic influence of Greek masters.

Celebrated as “works of art” rather than “artifacts,”⁹ the original functions of bronze statuettes were of little interest to collectors and indeed only of secondary interest to most early scholars of Greek and Roman art. On the one hand, the votive use of pre-Hellenistic bronze statuettes was made abundantly clear by their discovery in large numbers at various Greek sanctuaries, particularly at the Athenian Acropolis, Olympia, Dodona, and Samos. On the other hand, immersed in an atmosphere of collecting and display, and perhaps unduly influenced by literary sources¹⁰ and archaeological

Research Centre at The McDonald Institute of Archaeological Research publishes a journal devoted to this issue entitled Culture Without Context.

⁶ Winckelmann [1764] 2002.

⁷ Furtwängler 1893.

⁸ For past scholarship on Greek and Roman bronze statuettes, see pages 7-17 below, especially footnote nos. 17-18. The difficulty of distinguishing between Hellenistic and Roman bronzes is alluded to by Winifred Lamb (1969) in her book Ancient Greek and Roman Bronzes. The chapter dealing with Hellenistic bronzes is entitled “The Hellenistic period, or the Hellenistic Tradition,” which includes bronzes made after the Roman period. The following chapter in her book focuses on statuettes either distinctly Roman in subject matter or made in what Lamb describes as the “Roman Style.”

⁹ Webster's Dictionary defines artifact as any man-made object. The J. Paul Getty Art and Architecture Thesaurus is more encompassing defining artifacts as "objects made, modified, or used by humans." Viewed as artifacts, bronze statuettes are invariably tied to the cultural context from which they came and are studied with the primary purpose of learning more about a specific culture, e.g. its artistic, religious, social, or economic character.

¹⁰ In his dissertation “Greek Domestic Sculpture and the Origins of Private Art,” Harward (1982) suggests that literary evidence has unduly influenced our understanding of how sculpture functioned in Late Classical and Hellenistic houses. He contends that stories, such as the one concerning the statuette of Herakles Epitrapezios created by Lysippos for Alexander the Great as related by Martial (Epigr. 9.43-44)

discoveries from the Roman period, there is little doubt that many earlier scholars also believed that Hellenistic bronzes originally were viewed as decorative works of art in antiquity. Winifred Lamb, in her book on Greek and Roman bronzes, states that in the Hellenistic period, “statuettes in various materials, including bronze, were now in demand as cabinet pieces for rich connoisseurs, and even for ordinary householders.”¹¹ This was true to a certain degree among Romans as ascertained from an abundance of literary and archaeological records, which amply illustrate their interests in collecting and displaying Greek works of art.¹² Whether the same can be said for the inhabitants of the Hellenistic Greek world has not been conclusively determined. Information regarding the use and display of bronze statuettes in the Hellenistic period should be ascertained from both literary records and from the contexts in which the statuettes were found. This has often proven difficult as few Hellenistic bronze statuettes have been found in their original contexts. Nevertheless, Hellenistic bronzes, and more broadly Hellenistic art, have received a considerable amount of attention of late, but scholars have focused in general on the more well known bronze statuettes in major western collections and have mainly engaged in discussions of artistic style and possible origins.¹³ The study of Roman period bronze statuettes has proceeded at an even more rapid pace, particularly in

and Statius (*Silv.* 4.6), infer a decorative function for domestic sculpture, a notion, Harward claims, that the archaeological evidence does not support.

¹¹ Lamb 1969, p. 195.

¹² Information on the Roman desire to collect and display Greek works of art is most clearly presented in some of Cicero’s letters to Atticus, in which he frequently bids Atticus to send him Greek statuary appropriate for display in his villa (*Att.* 4, 2; 6, 3; and 9, 3). In his Verrine Orations, he also mentions a chapel in the house of Heius that was adorned with an Eros by Praxiteles, a Herakles by Myron and two Kanephoroi by Polykleitos (*Verr.* II 4,2-4). For a fuller discussion of the literary and archaeological evidence, see Jucker 1950, Pape 1975, Pollitt 1978, Zanker 1979b, Neudecker 1988, Bartman 1991, Isager 1993, and Hölscher 1994. For the archaeological evidence in particular see Pandermalis 1971, Vermeule 1977, Dwyer 1982, Raeder 1983, Neudecker 1988, and Wohlmayr 1989.

¹³ A few of the most notable Hellenistic bronze statuettes include the Baker Dancer and Portrait of a Philosopher in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Loeb Poseidon in the Munich Antikensammlungen.

the last thirty to forty years, although not surprisingly most of the activity has centered on the abundant finds from Italy and the northern and western provinces. Ironically, Hellenistic and Roman period (i.e. Greek Imperial) bronze statuettes from the eastern Mediterranean have been largely overlooked, and those found in Greece, a land that has given rise to a tremendous bronze sculptural tradition, have been treated only sporadically.¹⁴ It is this deficiency that the current study intends to remedy.

The bronze statuettes at the heart of this study were found in documented contexts within the confines of modern-day Greece.¹⁵ The statuettes, which typically measure no more than 50 centimeters, date from the fourth century BC to the third century AC, and will be examined according to where they were found and, relatedly, to what uses they may have served. Emphasis is placed on discussions of style, iconography and manufacture of bronze statuettes both in relation to the time period in which they were produced and, based on the context where they were found, their original function (e.g. votive, cultic or decorative). Ultimately, a greater understanding of the appearance and use of bronze statuettes from Hellenistic to Greek Imperial times will be achieved, one which can inform us on the cultural and artistic continuity (or discontinuity) of this chronological span. This study can also provide the basis for future work focusing on regional trends and styles of bronze statuettes within the Roman Empire. Further details on the aim and methodology of this study are presented below.

¹⁴ For the most part, bronze statuettes from Greece and Asia Minor have been published only in excavation reports or briefly mentioned in museum catalogues, e.g. those from Delos, Kos, Corfu, Thessaloniki, Nikopolis, and in many provincial and major museums including the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, and the archaeological museums in Istanbul and Ankara.

¹⁵ A broader study incorporating finds from the entire Greek East would have been preferable; however, due to limitations of time, resources, and the complexities of gaining access to study the bronze statuettes in

Research on Greek and Roman Bronze Statuettes to the Present Day

The vast majority of bronze statuettes found in Greece were discovered in major sanctuaries – at Olympia, Delphi, Dodona, and on the Athenian Acropolis – and date predominantly to the Geometric to Archaic periods. The finds, in general, are well known; many were published in excavation reports¹⁶ and subsequently discussed in studies focusing primarily on questions of regional schools and styles.¹⁷ Various authors have also presented more comprehensive surveys on the subject, including Jean Charbonneaux, Claude Rolley and Renate Thomas,¹⁸ who confined their studies mainly to Greek bronze statuettes, and Karl Anton Neugebauer and Winifred Lamb,¹⁹ who also covered Roman statuettes. To varying degrees, all of the above present a combination of bronze statuettes with no known provenance along with a selection of bronzes from excavated contexts. R. Thomas, in particular, includes a large number of statuettes discovered through archaeological excavations and consequently presents an invaluable discussion on the function and significance of bronze statuettes. Although brief, the article by Beryl Barr Sharrar, entitled “The Private Use of Small Bronze Sculpture,” is excellent.²⁰ The author presents a review of the religious and secular functions of bronze statuettes and appliques from the Geometric to Roman times, focusing primarily on the Greek world but also incorporating material from the Roman provinces.

Turkish collections, particularly those in Istanbul (currently not on display), they are not included in this study.

¹⁶ Delphi V, i and V, ii; Olympia IV; Olynthus X, Isthmia VII, Thebes VI, Carapanos 1878 and Pernice 1909 (Dodona), Heilmeyer 1979 (Olympia) and Ridder 1896 (Athenian Acropolis).

¹⁷ E.g. Langlotz [1927] 1967; Charbonneaux 1962; Lamb 1969; Niemeyer 1964; Kaulen 1967; Thomas 1981; Langdon 1984; and Herfort-Koch 1986.

¹⁸ Charbonneaux 1962, Rolley 1986, and Thomas 1992.

¹⁹ Neugebauer 1921 and Lamb 1969.

²⁰ Barr Sharrar 1996.

Collections of bronze statuettes in Greek museums have been sporadically published, but the catalogues are now rather dated. The National Archaeological Museum in Athens, in spite of the numerous bronzes carried to foreign shores over the intervening centuries, has one of the preeminent collections of classical bronze statuettes. Information on the collection (which is infrequently on display), including the exact number and subjects depicted, is largely unavailable. In 1910, Valerios Staïs published a guide to the bronzes in the museum collection, which although brief is still of considerable interest. Remarkably, aside from an early publication on the bronzes from the Société Archéologique d'Athènes by Andre de Ridder,²¹ few other publications focusing on bronzes from Greek museum collections have appeared. A similar situation exists for the finds from Pompeii and Herculaneum. Many of the bronze statuettes from the cities buried by the eruption of Vesuvius have been only sporadically published, although a considerable amount of interest has been focused on *lararia* and the statuettes found within.²² A number of broader studies on the decorative programs of Pompeian villas and their gardens have appeared as well as publications focusing on the architecture and decoration of individual houses and villas. More comprehensive studies addressing the decorative program of Roman houses in general have been carried out by Paul Zanker, Eugene Dwyer, Richard Neudecker and Wolfgang Wohlmayr.²³ Landscaping and sculptural decoration of gardens have been intensively researched, most notably by Wilhemina Jashemski in her two-volume work entitled The Gardens of Pompeii,

²¹ Ridder 1894.

²² Important inventory lists on *lararia* contents have been published by Boyce (1937) and Fröhlich (1991), while more in-depth discussions on the function and character of *lararia* have been conducted by Foss (1994 and 1997), Orr (1972, 1978 and 1988) and Adamo-Muscettola (1984). For small bronzes found at Herculaneum, see Budetta and Pagano 1988. For *genius* and *lar* figures, see Kunckel 1974 and 1984 (a further study on *lares* is in preparation).

Herculaneum and the Villas Destroyed by Vesuvius, but also in a number of collective works.²⁴

Outside of Greece and Italy a considerable effort has been put forth to publish museum collections of Greek and Roman bronzes.²⁵ In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, some of the major European and eastern Mediterranean collections were extensively catalogued including that of the Bibliothèque National and Louvre in Paris, the British Museum, and the Antiquarium in Berlin.²⁶ Although most of these publications are roughly a century old, they continue to serve an important function in presenting a broad overview of a large portion of the Greek and Roman bronze statuettes known at the time of their publications. This is critical as many of these collections contain hundreds of bronzes, and consequently a large portion is not on view to museum visitors. Many of these catalogues do not provide drawings or photographs of the bronzes, and in many cases the descriptions are very brief. Additional work on many of these collections is necessary, not only to update current entries but also to publish the objects that have been acquired in the interim.

More recently, two major undertakings have significantly added to our understanding of classical bronzes: the biennial international bronze congresses and associated exhibitions²⁷ and the numerous publications of Roman and indigenous bronze

²³ Zanker 1979a and 1979b, Dwyer 1982, Neudecker 1988 and Wohlmayr 1989. See also the collected papers in Gazda 1991.

²⁴ MacDougall and Jashemski 1981, and Cima and La Rocca 1998.

²⁵ See Menzel 1985 for a discussion of the state of research on Roman bronze statuettes.

²⁶ Bibliothèque Nationale: Babelon and Blanchet 1895, Louvre: Ridder 1913-1915, British Museum: Walters 1899, and Staatliche Museen, Berlin: Neugebauer 1931-1951. Additionally, C. C. Edgar (1904) published the Greek bronzes in the collection of the Cairo Museum and P. Devambez (1937) published the large bronze statuary in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum.

²⁷ A list of the bronze congresses up until 1999 can be found in the acta of the 13th International Bronze Congress (From the Parts to the Whole, vol. 1, p. 10). The most recent meeting, the 16th International Congress, took place in Bucharest in May 2003 (Antique Bronzes).

statuettes in major European collections.²⁸ The bronze congresses, begun in 1970, have taken place in locations throughout Western and Eastern Europe (an exception being the Cambridge, Massachusetts congress in 1996), which naturally have encouraged the participation of numerous regional scholars as well as many international experts. Perhaps not unintentionally, as the venues changed, scholars have benefited immensely from the concentration on bronzes from local museums and collections, which otherwise might have remained unnoticed and unpublished. Congress organizers have also emphasized specific themes, and the informal gatherings have frequently roused lively discussions on such issues as distinguishing Hellenistic from Roman bronzes, the dating of Roman bronze statuettes as well as production and technology. A substantial number of Roman bronzes have been found outside of Italy and the publications, containing full descriptions and excellent photographs, add considerably to our knowledge of the depth and diversity of both Roman and indigenous bronzes found in the Roman provinces and on the periphery of the empire. Knowledge of Roman provincial bronzes has also improved due to a recent campaign to publish all ancient bronzes in German, Austrian, Swiss, Belgian and Luxembourg collections, which has been directed by the Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz.²⁹

Large numbers of bronze statuettes are also held in American collections and many have been published either in museum or exhibition catalogues. Gisela Richter published the bronzes in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, later appended by Joan Mertens,³⁰ and two other noted collections, in the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, were catalogued respectively by Dorothy Kent Hill

²⁸ For a complete list of European catalogues, see Menzel 1985.

²⁹ E.g. Kaufmann-Heinimann 1983 and 1994, and Menzel 1960, 1966, and 1986.

in 1949 and Mary Comstock and Cornelius Vermeule in 1971.³¹ One of the most important publications on classical bronzes is the exhibition catalogue Master Bronzes from the Classical World by David Mitten and Suzannah Doeringer.³² Assembling small bronzes from diverse sources, public and private, small and large, the organizers included all manner of bronze objects spanning a wide chronological and geographical spectrum.³³ Accompanying the exhibition was a symposium entitled Art and Technology: A Symposium on Classical Bronzes, which enhanced our understanding of bronze-making technologies in the ancient world.³⁴ An important chapter, “Techniques of Working Bronze,” therefore, was included in the Master Bronzes catalogue and addressed such topics as casting, joining, cold-working, surface decoration and patina. Additionally, the exhibition and catalogue, while not forgoing traditional discussions of style and artistic schools, focused more intently on questions regarding the production, consumption and functions of small bronzes, subjects which previously had been only of moderate interest among scholars. Although not as groundbreaking, a later exhibition, The Gods Delight, provided concise and up-to-date information on a number of well-known Greek, Etruscan and Roman bronzes and contributed insightful essays on the appearance and uses of small bronze sculpture in ancient societies.³⁵

³⁰ Richter 1915 and Mertens 1985.

³¹ Hill 1949 and Comstock and Vermeule 1971.

³² Mitten and Doeringer 1967. The exhibition was held in 1967 and 1968 at the Fogg Art Museum, the City Art Museum of Saint Louis and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

³³ According to the organizers, many of objects included in the exhibition came from lesser-known American collections and a majority was unpublished.

³⁴ Doeringer, Mitten and Steinberg 1970.

³⁵ Kozloff and Mitten 1988. The exhibition traveled from the Cleveland Art Museum to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the Museum of Fine Art, Boston. In honor of the exhibition, a symposium, entitled “Small Bronze Sculpture from the Ancient World,” was held at the J. Paul Getty Museum (Small Bronze Sculpture).

Though less numerous than small-scale bronzes, much attention has focused on the rare surviving works of monumental bronze sculpture. General studies have been published by Kurt Kluge and Karl Lehmann-Hartleben,³⁶ David Finn and Caroline Houser,³⁷ and, in conjunction with the 13th International Bronze Congress, an exhibit and catalogue on large classical bronzes was produced.³⁸ Given the material worth of bronze itself, large-scale bronze statuary has rarely escaped ancient and medieval melting pots, and it is mainly due to shipwrecks or other disasters that intact bronze sculptures have survived to the present day. Consequently, finds from sanctuaries have been less forthcoming and there are few site publications dedicated to large bronze statuary. The site of Olympia has produced a considerable number of bronze statue fragments, which have been published by Peter Bol,³⁹ and a volume of Fouilles des Delphes was dedicated to the Charioteer statue.⁴⁰ Much more common are publications focusing on individual or groups of large-scale bronzes,⁴¹ and particularly the finds from the Mahdia and Antikythera shipwrecks and the Riace and Piraeus bronzes.⁴²

Studies on bronze-working techniques, especially for large bronze sculpture, have also been forthcoming; recent studies have been produced by Peter Bol,⁴³ Christa

³⁶ Kluge and Lehmann-Hartleben 1927.

³⁷ Finn and Houser 1983 and Houser 1987.

³⁸ Mattusch 1996b.

³⁹ Bol 1978.

⁴⁰ Delphi IV, v.

⁴¹ Himmelmann 1989 (Terme bronzes); Heilmeyer 1996 (Salamis Youth); and Mattusch 1997 (Victorious Youth).

⁴² Aside from the finds from the Antikythera (Bol 1972) and Mahdia shipwrecks (Das Wrack), also found at sea were the Artemision God and the Riace warriors (Due bronzi da Riace, Wünsche 1977, Lombardi Satriani and Paoletti 1986 and Moreno 1998). The Piraeus bronzes were discovered in the remains of a storage room possibly burned during Sulla's attack in 86 BC (Palagia 1997). The equestrian portrait of Marcus Aurelius is a rare example of a bronze sculpture that survived centuries of public display relatively unscathed. It remained unmolested through the turbulent Middle Ages mainly because it was erroneously identified as the Emperor Constantine.

⁴³ Bol 1985.

Landwehr,⁴⁴ Denny Haynes,⁴⁵ and Carol Mattusch, who has written extensively on the subject.⁴⁶ Challenging contemporary views on originality, particularly in relation to ancient bronze statuary, Mattusch suggests that ancient artists and patrons did not distinguish between “original” and “copy” as modern viewers do today.⁴⁷ Rather, bronze sculptures, although based on a primary model (i.e. the original wax or clay model) and repeatedly produced, were often made in response to the specific needs of the patron and could be altered accordingly often in subtle and varied ways. Interestingly, Mattusch comments that this process of manufacturing sculptural works in series had existed as early as the 9th century BC with the production of small-scale bronzes.⁴⁸ One wonders how many other innovations were passed from artists working in the minor arts to those who specialized in the production of large-scale paintings and sculpture.

Over the last thirty years scholars also have increasingly researched bronze-making technologies for small-scale bronzes. Some of the earliest scholars to have addressed this issue include Campbell Edgar,⁴⁹ Erich Pernice,⁵⁰ and Dorothy Kent Hill.⁵¹ More recently, Eric Poulsen and Michael Maaß, have examined serial production of bronzes, although with an emphasis on Roman bronze statuettes.⁵² Information on the use of decorative effects, notably gilding, patination and the application of gold and silver

⁴⁴ Landwehr 1985.

⁴⁵ Haynes 1992.

⁴⁶ Mattusch 1988 and 1996a. For research on ancient bronze foundries, see Heilmeyer 1969 (Olympia) and 1981, Mattusch 1977a (Athens), 1977b, and 1991 (Corinth); and Zimmer 1990.

⁴⁷ Mattusch 1996a, Chapter 5 “A Greek Bronze Original?”

⁴⁸ Mattusch 1996a, p. 149.

⁴⁹ Edgar 1903.

⁵⁰ Pernice 1904.

⁵¹ “An Egypto-Roman Sculptural Type and Mass Production of Bronze Statuettes” (Hill 1958) and “Note on the Piercing of Bronze Statuettes” (Hill 1982). For a general discussion of bronze working, see Hill 1969.

⁵² Poulsen 1977 and 1984, and Maaß 1984. See also Leibundgut 1984.

inlay, has also become more prevalent, as well as studies on metal analysis.⁵³ Already mentioned was the Art and Technology symposium,⁵⁴ held in conjunction with the Master Bronzes from the Classical World exhibit, and numerous studies have been presented at and published in the proceedings of the biennial international bronze congresses.⁵⁵

While a number of scholars and scientists focus ever more intently on the bronze statuettes themselves, two noted scholars, Stephanie Boucher and Anne-Marie Kaufmann-Heinimann, have carried out studies that look beyond the objects in an effort to gain a fuller understanding of the relationship between bronze statuettes and the cultural setting in which they were found. Boucher's exhaustive study concerns the pre-Roman and Roman bronze statuettes found in France.⁵⁶ Dividing each group of objects into indigenous and imported bronzes, she carefully locates the known findspots of a number of well-known types and demonstrates clearly that a considerable number of statuettes previously identified as Hellenistic, Italic or even Egyptian in origin were undoubtedly produced in Gaul. In addition to highlighting the vibrant and creative nature of local workshops, which she proceeds to locate, Boucher addresses a number of other problems including dating, fabrication, serial production and later copies.

In her study on the bronze figurines from the Roman settlement of Augusta Raurica, Anne-Marie Kaufmann-Heinimann also addresses the question of Roman and

⁵³ Articles and further references can be found in Doeringer, Mitten and Steinberg 1970, Born 1985, Bol 1985, and in the collection of papers Small Bronze Sculpture From the Ancient World (Small Bronze Sculpture).

⁵⁴ Doeringer, Mitten and Steinberg 1970.

⁵⁵ See especially the acta from the 1978 meeting in Lausanne (Bronzes hellénistiques et romains), the 1980 meeting in Berlin (Toreutik und figürliche Bronzen), the 1982 meeting in Székesfehérvár (Bronzes romains figurés), the 1996 meeting in Cambridge, MA (From the Parts to the Whole), and the 2001 meeting in Grado and Aquileia (I Bronzi Antichi).

⁵⁶ Boucher 1976.

indigenous bronzes. As suited to the nature of the finds, she concentrates on the contexts where the statuettes were found, namely official (i.e. public) buildings and residential quarters.⁵⁷ She distinguishes between statuettes that once occupied *lararia* and those that served as votives in sanctuaries either by findspot, or in the case of secondary deposits, by the types of objects found with the statuettes (e.g. cult instruments) or the presence of votive inscriptions. The large number of finds from Augusta Raurica allows Kaufmann-Heinimann to make comparative studies with bronze statuettes found elsewhere in the Roman Empire. Overall, she notes a large degree of conformity between the *lararia* contents from Gaul/Germania and Campagna, principally the overwhelming presence of Roman deities with the exception of *lares*.⁵⁸ Yet, in public sanctuaries, a larger percentage of bronze statuettes found represent local deities indicating that some indigenous religious practices still held sway.

Similar research that focuses on the use and appearance of works of art, particularly in relation to the contexts in which they were found, has been carried out by Vernon Harward, Martin Kreeb, and Brita Alroth.⁵⁹ Both Harward and Kreeb examine works of art found in Greek houses: Kreeb concentrates on Delian houses,⁶⁰ while Harward examines a broader selection in an effort to discern the function (decorative or cultic) of sculpture in the private sphere.⁶¹ As early as the fourth century BC and up until the late Hellenistic period, Harward argues strongly for the religious role of

⁵⁷ Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998.

⁵⁸ Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, pp. 182-198, and pp. 319-320.

⁵⁹ Harward 1982, Alroth 1989 and Kreeb 1984 and 1988. See also two articles by Barr Sharrar: "The Hellenistic House," (1988) and "The Private Use of Small Bronze Sculpture" (1996), as well as an article by Kunze, "Die Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Päläste" (1996). Although mainly concerned with Roman trends of artistic production and display, E. Bartman provides an excellent overview of the manufacture, display and function of small terracotta, marble and bronze statuettes in the Late Hellenistic and Roman worlds (1991 and 1992).

⁶⁰ Kreeb 1984 and 1988.

sculpture on display in Greek houses. In addition to an extensive review of ancient attitudes towards decoration gleaned from literary sources, he provides a valuable listing of the marble and the even scarcer number of bronze sculpture found in domestic contexts. He discusses the plentiful array of terracotta figurines found in Greek houses only briefly, but does admit that they likely served a decorative function.⁶² In his examination of the decorative aspects of Hellenistic houses on Delos, Kreeb similarly elucidates the religious role of a number of sculptures, mainly through the presence of votive inscriptions or accompanying altars, but acknowledges more readily an increasing decorative function.⁶³ In contrast, many scholars who have investigated the appearance of terracottas in fourth-century and Hellenistic houses support the notion that such works were predominately decorative.⁶⁴ The discrepancies between these two views – that the more expensive marble and bronze sculpture held a nobler function (cultic) while terracottas were simply decorative – is intriguing and warrants further scrutiny.

Not surprisingly, the growing trend towards more spacious and luxuriously appointed houses and villas in fourth-century and Hellenistic Greece and the concurrent interest in individual pursuits have been the focus of a considerable amount of recent research.⁶⁵ By comparison, scholarly inquiries into public religious practices of the same period, principally the offering of votives, have waned. This simply may be a response

⁶¹ Harward 1982.

⁶² Harward 1982, pp. 51-56.

⁶³ Sculptures with votive inscriptions and altars: Kreeb 1984, pp. 320-329, Kreeb 1988, pp. 63-67; for possible decorative uses, Kreeb 1988, pp. 67-69.

⁶⁴ In *The Coroplast's Art*, see in particular Reeder (pp. 86-87) and Uhlenbrock (pp. 77-78); also Raeder 1984, p. 22 and *Olynthus* XIV, pp. 64-65.

⁶⁵ The increasing grandiose and decorative nature of Late Classical and Hellenistic houses has been amply illustrated by Heermann 1980, Barr Sharrar 1988, Reeder 1988, Walter-Karydi 1994, Kutbay 1998 and Westgate 2000. At approximately the same period, there was an increasing importance placed on individual, i.e. private, activities and on the special character of individuals themselves as demonstrated by the growing interest in portraiture, particularly of the living (Pollitt 1986, pp. 7-10).

by scholars whose interests have naturally focused on one of the most dynamic trends in fourth-century and Hellenistic Greece – the rise of the individual. Devotion to public cults continued, although there apparently was a change in devotional attitudes and, in many locations, a decrease in activity.⁶⁶ On this subject it is worthwhile to look to the work of Alroth to gain a fuller understanding of the use of votive figurines during this period.⁶⁷ Her principal study, Greek Gods and Figurines: Aspects of the Anthropomorphic Dedications, focuses on the votive figurines found at some of the major Greek sanctuaries dating from the Geometric to the Late Classical period.⁶⁸ She addresses two major questions: one, to what degree did the cult image influence the appearance of votive figurines and two, is there any relationship between the identity of the major deity at a specific sanctuary and whether or not he/she received more or less figurines representing “visiting” deities (i.e. votives depicting a deity not specifically honored at the shrine or sanctuary). While these issues are of considerable interest, her study is also invaluable in that it provides a broad survey of the number and variety of votives found at some of Greece’s major sanctuaries. Two additional articles, “The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines” and “Changes in Votive Practice? From Classical to Hellenistic,” have further contributed to our understanding of votive behavior in Greece and are of considerable interest to my own study.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Alcock 1994 and Miller Ammerman 1990.

⁶⁷ Alroth (1987 and 1989) covers votive statuettes made from various materials, commonly terracotta, bronze, and ivory. Miller Ammerman (1990) also has researched this subject, but her study is confined to terracotta figurines.

⁶⁸ Alroth 1989.

⁶⁹ Alroth 1988 and 1998. A more in-depth review of these two articles can be found in Chapter 4.

Focus of This Study

As indicated above, there has been a long and intensive history of research on Geometric, Archaic and Classical bronze statuettes found in Greece. In contrast, Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronzes found in Greece have rarely been addressed in any sort of comprehensive fashion. A number of individual finds are relatively well known, such as the Poseidon from Pella (cat. no. 4), the Herakles Herm from Delos (cat. no. 7), and the Antikythera bronzes (cat. nos. 86-90), as well as a handful of bronzes found at some of the major sanctuaries;⁷⁰ however, many more Greek bronzes from the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods need to be more thoroughly published and in numerous cases looked at anew. Work on the bronze finds from the Athenian Agora is currently under way, as is the publication of the post-Geometric bronzes from Olympia.⁷¹ As the bronze finds from Delphi were republished by Rolley in 1969, the bronze statuettes from Dodona should be re-examined as they were only sporadically published approximately one hundred years ago.⁷² Furthermore, the statuettes from Paramythia, one of the most important collections of later bronzes found in Greece, warrant additional investigations,⁷³ and the final publication of the hoard of bronze statuettes discovered in the Athenian district of Ambelokipi by Pepi Krystalli-Votsi is anxiously awaited.⁷⁴ In

⁷⁰ Apollo or Dionysos from Delphi (cat no. 64), and the Warrior (cat no. 106) and Poseidon attributed to Dodona (Thomas 1992, p. 110, fig. 105).

⁷¹ Neda Leipen is currently working on the metal finds from the Athenian Agora and Ulrich Sinn is responsible for publishing the post-Geometric bronzes from Olympia.

⁷² The Dodona material was initially published by Carapanos in 1878 and 1890. In 1909, Pernice published the bronze statuettes attributed to Dodona held in the former Königlichen Museum in Berlin.

Subsequently, both Greifenhagen (1981) and Walter-Karydi (1981) have reanalyzed the Dodona material but on a somewhat limited scale.

⁷³ Walters 1899, nos. 272, 274-279. Originally it was assumed that they were Hellenistic in date and originated from a sanctuary. In a brief paper published in 1979, J. Swaddling presented new findings on the Paramythia bronzes demonstrating clearly that they are in fact Roman, most likely Hadrianic, and came from a *lararium*.

⁷⁴ A preliminary report on some of the statuettes was presented by P. Krystalli-Votsi (1995) at the Nijmegen bronze conference.

recent years the number of Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronze statuettes found in Greece has increased, and the corpus should be examined in order to address still unresolved questions regarding their use, character and appearance.

This study focuses on bronze statuettes that measure no more than half life-size. Most range between ten and twenty-five centimeters, although a number of statuettes, from hoards and shipwrecks, are as tall as fifty and sixty centimeters. They span a wide chronological spectrum, from the fourth century BC to the third century AC, yet this extensive period is warranted for a number of reasons. Due to their stylistic and iconographical similarities, distinguishing between Hellenistic and Greek Imperial statuettes has long been a difficult task, and therefore they have traditionally been studied together. Secondly, and more importantly, the stark distinction between Hellenistic and Imperial Greek bronzes is largely artificial. Although establishing when a work of art was created remains an important task to art historians and archaeologists, particularly when attempting to connect its creation with a distinct historical event or personage, in Greece there was no great cultural divide between the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. The establishment of Roman rule undoubtedly had an effect, yet the depth and breadth of Roman cultural influence on native Greeks is still in question.⁷⁵ Lastly, this broad survey allows for a fuller discussion of the changing nature and function of bronzes in a country where previously they played such an important role. Much is known of the use and appearance of earlier bronze statuettes and it is only fitting that the “history” of bronze statuettes in Greece be extended beyond the Classical period.

⁷⁵ Studies on the Romanization of Athens and of Greece may be found in Hoff and Rotroff 1997 and Alcock 1993.

For practical reasons, only bronze statuettes found within the borders of modern Greece have been included. Information on many of these was gathered from site publications as well as articles and books dealing with small bronzes. A large percentage of the bronze statuettes in this study has yet to be formally published, although they have been listed in preliminary archaeological reports, including Archaiologikon Deltion, Bulletin de correspondance hellénique and Archaeological Reports. A rare few have not been published in any form whatsoever, but are on display in various Greek museums. The majority of examples has been found on the mainland, although a number of statuettes from the islands also have been included.⁷⁶

As the title of this dissertation implies, I have made a concerted effort to locate and discuss bronze statuettes found *in situ*, and the material is examined according to the contexts in which they were found. Thus, for many of these objects, not only can the date of deposit be deduced, but information on the function of the bronze statuette also can be obtained. In the following chapter (Chapter 2), the small number of bronze statuettes found in Hellenistic domestic contexts is discussed. Prior to the fourth century BC, bronze statuettes have not been found in Greek domestic contexts, but during the following four centuries, from the fourth to the first century BC, the use of bronze statuettes in the Greek world would undergo a considerable change. Whereas previously they were mainly restricted in use as votives and deposited at public shrines and sanctuaries, by the Late Hellenistic period marble, terracotta and bronze sculpture was

⁷⁶ The Herakles Herm from Delos (cat. no. 7), Zeus from Rhodes (cat. no. 79), Herm from Thasos (cat. no. 80) and two groups from Kos (cat nos. 8-16). A small number have been found on or off the coast of Crete but will not be discussed here. These include bronze statuettes found in the sea near Aghia Galini: a youthful Mars, seated Hermes, Eros, Venus, Victoria and a bust of Isis-Fortuna (see Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, p. 305, fig. 272); a Hermes from Katô Symi [BCH 97 (1973), p. 398, fig. 322]; and a Herakles from the Kidonian Spring [ArchDelt 16 (1960), p. 271, pl. 234].

frequently found in houses serving both decorative and cult needs.⁷⁷ The appearance of bronze statuettes in private households does coincide with an increase in the luxuriousness of domestic decoration as well as a growing trend towards private religious practices, and thus their exact role – decorative or cultic – is often difficult to determine.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to bronze statuettes that date to the Greek Imperial period. They are considerably more numerous than those from the Hellenistic period, however, only a portion were actually discovered in the remains of a house or villa. Due to violent upheavals in the third century AC, many bronzes were deposited in hoards or lost in destruction debris, but the types of statuettes found and the general character of the assemblages suggest that they came from domestic contexts. Some similarities may be drawn to Roman bronze statuettes found in Italy and in the northern provinces; both in the Imperial Greek East and Latin West, it is clear that bronze statuettes were used in the service of the household cult.⁷⁸ But were there any close parallels, particularly during the Greek Imperial period, between these two regions in the use of bronze statuettes in domestic religious practices? I intend to address what if any continuity exists between Hellenistic and Greek Imperial household cult practices involving the use of bronze statuettes. Did Greek inhabitants adopt any Roman religious practices or was there still a preference for local Greek cults and practices? Another issue dealt with in Chapter 3 is the question of the decorative use of bronze statuettes. This may be defined as statuettes that were not primarily cultic in function but, judging from the subject portrayed or the

⁷⁷ This has been most clearly demonstrated by Kreeb (1988) in his study of the sculptural decoration of Delian houses. The decorative aspects of houses at Priene have also been elucidated by Wiegand and Schraeder (1904) and Raeder (1984). No free-standing bronze statuettes were found among the household contents at Priene.

⁷⁸ The publications by D.G. Orr and P. Foss are particularly informative on *lararia*. M. Nilsson's article "Roman and Greek Domestic Cult" (1954) is also very instructive.

context in which they were found, were celebrated more for their aesthetic or cultural value. It is well known that Hellenistic rulers and the elite often collected and displayed Greek works of art including replicas and freehand copies in their palaces and homes.⁷⁹ The fashion for opulently decorated houses was soon adopted by Romans who were astonished by the quantities of luxurious goods that flooded into Rome after military conquests in the east.⁸⁰ In Greece, the decorative display of sculpture continued and even accelerated in the Greek Imperial period, and there is strong evidence that bronze statuettes, of fairly large size and opulence, became equally desirable for their decorative properties.

Bronze statuettes found in religious contexts are covered in Chapter 4. Examples from major sanctuaries are discussed alongside finds from smaller provincial shrines. Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronze statuettes are examined together due to the difficulties of distinguishing the two groups as they were often found in votive deposits jumbled together. The number of votive bronzes dating to the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial period is miniscule compared to the vast quantities of Geometric, Archaic and Classical examples, and the decline occurred at approximately the same time that bronzes were increasingly found in Hellenistic and Greek Imperial domestic contexts. Noticeable as well is a diminishment in the originality and quality of votive bronzes. Exactly when,

⁷⁹ Both Pliny and Pausanias specifically mention the interest of Attalid kings in collecting famous works of art from earlier eras. Pliny mentions that a painting of Ajax by Apollodorus of Athens could be found at Pergamon (HN 35, 60) and that King Attalus (II) desired to buy a painting of Dionysus by Aristides (HN 35, 24). Pausanias refers to a bronze statue of Apollo by Onatos acquired by the Pergamenes (Paus. VIII, 42, 7) and a sculpture of the Graces by Bupalos on display in the *thalamus* of Attalus (Paus. IX, 35, 6). Aside from the Attalids, Pliny also reveals that a King Nikomedes desired to buy an Aphrodite by Praxiteles (HN 36, 22).

⁸⁰ Polybius (9, 10, 13) informs us that some of the works of art looted from houses in Syracuse ended up in Roman private collections. On this subject, see the study by Pape (1975) on the seizure of Greek works of art as war booty. Other studies on the subject have been conducted by Vermeule 1977, Pollitt 1978, Neudecker 1988, Isager 1993, and Hölscher 1994.

how and why these changes occurred has yet to be adequately explained. So too is the relationship, if any, between these various developments.

Chapter 5 consists of a brief discussion of bronze-making technologies for statuettes. In recent years, lost-wax casting for both large and small-scale bronzes has received much attention and therefore comments are mainly restricted to observations made from analyses of the bronzes included in this study. Bronze casting is briefly reviewed, but more consideration is given to issues of assembly, mounting, bases, gilding and inlay, which are less frequently covered in the literature on classical bronze sculpture.

While I have attempted to focus on bronze statuettes from primary and even secondary contexts, information on the archaeological setting from which they came has not always been forthcoming. Many excavations that took place decades ago were rarely conducted with any great concern for recording detailed or even general information regarding the original disposition of the artifacts. In other cases, excavation records may no longer be available. In the catalogue section of this dissertation, statuettes found in domestic and religious contexts are separately listed, as well as those from indeterminate contexts (where the known context reveals little regarding the origin of the statuette) and unknown contexts (vague or imprecise information regarding where the statuette was found). The last two categories are included in order to provide a fuller understanding of the iconographical and stylistic range of statuettes found in Greece and in a few cases may be used as comparative material.

Prior to the fourth century BC, bronze statuettes were essentially restricted to use as votives and were predominantly found at public shrines and sanctuaries. In the

following centuries, however, the function of bronze statuettes in Greek society was radically transformed. With changing attitudes towards the role of bronze statuettes in Hellenistic and Imperial Greek societies – from votive offering to private cult image to household decoration – the statuettes not only were increasingly in demand but there was also a noticeable emphasis on their decorative qualities. The mass production of bronzes was not unique to post-Classical Greece, but bronze-makers became increasingly adept at producing statuettes in series and often utilized techniques such as piece-molds and separately cast appendages in order to satisfy increased demand both in Greece and abroad. Towards the latter part of the Hellenistic period, the use of silver and copper inlay to highlight physical features and enhance dress was utilized more often, and delicately crafted bronze bases were regularly used. In contrast, the decrease in their use as votive offerings at public sanctuaries is marked by a comparable decline in the quality of the objects themselves. In this study, careful analysis of the context, function and meaning of bronze statuettes has revealed that beginning in the Hellenistic period and extending into the Greek Imperial period the use and appearance of bronze statuettes had undergone a tremendous change. A greater variety and quantity of bronzes were being produced in Greece in order to meet the complex religious, social, economic and cultural needs of its inhabitants

CHAPTER 2

Bronze Statuettes from Fourth-Century and Hellenistic Domestic Contexts

Greek literature clearly indicates that by the end of the fifth century BC sculpture serving distinct religious needs could be found in Greek houses.¹ Most frequently cited, not unusually, are herms,² but Hekate, who was also concerned with domestic activities, is often mentioned as well.³ Yet, aside from some terracotta figurines, we have few material finds from the Classical period to support this literary evidence. By the fourth century, archaeological finds from houses at Olynthus, notably small lead herms and terracotta statuettes of Hermes and Cybele, provide some of the earliest tangible corroboration in support of this religious use.⁴ By the end of the Hellenistic period, the inhabitants of Delos and Priene were filling their houses with small and large sculptural works of marble, terracotta and bronze, which served a multitude of purposes: cultic, votive and decorative.⁵ The expansion beyond sculpture's traditional religious role and setting to include a non-religious or decorative use is intriguing and, not surprisingly,

¹ For a review of the evidence, see Harward 1982, pp. 24-32; and Kunze 1996, pp. 111-112. For herms: Rückert 1998, pp. 176-184 and Wrede 1985, pp. 49-50.

² See in particular Thucydides (6.7) on the mutilation of herms located in temples and at the entryways of private houses and Athenaeus (Ath. 11, 460e) citing Eubulus who mentions stone Hermes on display in sideboards. For Timaeus' story of Xenocrates crowning a herm in the courtyard of Dionysius, see Ath. 10, 437b.

³ Ar. *Vesp.* 799-804 and Lys. 64 (references to shrines of Hekate). For Hekate figures found in the Agora, of which some are believed to come from houses, see *Agora* XI, p. 96. Other deities are occasionally mentioned, e.g. Hephaistos, Apollo and Aphrodite, but oftentimes it is unclear whether a cult image was present or merely a shrine and/or altar (see Kunze 1996, p. 111).

⁴ From House B VI 7 came a marble statuette of Asklepios (*Olynthus* XII, pp. 130-137, pls. 115, 116, 118, 119). A single lead herm figure and five small double herms, possibly representing Priapos (or Hermes) and Aphrodite, were found in a number of houses (*Olynthus* X, pp. 6-14, pls. II-III). Terracotta figurines were more abundant and include numerous female masks, unidentified standing and seated female figures, and representations of Hermes and Cybele (*Olynthus* XIV, p. 64).

ardently debated. The question is especially challenging for today's scholars of Classical Greek art who predominately study sculpture with the understanding that it fulfilled a distinct public need – either as a visual manifestation of religious devotion or in the service of one or another of society's needs, e.g. honorific or sepulchral – rather than as an object whose main purpose was private decoration.⁶ A review of the bronze statuettes from dated domestic contexts may lend insight into the debate on the cultic and decorative function of domestic sculpture.

In the study of fourth-century and Hellenistic bronze statuettes, determining the reason, or reasons, behind their sudden appearance in the home is often complicated by literary evidence that specifically refers to a famous bronze statuette made for a fourth-century domestic context – the Herakles Epitrapezios. The story of the statuette is transmitted to us by two Roman poets, Martial and Statius, both active during the Flavian period, who tantalize us with a tale of Lysippos creating a small bronze figure of Herakles for Alexander the Great. Statius specifically refers to it as a “Herakles Epitrapezios” and states that the statuette measured no taller than one Roman foot (29.6 cm),⁷ while Martial provides a fuller description:

He that sits on hard rocks made softer by an outspread lion skin, a great god in a small piece of bronze, and with upturned face watches the stars he bore, whose left hand is busy with a club, his right hand with wine; he is no recent fame, nor the glory of a Roman chisel; you see the noble gift of Lysippus. The table of the tyrant of Pella, him who lies low in the world he so swiftly subdued...⁸

⁵ Kreeb 1988, pp. 67-69 and Raeder 1984. Harward (1982, pp. 101-102) supports a religious role for sculpture in the Classical period, but admits that by the end of the fourth century BC "the distinction between the decorative and the religious had begun to blur."

⁶ This is an interesting contrast to traditional scholarship with its emphasis on connoisseurship, which tended to judge classical art on its formal and aesthetic qualities with little regard to its role and status in Greek and Roman society.

⁷ Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.

⁸ Mart. *Epigr.* 9.43-44.

Anyone familiar with this story is equally aware of its controversy. The circumstances of the conversations, which find the two writers heaping praise upon their patron Novius Vindex, the owner of the statuette, by way of emphasizing the long and noble lineage of the work, immediately calls the veracity of the story into question.⁹ Recently, Brunilde Ridgway has questioned the attribution of the original to Lysippos claiming that most of the copies, both in style and attitude, are more appropriate to an original Roman context and thus the work is more likely a Roman fabrication.¹⁰ On the other hand, most scholars do accept the Lysippan attribution, yet also agree that the bronze statuette owned by Vindex could not have been the original by Lysippos.¹¹ Numerous examples of a seated Herakles fitting the above description survive; however, the origin of the type and the circumstances under which it was made remain in question. Much of the debate regarding the true appearance of the original focuses primarily on the interpretation of the term “epitrapezios,” which can be translated as “on the table” or “at the table.”¹²

A comprehensive discussion of this contentious issue is not pertinent here. Nevertheless, it does provide the means to introduce the questions of exactly when do bronze statuettes make their appearance in domestic contexts and to what purpose. The story of the Herakles Epitrapezios of Lysippos is beguiling and should be mentioned with

⁹ Bartman 1992, pp. 148-149. The statuette is said to have been owned by Alexander the Great, Hannibal, and Sulla before being acquired by Novius Vindex.

¹⁰ Ridgway 1997, pp. 294-304.

¹¹ For a recent discussion of the Lysippan attribution, see Ridgway 1997, pp. 294-296.

¹² One argument on the appearance of the Lysippan sculpture involves its true size. Lysippos was known to have made large-scale sculptures, prompting a few scholars to postulate that a large or colossal statue existed first with the smaller version made afterwards. A related debate surrounding the term epitrapezios concerns whether or not Herakles is depicted in the act of dining. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta does not doubt that Lysippos made a statuette of Herakles Epitrapezios, yet asserts that since the Greeks reclined while banqueting, Lysippos' version would have shown Herakles reclining and not seated (Zadoks-Josephus Jitta 1987, pp. 97-98).

a note of caution. It is too easily used as proof that as early as the fourth century the Greeks were filling their homes with works of art, in much the same manner as the Romans.¹³ On the one hand, this has caused some scholars, for example Ridgway as noted above, to reject the story of the Lysippan Herakles Epitrapezios as apocryphal. On the other hand, the seemingly decorative nature of the statuette implied in the passage above has prompted a few others to demonstrate that the statuette, in actuality, had a religious function more in keeping with the traditional use of Greek sculpture.¹⁴ Ravaisson would associate it with the ritual of offering salt to gods at mealtime,¹⁵ while Picard has tried to associate Herakles with small images of the Phoenician god Melkart, which Alexander might have seen in Tyre in 332 BC.¹⁶ Regardless, by the fourth century BC there is both literary and archaeological evidence for the presence of sculpture in domestic contexts that primarily served a religious purpose.¹⁷ In the following discussion, attention will be given to whether bronze statuettes were also utilized for Greek domestic religious practices, of which we have only a limited amount of information gathered from classical literature and archaeological and epigraphical evidence. Finally, an attempt will be made to determine more precisely when bronze statuettes began to be favored more for their decorative properties than for their cultic function.

¹³ See for example, Thomas 1992, p. 32, and p. 121.

¹⁴ For a discussion of this debate, see Bartman 1992, pp. 147-171.

¹⁵ Ravaisson 1885, p. 29-50, and 65-76.

¹⁶ Picard 1911, pp. 257-270.

¹⁷ For a review of the literary and archaeological evidence in general, see Harward 1982, pp. 7-56; Kreeb 1988, pp. 87-93; and Kunze 1996, pp. 111-112. For herms: Rückert 1998, 176-184 and Wrede 1985, pp. 49-50. The earliest archaeological evidence for marble statuary comes from Olynthus (Olynthus XII, pp. 130-137), although Williams has published some shrines from Corinth, including one from the Late

This expansion in contexts, from sanctuary to house, and in use, from religious to decorative, is especially startling when compared with the tremendous number of bronze figurines from the Geometric, Archaic and Classical periods. They have been excavated from numerous sanctuaries and shrines, at Athens, Delphi, Olympia and Samos, indicating that they were used primarily as votives; they have not been found in domestic or funerary contexts.¹⁸ It is only during the fourth century BC and Hellenistic period that we finally see some evidence of bronze statuettes on display among the household furnishings. Exactly when this shift occurred and the reasons behind it still have yet to be established. While it is generally assumed that by the first century BC the inhabitants of Delos were displaying sculpture, paintings and mosaics primarily for their decorative properties,¹⁹ some scholars would like to push the date back even earlier to the fifth or fourth century BC.²⁰ Such assumptions have been difficult to prove, for in contrast to the abundance of sculpture preserved from Delian houses of the first century BC and the Roman houses and villas buried during the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 79 AD, sculptural finds from early Hellenistic houses in the Greek world have been both disappointingly slim and inadequately published.²¹

Classical “Terracotta Factory,” which he interprets as a house. Table supports and an altar were found, no sculpture, but Williams assumes two cult images were present (Williams 1981, pp. 418-421).

¹⁸ The rarity of bronze anthropomorphic figurines found in graves is perplexing. Bronze mirrors were not uncommon grave goods and therefore it cannot be a question of the expense of the material. Terracotta statuettes, often viewed as cheap alternatives to bronze statuettes, were popular and their presence, either as part of a funerary ritual or on account of being a favored personal possession, would not seem to rule out the use of bronze figurines. There are a few instances of bronze statuettes found in burial contexts, yet they are limited to areas beyond the borders of the Classical Greek world. For a fuller discussion of this subject, see the Appendix.

¹⁹ Kreeb 1988, pp. 67-68; Bartman 1992, p. 47; Webster 1995, p. 67.

²⁰ Ridgway 1971, p. 337 and p. 352 and Himmelmann 1979, pp. 127-142. For terracottas refer to Olynthus XIV, pp. 63-64.

²¹ Notable exceptions are Olynthus and Eretria.

In spite of the lack of archaeological evidence, one trend that supports the early introduction of decorative sculpture in fourth-century Greek houses is the general increase in opulent decor especially the ornamentation of private dining chambers.²² Since it was the andron that first exhibited this new taste for rich adornment, it has been proposed that private citizens sought to emulate the elaborate decoration of civic buildings, especially dining halls.²³ One of the best known examples is the Pompeion in Athens built c. 400 BC. With its peristyle colonnade and multiple dining chambers, some of which, if not all, decorated with pebble mosaics, it must have been an impressive sight.²⁴ According to Elena Walter-Karydi, the Pompeion and other similar buildings were well known for their splendid interior spaces and likely inspired the creation of the peristyle house, which appeared as early as the beginning of the fourth century BC.²⁵ She adds that while the House of the Mosaics at Eretria is perhaps the best known example, well-appointed peristyle houses are also evident in Athens in the fourth century BC.²⁶ Outside of Athens, the movement towards more ornate surroundings in private houses was in effect perhaps as early as the fifth century BC. In the pasta houses of

²² Demosthenes, in his *Third Olynthiac* (25-29), rebukes his fellow statesmen for their sumptuous houses.

²³ On this subject see Walter-Karydi, 1994, p. 12, Barr Sharrar 1988, p. 60 and Barr Sharrar 1996, p. 108.

²⁴ The building was extensively published by Hoepfner in *Kerameikos X*. It was remodeled c. 90 BC and therefore little is known of its earlier wall decoration. Early evidence of wall painting in Athens has been discussed by Bruno (1969, pp. 316-317) in his article on Masonry Style painting. He notes that fragments of painted and stuccoed wall decoration were found in the Athenian Agora under the north part of the Stoa of Attalos. In a letter to Bruno, Homer A. Thompson stated that they likely belonged to an earlier complex inhabiting that area, which could be dated to two separate phases, the late fifth and mid-fourth century BC. The fill in which they were found has a *terminus ante quem* of the last quarter of the fourth century BC.

²⁵ Walter-Karydi 1994, p. 12, and Walter-Karydi 1996, p. 56. In contrast, J.W. Graham sees the appearance of peristyle houses as a development from the pastas house form (Graham 1966).

²⁶ Walter-Karydi 1994, p. 26. Peristyle houses have been found near the city wall and were more evident outside the crowded city center, although a late fourth century BC peristyle house has been found on the northeast slope of the Areopagus (Walter-Karydi 1994, fig. 19). Portions of an andron with a mosaic floor have also been found in Athens, possibly dating to the early fourth century BC (Walter-Karydi 1994, p. 27, figs. 17-18).

Olythus, androns were decorated with polychrome wall paintings and pebble mosaics, and numerous terracottas, including masks and figurines, were on display there as well as in other areas of the house. Often, the works of art depict subjects that can be associated with the feasting activities that normally took place in the andron.

The growing popularity of elaborately decorated houses, in particular with collecting and displaying works of art, was probably accelerated as well by a desire to emulate the opulent palaces of Hellenistic rulers.²⁷ The Attalids are well known for their interest in collecting both contemporary and “antique” works of art. Pliny mentions that a painting of Ajax by Apollodorus of Athens could be found at Pergamon and that King Attalus (II) desired to buy a painting of Dionysus by Aristides.²⁸ Pausanias refers to a bronze statue of Apollo acquired by the Pergamenes from the island of Aegina and mentions a sculptural group of the Graces by Bupalos on display in the *thalamus* of Attalus.²⁹ According to Pliny, King Nikomedes of Bithynia also sought to collect famous works of art and expressed a particular wish to acquire an Aphrodite by Praxiteles.³⁰ While some may interpret this collecting activity as simply a desire to accumulate famous works of art, and to a degree this must have played a part as many of the works mentioned are by famous artists, the sculptures and paintings may have continued to serve a religious function in their new settings. There is archaeological and literary evidence of cult rooms in many of the Hellenistic palaces. In the northeast corner of Palace V at Pergamon there is evidence of a private cult room, which, based on the

²⁷ Bartman 1992, p. 37. Bartman proposes that art collecting among private citizens began by the 2nd century BC.

²⁸ Pliny HN 35, 60 and 35, 24.

²⁹ Paus. VIII, 42, 7 and IX, 35, 6.

³⁰ Pliny HN 36, 22.

painted and relief decoration, was likely dedicated to Dionysos or even to the king as the “new Dionysos.”³¹ Cult rooms may be distinguished as well at Vergina and Pella, and although the deities to whom they were dedicated remain unclear, there is some evidence to suggest that they were dedicated respectively to Herakles Patroos and the ruler cult.³² Athenaeus provides additional information on Hellenistic rulers and the deities they honored, including Ptolemy Philapator who had a dining chamber dedicated to Dionysos and a shrine to Aphrodite, both of which were located on the *thalamegos* or royal pleasure barge.³³ Hieron, the king of Syracuse, also had a shrine on his personal ship dedicated to Aphrodite said to have been large enough for three couches.³⁴ The association of these two deities with dining, in particular with the symposium, is strongly echoed in the decoration of dining chambers both in Priene and on Delos. Both Dionysos and Aphrodite have traditional associations with symposia and therefore it should not be imagined that it was in the palaces of the Hellenistic kings that the connection was initially made. Yet, perhaps these associations were made increasingly obvious with the extravagantly decorated dining chambers in Hellenistic palaces, which in turn prompted private citizens to decorate their dining chambers with mosaic, painted and sculptural decoration, albeit on a more modest scale.³⁵ The issue of whether or not the sculpted works found in dining chambers can be considered cult objects or merely appropriate decoration will be discussed further.

³¹ Kunze 1996, pp. 118-119.

³² Kunze 1996, pp. 120-122.

³³ Ath. 5, 205. For a sketch of what the *thalamegos* and Aphrodite shrine looked like, see Pfrommer 1996, pp. 98-99, figs. 1-2.

³⁴ Ath. 5, 207.

³⁵ Kunze 1996, p. 128.

In this discussion of bronze statuettes from fourth-century and Hellenistic houses, consideration of their original context will be of key importance. This can assist in dating the object's period of use, a major advantage for works from the Hellenistic period, and will help to establish whether the bronze served a religious or decorative function. For this reason it is beneficial to first determine if it is a primary or secondary deposit, and if possible, establish the exact identification of an object's findspot (e.g. courtyard, oikos, kitchen, second story etc.) and analyze any associated finds (votives, offering tables, etc.). As bronze items were so rarely preserved, a review of similar works in different media, also from domestic contexts, should provide more supporting evidence for determining the function. A review of Greek domestic religious practices with careful attention given to the types and subjects of religious images utilized provides vital comparanda. This information will be critical when determining the religious or decorative function of the very limited number of bronze statuettes from Hellenistic domestic contexts.

Greek Domestic Religious Practices

Our knowledge of Greek domestic religion has been gleaned from literary, epigraphical and archaeological sources and although a general picture of household religion has been formulated, our understanding of the intricacies of religious practices and the varieties that must have existed is far from complete. Even a cursory examination of the evidence indicates that we should be talking of Greek domestic *cults* rather than a single and universal domestic *cult*. Two scholars who have written on this subject, Martin Nilsson and Herbert Rose, have provided information on the range of

deities worshiped in the Greek household and to a degree the manner in which they were honored.³⁶ Yet, one is left with the overall impression, particularly from Nilsson, that in addition to veneration of Hermes, Hestia and various aspects of Zeus, there was a considerable variety of deities and heroes honored in Greek households with local divinities often included.³⁷ Lastly, it is worth emphasizing that the deities mentioned in literary and epigraphical evidence (i.e. inscribed altars) do not always coincide with those represented in sculptural form found in fourth-century and Hellenistic domestic contexts.

Literary evidence on private religious practices in the Greek world is scant, a situation surely caused because such activities were conducted in private and secondly because they were most likely rather commonplace. Information on sculpture in Greek houses serving domestic religious needs is even more exiguous, and when mentioned it is typically of secondary interest. For example, it is primarily through Thucydides that we are informed of the placement of herm statues in front of Classical Athenian houses;³⁸ however, he was more concerned with relating the incident of their vandalism in 415 BC than on informing the reader of their specific domestic religious role. Additionally, we are provided with tantalizing glimpses into fourth-century and Hellenistic private life through the writings and anecdotes of Athenaeus, who was active c. 200 AD. In his work, The Deipnosophists, he provides additional information on herm statues and statuettes. One is the well known story of Xenocrates, who after winning a golden crown at a drinking party of Dionysius of Syracuse, placed it on a herm statue situated in the

³⁶ Rose 1957; Nilsson 1940, pp. 65-79, Nilsson 1954 and 1974, pp. 175-207. For the worship of Zeus, see Sjövall 1931. More recently Harward (1982) has summarized the literary and archaeological evidence for Greek sculpture serving religious needs in the 5th and 4th centuries BC (pp. 80-101).

³⁷ For an extensive list of the gods honored in Classical and Hellenistic Greek houses, see Kunze 1996, pp. 111-114.

courtyard of the palace.³⁹ Such herm statues situated at doorways and in house courtyards served not only to demarcate private property but also provided protection to the household.⁴⁰ Athenaeus also recounts a passage from Eubulus regarding a stone image (statuette?) of Maia's son Hermes situated in a sideboard, which is given offerings during a drinking party.⁴¹ According to Rückert, in contrast to herms set up in front of houses (Hermes Propylaios or Strophaios), herm statues and statuettes situated within a house served as cult images and may be connected with the cult of Aphrodite.⁴² This connection is alluded to as well by Theophrastus who comments on the actions of an overly pious or superstitious man. In addition to purifying his house to pacify Hekate, on the fourth and seventh day of the month, he buys myrtle boughs and frankincense and makes sacrifice to the Hermaphrodite.⁴³ Herbert Rose, in his discussion of the passage, assumes that the Hermaphrodite may have been a double herm with the two deities portrayed back to back; however, pairs of small lead herms of a male and female deity placed side by side on a single base have been found at Olynthus and this is the arrangement to which Theophrastus may have been referring.⁴⁴

³⁸ Thuc. 6.27.

³⁹ Athenaeus citing Timaeus (Ath. 10, 437b).

⁴⁰ For specific information on the purpose of herms in Greek households, see Rückert 1998, pp. 176-184 and Wrede 1985, pp. 49-50. A 1st century BC grave stele from Erythrai suggests how these herm statues may have been set up: a man stands before a set of doors and to the left of the entrance is an archaic herm set up on a pedestal (Ridgway 1990-2002, vol. III, pl. 97).

⁴¹ Ath., 11, 460e.

⁴² Rückert 1998, pp. 182-184.

⁴³ Theophr. *Char.* 16, 10. For a discussion of the passage, see also Rose 1957, pp. 108-109 and Harward 1982, pp. 84-88.

⁴⁴ Rose 1957, pp. 108-109. For the small lead herms from Olynthus, see *Olynthus X*, pp. 6-14, pls. II-III and the discussion by Harward 1982, pp. 84-88.

Archaeological evidence verifies the presence of herms in fourth-century and Hellenistic Greek houses. Among the earliest are the small lead herms from Olynthus,⁴⁵ but perhaps the most well-known example is the fragmentary 4th century BC marble herm from the courtyard of House II at Eretria.⁴⁶ By the Hellenistic period, herms of varying size and media could be found in Greek houses, rarely at the entrances but more often situated in the courtyard, in the peristyle or within the house itself. On the island of Delos, numerous herm statues were discovered in houses, not only representing Hermes and Dionysos but also Herakles, Priapos, Harpokrates and Eros.⁴⁷ While some may have continued to serve a cult or religious function, others appear to have been more decorative in nature.⁴⁸

Another household deity mentioned in fifth and fourth century literature is Hekate. Herbert Rose indicates that in classical times, Hekate was viewed more as a "witches' goddess" and, although considered a household deity, shrines to her were commonly placed outside of the house, preferably at the nearest crossroads.⁴⁹ This attitude is echoed in Theophrastus' story of the overly pious man who is "apt to purify his house frequently claiming Hekate has bewitched it."⁵⁰ The desire to keep the goddess at a distance is also reflected in a passage from The Wasps by Aristophanes, who comments

⁴⁵ Olynthus X, pp. 6-14, pls. II-III.

⁴⁶ Only the head, shoulder tenons and base are preserved; the base was found situated in the peristyle at the entrance of a large room (room *i*), which preceded one of the androns (Eretria X, pp. 97-98, figs. 153-154). Gard has dated the herm to the late 4th century BC (Gard 1974, pp. 50-59). On the basis of ceramic evidence, House II was constructed in the late 5th - early 4th century BC (Eretria X, pp. 111).

⁴⁷ Kreeb 1988, pp. 59-60 and Kreeb 1984, pp. 337-339.

⁴⁸ Rückert 1998, p. 183.

⁴⁹ Rose 1957, p. 104.

⁵⁰ Theophr. Char. 16, 10.

on shrines to Hekate located at doorways.⁵¹ These two references do not clearly state whether statues of the goddess were displayed in front of or within Greek houses; a simple aniconic shrine may have served just as well. Statues and statuettes could be found in Greek houses, although this appears to have been rare. On this matter, Porphyry preserves a passage by Theopompos concerning the pious nature of Clearchus of Arcadia, who offers wreaths and adorns a Hermes and Hekate statue in his house.⁵² From Delos, only a few Hekate are known, one from the Establishment of the Posiedonistas⁵³ and a fragmentary example from the Rue du Théâtre; however, neither were found in or in front of a traditional oikos.⁵⁴ Martin Kreeb identifies a base preserved in a wall niche in House VI D in the Theatre district as once having displayed a three-bodied Hekate statuette, which would have suited the shape of the cutting in the marble base.⁵⁵ From elsewhere in the Greek world, small statues of the goddess are known and would have been eminently suitable for private display.⁵⁶

Two other deities traditionally associated with Greek household religion are Hestia and Zeus. Yet, unlike Hermes and to a small degree Hekate, Hestia and the various aspects of Zeus worshipped in Greek houses were rarely if ever depicted in human form. Hestia was associated with the hearth and this was the focal point of her cult. She received offerings of food and drink at family meals and during feasts, and there is the impression that such offerings were rather generic and conducted with little

⁵¹ Ar. *Vesp.* 799-804. By contrast, it is intriguing to note that Euripides' *Medea*, a priestess of Hekate, refers to the goddess as dwelling in the inner chamber of her house (Eur. *Med.* 396).

⁵² Porph. *Abst.* 2, 16.

⁵³ Harward 1982, pp. 128-129, site catalog 21; Kreeb 1988, p. 66, site catalog S 1.19.

⁵⁴ Harward 1982, pp. 128-129, site catalog 56.2.

⁵⁵ Kreeb 1984, pp. 328-329, fig. 12-13, and Kreeb 1988, p. 66.

fanfare.⁵⁷ Zeus was worshipped in various guises, the two most common being Zeus Herkeios and Zeus Ktesios, and served as protector of the house and storerooms.⁵⁸ Zeus, and also his sons the Dioscourai, typically were not given human form but were associated with the household snake, which traditionally served as the household protector. The fusion of these two protective figures, Zeus and the snake, is illustrated in a passage by Antikleides, preserved by Athenaeus, who describes the appropriate manner to honor Zeus Ktesios: set up a vessel, adorn it with cloth and white wool and fill it with ambrosia (water, oil and fruits of the earth),⁵⁹ an offering intended and especially appropriate for the household snake.⁶⁰ Zeus Herkeios is also mentioned by Aristotle, who inquires of a citizen whether he has a Zeus Herkeios and an Apollo Patroos⁶¹ and where their shrines are situated.⁶²

Aristotle's comment on shrines raises another question, that of whether or not Greeks had fixed shrines and altars in a manner similar to Roman *lararia*. Oscar Broneer, in his article "The Corinthian Altar Painter," comments that a number of small terracotta altars have been found at Corinth, which probably were utilized for private family cult activities.⁶³ At Olynthus, numerous small altars were found both in the courtyard and in the house, and they must have been a common feature in Classical and

⁵⁶ Cat. no. 111: Hekate from Orikon. See also Alexander 1939 (wooden Hekate statuette said to be from Alexandria) and *Agora* XI pp. 86-96 for Hekate statuettes from the Athenian Agora.

⁵⁷ See Rose 1957, pp. 104-105 and Nilsson 1954, p. 77-79.

⁵⁸ Sjövall 1931, Rose 1957, pp. 98-103, and Nilsson 1954, pp. 79.

⁵⁹ Ath. 11, 473 b-c. For a discussion of this passage, see Rose 1957, pp. 100-102.

⁶⁰ Snakes are typically drawn to water and there are numerous Geometric and Orientalizing amphorae with plastic snake figures winding around the vessels. See also Nilsson 1954, p. 79.

⁶¹ Statues or images of Apollo are infrequent and he may not have been a common household deity; although Aristophanes, in his play *The Wasps*, mentions a "sidewalk Apollo" situated at the entrance of a house (875-876).

⁶² Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 55, 3.

⁶³ Broneer 1947, p. 219.

4th century Greek houses.⁶⁴ Freestanding and small in size, these portable altars (*arulae*) could easily have been moved to different areas of the house and courtyard for various religious needs. On Delos, free-standing altars of marble were found in the courtyards and hallways of a number of houses, some inscribed with names of deities, including Apollo, Helios, Sarapis, Artemis, Aphrodite and the Dioscouroi.⁶⁵ More numerous are the fixed domestic altars either found inside in the courtyard or peristyle or, in more elaborate houses, abutting an exterior wall of the house just outside the doorway.⁶⁶ Many were stuccoed and painted with scenes of sacrifice and Compitalists, and the adjoining wall was often painted with similar scenes as well as with depictions of Herakles and Hermes.⁶⁷ In his 1926 publication of these altars and painted walls, Marcel Bulard proposed that the altars and paintings should be associated with the domestic religious practices of the Roman residents of the island.⁶⁸ Philippe Bruneau, however, has demonstrated that many of these scenes and figures have Greek antecedents and that the altars, paintings, and associated rituals were more likely to have been the result of a mingling of Greek and Roman traditions. Bruneau claims, however, that there is significant evidence that the inhabitants of these houses were likely Greek.⁶⁹

Additionally, there is very little evidence for the presence of fixed household shrines in the Classical period, and when found *in situ* or at least in a primary context,

⁶⁴ *Olynthus* VIII, pp. 322-324. Yavis briefly discusses house altars in his publication on Greek altars (Yavis 1949, pp. 175-176).

⁶⁵ Bruneau 1970, pp. 640-641.

⁶⁶ Bulard 1926, p. 7.

⁶⁷ Less popular subjects include Liber, Ceres, Libera, Sol and Silvanus. For a complete listing and discussion of the scenes, see Bulard 1926 and Bruneau 1970, pp. 589-615.

⁶⁸ Bulard 1926, ch. 1.

⁶⁹ Bruneau, pp. 404-412 and 580-615. For further discussions on the ethnicities of Delian house owners, see Trümper 1998, pp. 134-136 and Rauh 1993.

sculptures that served household religious needs were found throughout the house. Herm statues, although commonly assigned to entry and doorways situated outside and in peristyles, were probably found indoors as well.⁷⁰ The marble statue of Asklepios found in House B VI 7 at Olynthus was situated outside an andron, but more telling are the terracotta statuettes from Olynthus which were found spread throughout the house including the upper story.⁷¹ Deities not commonly manifested in sculptural form were also worshipped at different locations. Hestia was honored at the hearth and the various aspects of Zeus, e.g. Herkeios and Ktesios, may have been propitiated at locations more appropriate to his respective sphere of influence, the courtyard and storerooms. Thus, by the 4th century BC, Greek household cults consisted of a mixture of iconic and aniconic worship not restricted to one permanent household shrine but rather were spread throughout the household and surrounding property.

By the end of the Hellenistic period, literary sources and archaeological evidence indicate that many more gods could be found in Greek houses in the service of domestic cults. In addition to traditional household gods - Hermes, Hestia, Hekate and Zeus - there are references to statues or statuettes of Aphrodite,⁷² Asklepios,⁷³ Artemis,⁷⁴ and Sarapis,⁷⁵ examples of which have been found at Olynthus,⁷⁶ Priene⁷⁷ and Delos.⁷⁸ Other sculptural imagery, both in terracotta and marble, that appear in greater numbers include representations of Cybele,⁷⁹ Tyche⁸⁰ Agathos Daimon,⁸¹ Isis and Sarapis,⁸² who were increasingly favored for private cult during the Late Classical and Hellenistic periods. Herakles too, becomes a popular figure particularly on Delos where he served in

⁷⁰ See above p. 34-35. Athenaeus relates a passage from Eubulus regarding a herm figure situated in a cupboard (Ath. 11, 460e).

part as an apotropaic figure as exemplified by the many statuettes of the hero and symbols associated with him found among the domestic finds.⁸³

The proliferation of deities now honored within Hellenistic houses is echoed in the inscribed house altars found at Priene, Thera and Miletus. According to Martin Nilsson, many are Hellenistic in date, although some are Roman and those in particular from Thera and Miletus may be difficult to distinguish.⁸⁴ Chief among the deities mentioned are Hestia, Tyche, Agathos Daimon, Hygieia, and many aspects of Zeus: Ktesios, Kataibates, and Soter.⁸⁵ At Miletus, a number of local and foreign gods were included, such as Zeus Labrandeus, Harpokrates, and Helios Sarapis.⁸⁶ The choice of deities is an unusual mix of traditional Greek household gods and foreign and local gods. Noticeably missing are the names of two deities, Dionysos and Aphrodite, whose imagery became especially popular in Hellenistic and Roman houses.⁸⁷ On the other

⁷¹ *Olynthus* XIV, p. 64-66. Robinson comments that the religious terracottas do not seem to have been set apart from the rest of the house contents.

⁷² Theoc. *Epigr.* 13 (AP 6, 340).

⁷³ Theoc. *Epigr.* 8 (AP 6, 337).

⁷⁴ AP 6, 267 and 6, 157.

⁷⁵ Engelmann 1975, pp. 9-15: An inscription mentions a small cult statue of Sarapis in a house on Delos.

⁷⁶ A statuette of Asklepios was found in House B VI 7 (*Olynthus* XII, pp. 130-137, pls. 115, 116, 118, 119); for Aphrodite figures see *Olynthus* II, p. 3-4, figs. 29-30 and *Olynthus* XIV.

⁷⁷ Wiegand and Schrader 1904.

⁷⁸ Kreeb 1988, pp. 58-60 and pp. 64-66.

⁷⁹ *Olynthus* XIV, p. 64. Delos: Kreeb 1988, nos. S 38.3, S 49.7, S 56.4, S 58.1. Priene: Raeder 1984, no. 44. One of the few clearly identifiable household shrines was found at Olbia and dates to the Late Hellenistic period. A room with a mosaic floor contained terracotta statuettes of Cybele and a second figure, either a deity or a priestess, as well as an altar [*AA* 26 (1911), pp. 209-221].

⁸⁰ Delos: Kreeb 1988, no. S 24.13.

⁸¹ Delos: Kreeb 1988, no. S 22.1. Kallipolis: Hoepfner 1999, pp. 438-440.

⁸² Delos: Kreeb 1988, nos. S 53.8 and S 53.19.

⁸³ For Herakles figures from Delian houses, see Bruneau 1964; Kreeb 1988, nos. S 1.3, S 9.2, S 24.22, S 49.5; and Harward 1982, pp. 129-131.

⁸⁴ Nilsson 1954, p. 80. See also Nilsson 1974, pp. 177-178.

⁸⁵ For a more comprehensive list, see Nilsson 1974, pp. 177-178.

⁸⁶ Nilsson 1954, p. 80.

⁸⁷ Delos: Kreeb 1988, p. 60. Priene: Wiegand and Schrader 1904, pp. 320-327 and Raeder 1984, pp. 22-25.

hand, their names are preserved on numerous inscribed drinking cups found in houses⁸⁸ and thus their presence in Hellenistic houses must be connected, at least in part, to their association with symposia.

The Comic Actor from Olynthus

The earliest known free-standing bronze figurine excavated from a house is a Comic Actor excavated from Olynthus in 1931 (cat. no. 1, figs. 1-2). David Robinson dates it to the first half of the fourth century BC⁸⁹ and associated finds, which include coins, lamps and pottery, also support a fourth-century date.⁹⁰ The statuette represents a Phrygian slave stepping forward in a brisk manner and carefully balancing two vessels in his outstretched hands. Although simply modeled with a narrow chest, bulging belly and cylindrical-shaped arms and legs, the figure has a certain droll charm conveyed not only by the large animated mask he wears, but also by his too short *somatia*, which reveals his large phallus and barely covers his round belly. In addition to serving as an amusing decorative item, the Comic Actor also served a utilitarian purpose. The dishes he carries, attached to his hands by rivets, were fitted with lids that could be swiveled aside. The small vessels would have served as containers for food or a condiment, and therefore it has been assumed by some scholars that the figure originally would have decorated a

⁸⁸ Nilsson 1974, p. 177. See also Tolles 1943.

⁸⁹ Based on the clothing and mask, Robinson considers it as an actor of Middle Greek Comedy in the costume of Old Comedy, and dates it c. 380-350 BC (*Olynthus* X, p. 5).

⁹⁰ *Olynthus* VIII, pp. 346, 347, 349, and 352. There is considerable debate regarding the exact date of the complete abandonment of Olynthus. While it appears that much of the site was left uninhabited after Philip's sack in 348 BC, there is a limited amount of literary and archaeological evidence that suggests that portions of Olynthus continued to be occupied perhaps until 316 BC when Cassander forced the remaining inhabitants to move to his new city. For a brief review of the evidence see "Proceedings of the 91st General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America," *AJA* 94 (1990), pp. 315-316.

large bronze dish.⁹¹ Yet, the means of attaching the figure to a vessel is not evident and two similar bronze figurines, a fine example from Berlin⁹² and a very well preserved one in Toronto,⁹³ show no sign of having served as appliqué.

Sixteen related comic actor figures in bronze are known, most of which have been published by Thomas Webster in his multi-volume work on monuments of old, middle and new comedy.⁹⁴ Aside from the Olynthus example, two from Boeotia and another from the Mahdia shipwreck, the findspots of the bronze comic actors listed by Webster are not known.⁹⁵ It is generally assumed that Athens was the main production center for these theatrical figurines, and the large number that has survived, both in bronze and cheaper imitations in terracotta, reflect their popularity in the late fifth and fourth centuries BC.⁹⁶

The Olynthus Comic Actor was excavated from House E.S.H. 6, which consists simply of three rooms (*a-c*) all aligned along the north side of an open courtyard. Foundation walls are visible along the east side of the court and a short spur of the west side indicates that the house was originally planned along traditional lines but was never completed.⁹⁷ The discovery of a bathtub in room *a*, as well as pottery, lamps and coins, indicate that the house was in use prior to the destruction of the city in 348 BC.⁹⁸ For some reason the house was never fully completed and the inhabitants simply made do

⁹¹ Robinson 1932, p. 138, and Barr Sharrar 1990, p. 35.

⁹² Illustrated in *Das Wrack*, p. 542, fig. 6.

⁹³ Mitten and Doeringer 1967, no. 118.

⁹⁴ For the group to which the Olynthus actor belongs, see Webster 1978, pp. 39-42.

⁹⁵ One bronze actor in Nicosia (inv. no. D 266) may have come from Cyprus and another in the Louvre (inv. no. MND 468) is said to have come from Tripolis, Greece (Webster 1978, pp. 40-41).

⁹⁶ Uhlenbrock 1990, p. 48.

⁹⁷ *Olynthus* VIII, p. 138.

⁹⁸ *Olynthus* VIII, p. 138.

with three rooms.⁹⁹ The bronze figurine was found in the largest room (*b*),¹⁰⁰ which in a comparable house plan in Olynthus (E.S.H. 1) served as the andron.¹⁰¹ An argument could also be made for Room *c* being used as the andron based on the situation of the door.¹⁰² Considering the small size of the house, however, setting aside one room to serve exclusively as the andron may have been impractical. The finds from the house shed little light on the matter: a bronze high-stemmed cup was found in room *a*, from room *b* were found 3 squat lekythoi and a kantharos and from room *c*, a fish plate.¹⁰³

Regardless of where it was found, there is little doubt that the bronze figure served a practical function in connection with the *deipnon* or banquet preceding the symposium proper. Scholars who support a religious connotation of these actor figures include Barr Sharrar, who considers that the bronze Comic Actor may have served as a sort of apotropaic charm, specifically in association with some private festival.¹⁰⁴ Additionally, Webster, in a related discussion on theatrical masks from Priene, holds a similar view and suggests that they may have been used to evoke the festivities that took place at sanctuaries of Dionysus.¹⁰⁵ To the contrary, Jaimee Uhlenbrock looks to the popularity of theatrical figures beginning in the late fifth century BC and proposes that comic figures, both in terracotta and in bronze, were made as “souvenirs of the theater, preserving the memory of a favored theatrical role or actor.”¹⁰⁶

⁹⁹ *Olynthus* VIII, p. 138.

¹⁰⁰ *Olynthus* X, pp. 1-6.

¹⁰¹ *Olynthus* VIII, pl. 105.

¹⁰² As suggested to me by J. Binder and B. Tsakirgis.

¹⁰³ For the house inventories, see *Olynthus* VIII, pp. 346-349. Also found in the house, though their exact location was not recorded, were two lamps, fragments of terracotta masks, heads and a plaque.

¹⁰⁴ Barr-Sharrar 1990, p. 35.

¹⁰⁵ Webster 1969, p. 62.

¹⁰⁶ Uhlenbrock 1990, p. 48.

At Olynthus, the use of theatrical subjects for domestic display is confirmed by a small number of terracotta actor figurines and a comic mask found in some of the other houses.¹⁰⁷ It is difficult to determine exactly in which rooms they were found, which in turn might have suggested whether they served primarily a cultic or decorative function. Robinson notes that finds in general were extremely scattered most likely due to the looting conducted by Philip's army or by the frantic efforts of the inhabitants to escape with their some of their personal possessions.¹⁰⁸ Although it cannot be proven that theatrical figures and masks were restricted to decorating only those rooms associated with the symposium, theatrical subjects as well as Dionysiac imagery in general, were occasionally employed when decorating dining chambers.¹⁰⁹ At Priene, especially popular for display in the andron were subjects from the circle of Dionysus and Aphrodite, but the emphasis appears to have been on their decorative quality, particularly in relation to the symposium activities, rather than on their religious character.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, Athenaeus, in his description of Ptolemy Philadelphus' banqueting pavilion, provides rich details of the decoration, which included representations of theatrical characters taken from tragedy, comedy, and satyric drama.¹¹¹ At Delos, the dining chamber of the House of the Comedians is decorated with comedic scenes and, according to Barr Sharrar, may have alluded to the themes of eating and drinking, which were so popular in Attic comedy.¹¹² By the first century BC the decorative properties of

¹⁰⁷ Olynthus XIV, cat. nos. 378c, 379, 381, 381a, 382 and 384.

¹⁰⁸ A number of terracottas were also found in the streets and alleys (Olynthus XIV, pp. 64-66).

¹⁰⁹ Terracotta figurines of Pan and a Silenos were found in the andron of the House of the Comedian (Olynthus VII, nos. 302-304).

¹¹⁰ Raeder 1984, pp. 24-25.

¹¹¹ Ath. 5, 196-197.

¹¹² Barr Sharrar 1996, p. 108. See also, Bieber 1961, pp. 36-50 and pp. 87-107.

theatrical imagery, which now included theatrical backdrops for wall painting designs, had become especially fashionable among the Roman elite.¹¹³ Such imagery had lost most, if not all, religious connotations and served instead to emphasize the cosmopolitan and educated background of the house or villa owner. The utilitarian purpose of the Olynthus Comic Actor strongly suggests that the figure did not serve a cultic function, but rather, like the theatrical imagery found at Priene and Delos, was considered an appropriate decorative item suitable for a dining chamber.

Statuette of a Woman from Arta

In considering my next example, a bronze statuette of a woman from Arta (cat. no. 2, figs. 3-5), some of the issues relevant to the Comic Actor from Olynthus and the decorative nature of Dionysiac imagery are equally appropriate. The statuette was excavated from one of the houses revealed during the excavation of a small sector (*Lambraki*), located along *Odos Kiprou*.¹¹⁴ The sector is small, bound in on all four sides by modern structures, and is mainly comprised of portions of four houses overlaid by a section of a later wall. The houses date back to the Archaic period, but were also in use during Classical times with a final habitation phase during the late Hellenistic period.¹¹⁵

The bronze, thought to be a maenad, has been given a Hellenistic date by the excavators. The general history assists in providing only a *terminus ante quem*.

Historical sources suggest that Ambrakia (modern Arta) was at its most prosperous in the

¹¹³ Bieber 1961, pp. 124-125 and pp. 228-232.

¹¹⁴ The statuette was excavated from a house located at *Odos Kiprou*, Arta. It was discovered in a room to the south of a paved court (I. Andreou, pers. comm). For the excavation report, see Andreou, I. 1992. *ArchDelt* 42 (1987) B' 1 *Chronika*, pp. 308-310, pl. 169b; Pariente, A. 1993. "Chroniques des Fouilles, 1992," *BCH* 117, pp. 814-817, fig. 81.

late fourth and early third centuries BC when Pyrrhos, King of the Molossians, made it his capital city and lavishly decorated it.¹¹⁶ At the end of the century there is evidence that Philip held it briefly from 209-207/6 BC and again in 206-205 BC; yet little is known how the city and its inhabitants fared during this time.¹¹⁷ In 189 BC Ambrakia was taken by the Romans under Marcus Fulvius and lost many of its public statuary and paintings because of its support of the Aetolian League. The city's inhabitants were spared a more thorough pillaging when it offered a gold crown worth 150 talents to Marcus Fulvius.¹¹⁸ Later it was provided with the status of a free city, although it is unlikely that it regained its original prosperity. The city was dealt a decisive blow in 31 BC when Augustus forced the inhabitants to move to the newly founded city of Nikopolis, and perhaps this is the reason for the abandonment of the *Lambraki* houses. This information does little to assist in dating the bronze except for the forced emigration of the inhabitants in 31 BC, which provides a *terminus ante quem* for the statuette.

Attempts to date the statuette on stylistic grounds is also fraught with difficulties. Comparisons with terracotta female figurines, which abound in the fourth century and Hellenistic period, are inconclusive predominantly due to the fact that the Arta figure with her simple chiton and old-fashioned hairstyle does not compare well with the elaborately draped and coifed Tanagras. Comparisons with large-scale sculpture might have proven more successful if it were not for the fact that some of the most firmly dated works come from the eastern Mediterranean. Certain affinities can be drawn with the dancers on the Akanthos Column from Delphi, which Ridgway would date to c. 330

¹¹⁵ Andreou, I. 1992. *ArchDelt* 42 (1987) B' 1 Chronika, p. 310.

¹¹⁶ Strabo 7.7.6.

BC.¹¹⁹ Like the three Delphi maidens, the Arta figure poses in an elegant yet somewhat conservative manner, which sharply contrasts with the more elongated proportions, complex positions and forceful torsion similar figures would exhibit in the latter part of the Hellenistic period. Although still open to debate, on the basis of style, a plausible date of manufacture is the late fourth or third century BC, a chronological span that also coincides with the Ambrakia's period of greatest prosperity.

Another perplexing issue regarding the statuette is the identity of the figure. At first glance, the youthful figure, dressed in a long flowing chiton, which flutters about the body in response to her movements, bears a resemblance to maenads. These female followers of Dionysus typically are easily recognizable because of the wreaths of ivy and berries they wear on their heads and the objects they carry, thyrsos, tympana, and, most telling of all, the limp and tattered bodies of their animal victims. The female figure from Arta holds in her right hand a heavily encrusted object, difficult to identify, but which may have been a thyrsos. In her left arm she cradles an animal skin filled with fruit, an attribute not seen in representations of maenads. Additionally, the Arta figure wears low slip-on boots and a fillet worn low across her forehead, two unusual and distinctive features that maenads rarely wear. One other possible identification is that she represents one of the four Seasons (*Horai*). We know from Athenaeus's description of Ptolemy Philadelphus' (285-242 BC) procession that *Horai* were identifiable by the types of

¹¹⁷ Hammond 1967, p. 611.

¹¹⁸ Hammond 1967, p. 625.

¹¹⁹ Ridgway (1990-2002, vol. 1, pp. 23-25) supports a later date for the sculptures of the Akanthos group believing that they were created after the original was damaged in an earthquake. The date of c. 330 BC was arrived at on the basis of the letter forms of later inscription and the relation of the new step blocks with the Daochos dedication.

seasonal fruit they carried.¹²⁰ Although surviving Hellenistic examples of these four personifications are rare, Roman depictions are more numerous. They range in date from the first century BC to the fifth century AD,¹²¹ and some were likely inspired by fourth-century and Hellenistic models.¹²² Roman reliefs and sculpture frequently depict one or two of the seasons (customarily identified as Spring and/or Autumn) holding fruit in a fold in their garments, and a Pompeian wall-painting portrays Autumn holding fruit and an olive branch, and, like the Arta bronze, wearing boots.¹²³ While *Horai* can be associated with numerous gods – Demeter, Apollo, and Aphrodite – it is her connection with Dionysus that is of interest here. The Ptolemaic procession described by Athenaeus in which the *Horai* participated was devoted to Dionysos, and numerous Roman reliefs show a similar scene of the god followed by four dancing women identifiable by their attributes as *Horai*.¹²⁴ It is this connection to Dionysos, whose followers had already become favorite subjects for terracotta and marble sculpture displayed in Late Classical and Hellenistic houses, that may have encouraged the introduction of the *Horai* into the domestic sphere.

The Youth from Eretria

While the two bronzes from Olynthus and Arta appear to have served a decorative function, there is clear evidence that bronze statuettes were put to other uses in

¹²⁰ Ath. 5, 197-198.

¹²¹ Representations of the Seasons became especially popular for house mosaics and although favored for their decorative quality, they also symbolized good fortune and prosperity (Michaelides 1986, p. 220).

¹²² *LIMC* V, 1990, nos. 22-34, s.v. *Horai/Horae* (L. Abad Casal).

¹²³ *LIMC* V, 1990, p. 513, no. 14, pl. 351, s.v. *Horai/Horae* (L. Abad Casal). *Horai/Horae* are occasionally depicted holding sickles, lagabolons or thyrsos.

¹²⁴ *LIMC* V, 1990, pp. 505-506, nos. 20-30, pl. 345-346, s.v. *Horai* (V. Machaira).

Hellenistic houses. In 1971, while excavating House II at Eretria, the Swiss Archaeological School discovered a group of bronze objects that provides clear evidence for the use of bronze statuettes in the service of domestic cult. The group consists of 21 objects, including an intriguing figure of a youth, nude save for a chlamys clasped around his neck and covering one arm and shoulder, portrayed in the act of making a libation (cat. no. 3, figs. 6-7). The rest of the material, an enigmatic mix of animate and inanimate objects, includes two horses, two dogs, a two-headed dog (Cerberus?), crouching lion, snake, caduceus, sword, double-headed ax, broom or bellows, wheel, plow, key, club, sickle, bean pod, and a weight.¹²⁵

The assemblage was found in Room x2, which had been constructed sometime during the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century BC after the initial construction of the house.¹²⁶ During this renovation, the large house was divided into two separate residences, necessitating the division of Room x into three smaller chambers (x1-x3). Room x3 became an andron as indicated by the newly added mosaic panel in the center of the floor with elevated marble platforms along the sides for the placement of klinai.¹²⁷ Room x2 served in part as the anteroom for this smaller andron, but was also of a size for other functions. It was in this room, in the southwest corner, that the bronze objects were found with three bronze coins dated c. 250-200 BC.¹²⁸

Although there is little doubt that the objects found in House II are cultic in nature, some questions remain as to their exact meaning and function. According to Effy

¹²⁵ For complete details see Kassapoglou 1980 and 1993.

¹²⁶ Kassapoglou 1993, p. 247, and Reber in *Eretria* X, pp. 111-112.

¹²⁷ Reber in *Eretria* X, p. 110.

¹²⁸ Kassapoglou 1993, p. 248. Reber (*Eretria* X, p. 110) questions whether the bronze objects were actually on display or if they were a deposit buried just below floor level.

Kassapoglou, the objects form a cohesive group and served a cult function.¹²⁹ Yet, the deity or deities for whom these objects were intended is not clear: certain objects (plow, hand sickle, and bean pod) reflect agricultural or fertility concerns, while others are clearly chthonic (snake and the two-headed dog - Cerberus?). The dog and horse figurines likely represented sacrificial animals.¹³⁰ The leg and forearm were made to be objects in and of themselves and may be compared with the votive offerings to Asklepios.¹³¹ If Kassapoglou had to distinguish one god to whom the ensemble was dedicated, that deity would be the goddess Isis, who as a more universal divinity was concerned with agriculture, navigation, justice and world order. She points out that during the third century BC, the period when the bronzes were most likely made, the cult of Isis was being introduced to Eretria. Yet it seems improbable that all the objects in the Eretria group were made in honor of any one deity. In fact Kassapoglou does admit that many of the implements and animals have strong connections to other well-known deities: the lion was sacred to Cybele, the serpent in household cult was associated with various forms of Zeus (particularly Zeus Ktesios), the caduceus was the symbol of Hermes and the club of Herakles. Nor is the selection of these particular deities surprising, as by the third century BC Zeus and Hermes already had a long history of

¹²⁹ Kassapoglou 1980, pp. 265 & 267 and Kassapoglou 1993, p. 251.

¹³⁰ Kassapoglou 1993, p. 250.

¹³¹ Kassapoglou 1993, p. 251. The healing cult of Amphiarius, located nearby at Oropos, is also a possibility as it had close ties with Eretria in the late 5th and 4th centuries BC.

eneration within the domestic sphere.¹³² Cybele and Herakles were relative newcomers, but their popularity would increase tremendously over the next few centuries.¹³³

In light of traditional household worship, the use of symbols rather than anthropomorphic representations at House II in Eretria should not be considered as an uncommon occurrence. For the most part, traditional household deities were only rarely given tangible form,¹³⁴ and it is mainly through literary and epigraphical evidence that we know of the variety of divinities honored in the private sphere.¹³⁵ Thus, considering that Greek domestic cult incorporated the veneration of a wide spectrum of deities, it is clearly plausible that multiple gods were honored at House II in Eretria. Although the identities of the gods being venerated is not as thought provoking as the specific manner in which they were honored. The assemblage of bronze items found at House II is not common to other domestic contexts and in fact is more in keeping with traditional *ex-votos* found at major sanctuaries dating from the Geometric to the Classical period. The animal figurines and anatomical votives are perhaps the most widespread. Dogs are less numerous, and as yet I have not found a parallel for the double-headed canine figurine,

¹³² Nilsson (1940, pp. 66-72 and 1954, pp. 79) reviews the various forms of Zeus which were most popular in domestic cult. For herms in particular, refer to Wrede 1985, pp. 2-4 and Rückert 1998, pp. 176-184.

¹³³ Cybele figurines have been found in houses at Olynthus (*Olynthus* XIV, p. 64). Herakles appears to have been introduced rather late and was especially popular in the east (Connelly 1990, p. 98). The use of his club as an apotropaic symbol is well known from Late Hellenistic houses on Delos (Bruneau 1970, pp. 643-644).

¹³⁴ Nilsson 1940, p. 72, and Nilsson 1974, p. 188.

¹³⁵ House altars, dating mainly from the Hellenistic period, record the names of Zeus Herkeios, Zeus Kataibates, Zeus Ktesios, Zeus Meilichios, Zeus Soter, Hestia, Apollo, Hekate, and the Dioskouroi (Nilsson 1954, p. 80). Inscribed altars found in Hellenistic houses on Thera refer to the Agathos Daimon, Hermes, Hestia, Zeus Soter, Tyche and Hygieia (*Thera* III, p. 174). Numerous literary sources mention deities honored within the home, including Hephaistos, Zeus Herkeios, Aphrodite, Artemis, and Asklepios (Kunze 1996, p. 111).

although its identification as Cerberus is likely.¹³⁶ Among the bronze implements, the small wheel, double-headed ax and caduceus are well attested.¹³⁷ A Geometric votive deposit from the Kidonian Spring on Crete, far removed from the Eretria bronzes both in chronological and geographical terms, also contained miniature double-headed axes and a small wheel, demonstrating the traditional and universal nature of such votives in the Greek world.¹³⁸

The youth posed in the act of making a libation is also a type that frequently would be found among sanctuary dedications. Athletes were commonly shown in the act of libation, and vase-painting scenes tell us that Greeks made libations before going on a journey or to war. A second form of wineless libation (*choê*) was performed in honor of chthonic deities or for the recently deceased. Swayed by the figure's partial nudity and close-fitting cap commonly worn by contestants, Kassapoglou prefers the identification of an athlete, perhaps an ephebe.¹³⁹ Considering that the Eretria bronze portrays a boy rather than a young man, and that athletes are traditionally portrayed completely nude, Kassapoglou's identification is unlikely. Based on the predominantly chthonic character of the associated finds, I would submit instead that the youth is performing a *choê* libation.¹⁴⁰ Viewed together with the associated bronze animals and objects, the range and character of the finds suggest that a traditional form of public worship, complete with

¹³⁶ A limited number of small bronze dogs were found on the Athenian Acropolis (Ridder 1896, pp. 165-166, nos. 460-462).

¹³⁷ Wheels: *Delphi* V, i, pp. 118-119, nos. 631-638; *Isthmia* VII, p. 11, nos. 41-41a; *Olympia* IV, pp. 68-69, nos. 498-510; *Perachora*, p. 176, no. 19; *BCH* 109 (1985) p. 769, fig. 18 (from Rhamnous and associated with Nemesis) and *BCH* 103 (1979) p. 561, fig. 81 (Epidauros). Double-headed ax: *Delphi* V, i, pp. 119-121, nos. 648-649; and from houses at Olynthus came bronze ax amulet pendants, *Olynthus* X, pp. 131-132, nos. 438-445. Caduceus: Ridder 1896, p. 134, nos. 409-410.

¹³⁸ *ArchDelt* 16 (1960) p. 71, pl. 234.

¹³⁹ Kassapoglou 1980, p. 265.

libation bearer and other votive gifts, had been adapted for use in the household cult, which previously had never been so formalized.

The statuette itself is not of the highest quality as evident in the lackluster modeling of the body and careless execution of fine details such as the facial features and hair. The simple square base, cast together with the figure, is reminiscent of the standard base forms of Archaic and Classical statuettes, which ties it closer to earlier traditional forms and functions than to the more cultivated and ornate bronze statuettes of the late Hellenistic period. The youth, perhaps age eight to ten judging from his compact stature and soft, rounded musculature, is a type commonly depicted in art of the late fourth and third centuries BC. A comparable bronze statuette of a youth holding a dove found at the sanctuary at Dodona (cat. no. 61, figs. 35-36), has been dated on the basis of style to c. 330-320 BC.¹⁴¹ Late Classical and Hellenistic terracotta figurines depicting similar types are much more numerous and have been found throughout central Greece, particularly Corinth and Boeotia.¹⁴² Excavated from the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth and of particular interest is a small group of terracottas depicting young boys, which Gloria Merker dates by context to the late fourth or early third century BC.¹⁴³ Like the Eretria bronze youth, the boys are represented standing, feet set approximately shoulder's width apart, with a cloak hanging from their shoulders or wrapped around their waists.¹⁴⁴ The Corinthian youths hold various offerings, including grapes, aryballoi, roosters and

¹⁴⁰ For the role of children in domestic and public religious celebrations, see Golden 1990; Corinth XVIII, iv; and Rühfel 1984.

¹⁴¹ Thompson 1982, p. 160.

¹⁴² Corinth XVIII, iv, pp. 188-189; Thebes V, nos. 122, 128, and 163; and for Tanagra, Higgins 1986, pp. 150-151, fig. 183

¹⁴³ Corinth XVIII, iv, p. 194.

bags of knucklebones; a few figurines dated to the Classical period, although stylistically distinct from the Eretria example, depict youths bearing phiales.¹⁴⁵ Such comparanda suggest that the bronze youth from Eretria was perhaps manufactured in the late fourth or early third century BC, at least a few generations prior to the *terminus ante quem* of c. 250-200 BC proposed by Kassapoglou.¹⁴⁶ Where and how the statuette was displayed prior to its burial remains in question.

The Poseidon from Pella

Perhaps one of the best known bronze statuettes from a Greek domestic context is the Poseidon from Pella (cat. no. 4). The statue type is often referred to as the Lateran Poseidon and is considered by many to be based on a sculpture by Lysippos made for the harbor at Corinth.¹⁴⁷ The identification of a prototype is contested and a discussion of the arguments is not pertinent here.¹⁴⁸ Of much greater interest for the present study is the statuette's findspot and the hypothesis that it served as a domestic cult figure.

¹⁴⁴ Corinth XVIII, iv, inv. nos. H319, H320, H323, and H331, pp. 188-189). Merker proposes that Corinth or Boeotia was a major production center for this type of terracotta (Corinth XVIII, iv, p. 189).

¹⁴⁵ Corinth XVIII, iv, p. 188.

¹⁴⁶ Kassapoglou 1993, p. 248.

¹⁴⁷ Another theory traces the prototype back to an Athenian fifth-century statuary group of Poseidon and Athena. For a summary of the arguments regarding the origin of the Lateran Poseidon type, see Bartman 1992, pp. 103-128.

¹⁴⁸ Two main theories exist regarding the origin of the Lateran Poseidon type. Stephani (1874) would trace it back to a Poseidon and Athena group located on the Athenian Acropolis, an idea also supported by Ghedini (1983). Lange (1879) and later Picard (1963) proposed that the type was based on a Lysippan work located at the Isthmus. Bartman discusses the problem at length and notes that the presence of formal variations between many of the extant copies is indicative that there was not one prototype but rather many models from which later copyists could imitate (Bartman 1992, pp. 103-128). Contrary to Bartman, it is worth pointing out that the main differences can be divided into two groups, that is between the large marble statues and the smaller works, which include a number of bronzes. The marble statues typically include various props to buttress the figure, e.g. dolphins, or a length of cloth draped over the bent leg. In contrast, the bronze statuettes representing the Lateran Poseidon are much more uniform in appearance. As bronze figures have greater tensile strength, there was no need to add extra supports, such as drapery or

The Pella statuette was discovered in a large house in Sector IV (referred to hereafter as House IV) in a room in the northwest corner of the peristyle.¹⁴⁹ A nearby room, often referred to as a domestic shrine, was equipped with two low platforms and a circular table – only the top with engraved decoration survives – which may have been used to hold offerings.¹⁵⁰ Although the bronze statuette was not found in this cult room, it is conjectured that the two belong together.¹⁵¹

Similar platforms found in houses and used to display votives are known from Priene. House 22, the so-called Sacred House, located in the Western Residential Quarter, was used as a sanctuary and in its cult room were discovered an offering table placed in front of an L-shaped podium (c. 1.20 m high) set against the east wall.¹⁵²

Terracotta votives, including a herm, bust of Cybele, and an Eros and Maiden group, were discovered in the area and are presumed to have been displayed on the table and

dolphin figures, which later copyists had to employ to depict the figure in marble. This suggests that one of the favored prototypes was undoubtedly a bronze statue.

¹⁴⁹ *ArchDelt* 16 (1960), pp. 79-80, pl. 65a. The house, the only one as yet in Sector IV, is located to the southwest of the House of Dionysus and does not have a formal name. According to Heermann, it was likely constructed c. 310-280 BC (Heermann 1980, p. 119). She also points out that the room where the bronze was found is a later construction as indicated by the field stones and spolia used to build its west wall, which in her opinion was built after the sack of 168 BC (p. 112 and p. 119, figs. 1 and 18). This suggests that House IV may have been occupied after the sack; however, the information does not allow us to date the Poseidon bronze any more precisely.

¹⁵⁰ *ArchDelt* 16 (1960), pp. 79-80, pl. 64b and 65b. The use of tables for holding not only votives but cult images is supported by cult scenes depicted in other media. See Bühler 1973, pp. 45-47, colorplate 1 (outdoor cult scene with table covered with votives and a herm or Priapos); and Jucker 1980, p. 444, fig. 6 (table with votives set before a herm statue).

¹⁵¹ Harward 1982, p. 136. Heermann, in her discussion of Macedonian palace architecture, is skeptical of the identification as a domestic shrine and instead suggests that this small room, measuring only 4.10 x 4.05 m, might have served as a “diclinium” (Heermann 1980, pp. 117-118). Considering that rooms for two klinai have not been found outside of a few rare instances occurring in tombs, and more importantly, the fact that the two platforms measure only 10 cm high, the use of the room as a two-couch dining chamber seems extremely unlikely.

¹⁵² Wiegand and Schrader 1904, pp. 172-182, figs. 166 and 169. The upper portion of a marble statuette, possibly representing Alexander the Great, was found in the northern hall (cult room?) and it has been conjectured that the sanctuary may be the Alexandreum mentioned in an honorary inscription (Rumscheid 1998, p. 98).

podium.¹⁵³ The Temple of Demeter at Priene also had a similar arrangement. The cella contained a raised platform (1.23 m high), perhaps running along all four walls but best preserved in the northwest corner, which, based on the cuttings still visible, supported at least two statues.¹⁵⁴ Another interesting parallel, dating much earlier but located on mainland Greece in Phokis, is the provisional cult room for Apollo and Artemis at Kalapodi,¹⁵⁵ which was presumably constructed to house the cult in the intermittent period between the destruction of the Archaic temple by the Persians and the construction of the Classical temple. Within the small chamber, an orthostate block (40 cm high) was set a short distance from the west wall and used as an offering table as indicated by the votive objects (including one small bronze kouros) and ash deposits found *in situ*.¹⁵⁶ The podiums mentioned above are significantly taller than the two 10-cm platforms at House IV in Pella. Considering the size of the chamber in proportion to the height of the Poseidon statuette, they were in all likelihood used as platforms to display votives, and consequently, the use of the room as a domestic shrine with the Poseidon figure as the focus of that cult is convincing.

The statuette itself is in excellent condition, missing only the trident once held in his left hand and his left index finger. Fortunately, its limestone base is preserved, but the rocky support below his right foot is largely missing. Only small fragments of the stone footrest and traces of the lead and iron used to secure it to the base remain.

Surprisingly, a small rock was also placed under his standing left leg. The choice of a

¹⁵³ Wiegand and Schrader 1904, pp. 178-179.

¹⁵⁴ Wiegand and Schrader 1904, pp. 147-155, figs. 121-122.

¹⁵⁵ Felsch 1980, pp. 85-99.

roughly-worked block of limestone for the base may at first appear odd, yet if we visualize the statuette in its original state, complete with a craggy boulder beneath his right foot, the roughhewn base provides a more harmonious impression than a polished bronze one. Indeed, the contrast between the smooth, highly-polished bronze figure and the pale color of the rugged stone not only provide a realistic touch allowing us to imagine the god in a naturalistic setting peering out over the sea, but the arrangement also has a distinct decorative quality rarely seen on earlier bronze statuettes.

Rarely discussed in depth is the issue of the statuette's date.¹⁵⁷ While general information is known about the city of Pella, its houses and their contents have yet to be comprehensively published and therefore much of their individual history is unknown. A brief discussion of the city's history is in order. At the beginning of the fourth century, Archelaos I made Pella the capital of the Macedonian kingdom and under Cassander it was greatly enlarged. It was at the end of this century, c. 300 BC, that many of the public buildings and large and elaborate private houses were constructed.¹⁵⁸ In 168 BC, Pella fell to the Romans and the city was sacked. Portions of the city were subsequently reoccupied,¹⁵⁹ but shortly thereafter, due to earthquakes and the establishment of a Roman colony to the west, it was eventually abandoned.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁶ Felsh 1980, p. 89. The small bronze kouros was set into a depression in the block with lead. Included among the many votive objects were a terracotta mask and rooster. Rolley (1986, p. 32) suggests that the kouros statuette might have served as the cult image.

¹⁵⁷ In *The Search for Alexander* (p. 179, no. 154), the Poseidon statuette is dated to the Late Hellenistic period; Rolley (1986, p. 199, fig. 172) states that it was made before the sack of 168 BC; Harward (1982, p. 106), does not mention the statuette specifically but briefly mentions that sculpture from Pella could date after 168 BC as the city was occupied after the sack.

¹⁵⁸ Petsas 1978, p. 134 and Touratsoglou 1995, p. 138.

¹⁵⁹ Various finds from Sector I discovered in the vicinity of where a Pan statuette was found date to the 2nd or 1st century BC (*ArchDelt* 16, 1960, p. 81; see also Harward 1982, p. 106).

¹⁶⁰ Touratsoglou 1995, p. 138.

House IV, where the Poseidon was found, was occupied for approximately two centuries, from c. 300 BC until perhaps as late as the first century BC, and the statuette's artistic style provides few chronological indicators of its date of production. Aside from the heavy build, which likely reflects the appearance of the original, the bronze demonstrates a number of unusual stylistic traits – massive yet slick musculature, thick stringy locks of hair, and small hard-set facial features – that seems to indicate a local origin.

Circumstantial evidence does seem to support a date prior to the sack in 168 BC: if the statuette does belong to the room generally identified as a domestic shrine room, then the bronze Poseidon was likely commissioned, or bought, at approximately the same time the house was constructed. After the Roman sack, it is unlikely that the local inhabitants would be in any circumstances to buy a statuette of this expense. If the Romans were the later occupants, it is doubtful they would have had such a statuette made or set up in such a large domestic shrine, as it was not in keeping with their own religious practices.

One last piece of evidence may help narrow down the date for the Pella bronze. The decision to display a statuette of Poseidon may have been influenced by the honored position the god held under the ruler Demetrios Poliorketes (336 - 283 BC). An image of the god of the exact same type appears on a coin of Demetrios Poliorketes minted in Pella and Amphipolis between 291 and 289 BC, suggesting to Christian Kunze that the owner of House IV was apparently influenced in his choice of deity and statue type by the

propagandistic imagery put forth by the current ruler.¹⁶¹ Otto Mørkholm, in his study of early Hellenistic coinage, indicates that Poseidon most likely served as Demetrios Poliorketes' patron god because of the ruler's reliance on his naval fleet to control his empire and perhaps more specifically in honor of a victorious sea battle off Salamis in 306 BC.¹⁶² Additionally, it is interesting to note that among Poliorketes' territorial possession was Corinth, the city in which Pausanias mentions the existence of several statues of Poseidon, including, according to many, the original Lateran Poseidon made by Lysippos. Although not conclusive, the fact that at the beginning of the third century BC we find in Pella Poliorketes' newly minted coin and the building or recent construction of House IV suggests that both the shrine and statuette date to this same time period.

The Herms

One aspect of domestic religious imagery about which we know a fair amount is the use and display of herms. While it generally has been accepted that herms, which served to mark the transition from public to private space and functioned as apotropaic symbols,¹⁶³ were on display in houses as early as the late fifth century BC, few early examples have been found *in situ*. As discussed above, literary evidence, particularly Thucydides' account of the mutilation of the herms in 415 BC,¹⁶⁴ and Timaeus' comments regarding a herm located in the house of Dionysios II of Syracuse,¹⁶⁵ suggest that herms were displayed outside by the house door or in the adjacent court. Fifth-

¹⁶¹ Kunze 1996, p. 125.

¹⁶² Mørkholm 1991, pp. 77-78.

¹⁶³ Properly referred to as Hermes Propylaios and Strophaios (Rückert 1998, p. 176).

¹⁶⁴ Thuc. 6,27.

¹⁶⁵ Ath. 10, 437.

century vases provide additional support, mainly for the placement of herms just outside house entrances.¹⁶⁶ One of the earliest large-scale marble examples, possibly dating to the late fourth century BC, was discovered in the north portico of House II at Eretria.¹⁶⁷ Yet, this is a rare example, and prior to the late Hellenistic period when we have a considerable number of herms found in houses on Delos,¹⁶⁸ there is little material evidence supporting the presence of large herms in or in front of houses. It is possible that most inhabitants of the Greek world could not afford the grander and costlier marble or bronze herms, and instead, had to make do with cheaper works of wood or terracotta. Smaller herms made of lead, bronze and terracotta have been discovered in greater numbers, including five unusual double herms in lead from Olynthus,¹⁶⁹ a bronze from Florina (cat. no. 5),¹⁷⁰ and terracotta examples from Priene¹⁷¹ and Delos.¹⁷² Considering their small size, they were not placed on the ground as their larger counterparts were, but rather were displayed in small wall niches, similar to those preserved on Delos.¹⁷³ There is also evidence from the Athenian Agora that herm figures were carved in relief and such representations, either in stone or wood, could have easily been displayed at house

¹⁶⁶ A fragmentary loutrophoros in Karlsruhe (inv. no. 69/78) depicts a wedding procession approaching a doorway, besides which stands a large herm of Dionysus (*ARV*² 1102.2).

¹⁶⁷ *Eretria* X, pp. 97-98. Gard would like to date the herm to the late 4th century BC (Gard 1974, pp. 50-59).

¹⁶⁸ See Kreeb 1988, pp. 63-64.

¹⁶⁹ Also found was a single lead herm. According to Robinson, the double herms represent Aphrodite and Priapos, although Hermes is also a candidate (*Olynthus* X, pp. 6-14, pls. II-III).

¹⁷⁰ *AE* 1932 (1934), pp. 75-76, fig. 40.

¹⁷¹ For terracotta herms from Priene houses, see Wiegand and Schrader 1904, pp. 343-345; a published plan indicates at least one was found in the courtyard of House 32 (p. 325, fig. 365).

¹⁷² *Delos* XXIII, pp. 126-128, nos. 316, 319, 324, and 328; no. 319 was found in a courtyard.

¹⁷³ Kreeb 1988, pp. 43-46.

entryways,¹⁷⁴ yet it also should be emphasized that a number of Greece's inhabitants may not have felt compelled to display an image of the god at all.¹⁷⁵

There is additional evidence that herms, particularly small herms, were displayed within the house as well. Eubulos, the comic poet writing in the mid-fourth century BC, comments on a herm placed within a cupboard.¹⁷⁶ Rückert suggests that while ithyphallic herms were placed at house entryways and served primarily as protective deities, herms found within the house often served as cult objects, given that Hermes, along with Hekate and Apollo, was honored as a household deity.¹⁷⁷ By the late Hellenistic period, the herm form was utilized for the representation of additional divinities, including Athena, Eros, and Herakles, and increasingly took on a more decorative function.¹⁷⁸ Romans as well were attracted to the decorative qualities of herm statues. Cicero, in his many letters to Atticus, was especially effusive in his desire to acquire Greek herms, which he intended to display in rooms most appropriate to the god portrayed and his or her specific sphere of influence. Thus, Athena herms were considered an appropriate decoration for Cicero's academy, while Herakles herms were best suited to gymnasia and palaestra.¹⁷⁹ Although we lack literary sources for sculptural displays on Delos, archaeological finds indicate that herms in general were especially popular. In fact, among the extremely scarce bronze finds from the island, two are herm

¹⁷⁴ *Agora XI*, p. 141, nos. 234-242. The examples, dating from the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods, include figures carved on columns and one on a stone block from a shop in the Stoa of Attalos.

¹⁷⁵ Jameson 1990, p. 194.

¹⁷⁶ *Ath.* 11, 460.

¹⁷⁷ Rückert 1998, p. 184.

¹⁷⁸ Wrede 1985, pp. 18, 58-62 and Rückert 1998, p. 183. Rückert suggests that given the prevalence of imagery from the spheres of Dionysus and Aphrodite in symposia settings, it is extremely likely that herms depicting satyrs, Priapos and Eros would have been displayed there (p. 183).

¹⁷⁹ *Cic. Att.*, I, 4, 2; 6, 3; and 9, 3.

statuettes, one of Herakles (cat. no. 7, figs. 8-9) the other an Eros (cat. no. 53, figs. 29-30).¹⁸⁰

The Herakles herm, erroneously identified by some as a Silenos or Papposilenos,¹⁸¹ is distinguished by the lionskin draped around his body and is comparable to many other examples of this statue type found on Delos.¹⁸² The small bronze herm was found just outside of room *iota* of the Maison des Sceaux and is believed to have fallen from the upper story.¹⁸³ Certainly this cannot be the location of a palaestra or gymnasium, where Herakles herms were traditionally situated. In general, the identity of second story rooms has been difficult to determine. With Delos we are better informed considering that it has been possible to discern to a fairly certain degree which materials came from the upper floors. Ruth Westgate has studied the decorative programs from houses on Delos and has been able to determine that many of the upstairs rooms were lavishly ornamented with mosaic floors, stuccoed architectural decoration and figured or floral wall paintings.¹⁸⁴ Mosaic tesserae, furniture fragments, terracottas and fine ceramics are among the items said to have come from the upper floor of the Maison des Sceaux indicating that it too had luxuriously appointed rooms.¹⁸⁵

Herakles herms have come to light from other Hellenistic and Imperial houses in the eastern Mediterranean, where the type is said to have originated. A small terracotta

¹⁸⁰ The Eros herm was found just north of the Hypostyle Hall and probably belonged to one of the Roman houses of the first or second century BC, which were built later on the site (Bruneau and Ducat 1983, p. 163).

¹⁸¹ Rolley (1986, p. 213) and Harward (1982, p. 153) identify it as an elderly satyr. Kreeb (1988, p. 123) describes it as a Herakles herm, a type which was very prevalent on Delos (see Marcadé 1969, pp. 454-456, pls. 19-20).

¹⁸² For Herakles herms found on Delos, see Marcadé 1969, pp. 454-456. pls. XIX-XX.

¹⁸³ Kreeb 1988, p. 123.

¹⁸⁴ Westgate 2000, pp. 400-414.

example excavated from House XXV at Priene is one of the earliest known from a domestic context although it bears few similarities to the Delos version.¹⁸⁶ Closer in style is a badly preserved terracotta Herakles herm excavated from the palatial House of Attalos at Pergamon.¹⁸⁷ Two larger marble Herakles herms, one from the Casa Romana on Kos (H: c. 70 cm)¹⁸⁸ and the other from a late Roman villa in Halicarnassus (P.H: 32.6 cm),¹⁸⁹ are better documented. Both were apparently situated near an exterior space or garden and presumably were meant to evoke thoughts of a gymnasium or palaestra. On Delos, within the confined residential area, there was little extra space for an exercise yard, let alone a garden. This was presumably the case within the cramped space of House XXV at Priene as well. Either such herms were displayed without regard to location but were none-the-less used to suggest the learned character of the house owner, or Herakles herms were exhibited in other contexts, for example in dining chambers, for other reasons. Herakles is loosely affiliated with the circle of Dionysos and for that reason may have been a suitable subject for display in a dining room of the *Maison des Sceaux*, as dining chambers in general were traditionally festooned with Dionysiac imagery.¹⁹⁰ While it is difficult to determine whether second-story dining rooms were frequent on Delos based on archaeological evidence, Roman literary sources suggest that they were not uncommon in Roman houses.¹⁹¹ Furthermore, there is good evidence that

¹⁸⁵ Trümper 1998, p. 209.

¹⁸⁶ Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p. 347, fig. 408; and Töpperwein-Hoffmann 1971, p. 130.

¹⁸⁷ The terracotta from the House of Attalos (H: 9.7 cm) comes from a context dating perhaps as late as the 2nd or 3rd century AD (Töpperwein 1976, pp. 86 & 239, no. 553, pl. 80).

¹⁸⁸ Albertocchi 1997, pp. 121 & 123, fig. 230.

¹⁸⁹ Poulsen 1997, p. 78, fig. 108.

¹⁹⁰ For the popularity of Dionysiac subjects on Delos, see Kreeb 1988, pp. 58-60. For Priene, see Wiegand and Schrader 1904, p. 347.

¹⁹¹ Mau 1904, p. 267.

the owners of the Maison des Sceaux were in fact Roman. Nicholas Rauh, in his study on the commerce and religion of Delos, has studied the finds more extensively and has suggested that the Maison des Sceaux was owned by members of the Italian Aufidii family.¹⁹² Rauh has further determined that the first floor of the house was used predominantly for business and storage while the second story served as residential space and private offices. The existence of a dining chamber on the second floor is more than likely and this may well have been the original setting of the Herakles Herm statuette.

Unlike the Maison des Sceaux, the ownership of a majority of the houses on Delos is more difficult to determine.¹⁹³ As such, we cannot assess the use of sculpture in Delian houses as if they were strictly Greek, for the owners might have been Roman, who, like Cicero, sought to fill their houses with decorative objects. Certainly religious imagery proliferated, as demonstrated by the representations of Cybele and Agathos Daimon, and there is evidence that house chapels existed as well.¹⁹⁴ In fact, given the proliferation of imagery in Delian houses, one of the most challenging tasks is determining which works were primarily decorative and which were religious. That such a mixture existed is evident not only from the archaeological record, but also may be inferred from some of Cicero's remarks made in his Verrine Orations:

You have stayed at Messana in Heius' house, you have seen him perform divine service in his own chapel before those gods almost every day; well the loss of his money does not trouble him, nor indeed does he so much long for the objects that

¹⁹² Rauh 1993, pp. 215-219.

¹⁹³ See Trümper 1998, pp. 134-136.

¹⁹⁴ Kreeb 1988, pp. 63-66.

were purely decorative – keep his basket bearers, if you will, but restore to him the images of his gods.¹⁹⁵

Conclusions

While this review of the bronze statuettes found in fourth-century and Hellenistic domestic contexts was restricted to a discussion of only a few objects and certainly nothing definitive can be said about what role they might have played in household cults, one thing of note is the wide diversity of the subjects represented and the various needs they apparently fulfilled within the household.

The sole bronze figurine found at Olynthus can be associated with the activities that normally took place in the andron, not only by its findspot nearby but also due to the subject portrayed, a comic actor, and its utilitarian function. Based on this information, the bronze statuette is unlikely to have played a role in domestic cult or to have had much religious import. Instead, it should be considered in light of the contemporary trend towards embellishing the private andron, which in addition to mosaic floors and painted walls, must have also included luxury furnishings.

If we may judge from the sculptural finds found at Olynthus, the incipient use of decorative sculpture seems to have been limited to small objects, measuring in general under 20 cm, and were predominantly of terracotta, although this simply may be a matter of circumstances of survival.¹⁹⁶ Scholars, including Harward and Bartman, who have

¹⁹⁵ Cic. *Verr.* II, 4, 8. Specifically mentioned are an Eros by Praxiteles, a Herakles by Myron and a wood figure of Fortuna, which were likely the focus of cult and sacrifice (Cic. *Verr.* II, 4, 2-3).

¹⁹⁶ Only three marble sculptural works were discovered in the residential quarter at Olynthus. These include a female statuette (25 cm), the Asklepios statuette (31 cm), and a diademed head (P.H. 24 cm), which may have belonged to a herm. The latter two apparently served religious needs.

rejected the appearance of decorative art in the home prior to the Hellenistic period, have done so with little consideration of the evidence of terracottas.¹⁹⁷ On the other hand, scholars who have specialized in the coroplastic arts admit more readily that terracotta figurines grew increasingly secularized as early as the late fifth century BC. Jaimee Uhlenbrock suggests that in Athens, the production of theatrical figures may have served as souvenirs of the theater,¹⁹⁸ and according to Rebecca Miller Ammermann, the profusion of small Aphrodite and Eros figurines probably was inspired more by erotic and romantic notions than by increased religious devotion.¹⁹⁹ Couldn't the same be said for bronze and marble statuettes, which the terracottas are said to imitate? Uhlenbrock asserts that the many terracotta actor figurines "were inspired by more costly bronze prototypes,"²⁰⁰ while Reeder, in a discussion of large terracotta statuettes from Smyrna, declares that "it is difficult to believe that prosperous citizens would not have preferred to own marble equivalents."²⁰¹ Numerous marble statuettes of a similar size (30-60 cm) survive in large numbers, which she says would not have been appropriate for display in public areas, sanctuaries, or royal palaces, and therefore were likely intended for private homes.²⁰² Certainly, small figurines in terracotta, marble, or bronze were favored for

¹⁹⁷ Harward briefly discusses the terracottas from Olynthus admitting that "it is currently best to be cautious in discussing the early use of terracottas in private homes," but later states "terracotta figurines were in general a very common and popular form of domestic decoration at least as early as the fourth century BC" (Harward 1982, pp. 51-56). Bartman suggests that with sculpture found in the home there is the possibility that they served more than one function (1992, p. 47). She adds "the precise shift in artistic purpose from religious to decorative has yet to be firmly established," but she currently supports a date of the late second or early first century BC (Bartman 1992, pp. 46-47).

¹⁹⁸ Uhlenbrock 1990, p. 48.

¹⁹⁹ Ammermann 1990, p. 38.

²⁰⁰ Uhlenbrock 1990, p. 48.

²⁰¹ Reeder 1990, p. 86.

²⁰² Reeder 1990, p. 86.

domestic display because of the limited available space in the average fourth-century home.

Religious needs continued to play an important role in the household activities during the fourth century and Hellenistic period. Among the traditional household divinities whose identities are chiefly known from epigraphical and literary sources, Hermes (and associated herms) is most prevalent. Rare bronze examples include the more traditional herm form from Florina and the Herakles herm from Delos, and many more like them must have existed, their small size eminently suitable for display in niches, cupboards or on tables.

When private cult first began to take tangible form within the home, aside from herms, it was not the traditional household gods – Zeus, Hekate, and Hestia – who were commonly adopted. Putting aside the question of the identity of the terracotta female busts and masks found in Olynthian houses, we find a strong presence of non-traditional Hellenic deities, for example, Cybele and Asklepios, who might have more easily made the transition from public to private cult, whereas long-held traditions, sometimes the hardest to break, may have prevented the introduction of others.

The rather unusual bronze votive deposit from House II at Eretria is much more difficult to categorize among the bronzes found in domestic contexts. Judging from the types of objects found and the fact that they were found in a house, the assemblage of bronzes performed some role in the service of a domestic cult. The individual objects are clearly identifiable and may symbolize the worship of the divinities with whom they are commonly associated (e.g. Hermes, Cybele, Asklepios, Herakles etc.). The inclusion of the libation bearer appears to be a natural addition. More perplexing, however, is the fact

that this grouping is an anomaly. The bronze objects themselves are standard *ex-votos*, but they have always been associated with sanctuaries. I know of no other similar deposit from a domestic context. Even in later houses, as illustrated by finds on Delos, it is only Herakles' club and images of snakes, which reappear. It is in fact their similarity to sanctuary *ex-votos* that suggests to me that the inhabitants of House II simply adapted a public rite and transferred it to private practice. A common trend of the Hellenistic period does seem to be the greater importance put on private life and the private domain. This formalization of private cult may simply have been a natural progression on the part of religion, which in the Eretria case, was carried out in a distinct, perhaps local manner.

Providing some of the most intriguing evidence for the elaboration of private cult is the Poseidon from Pella. The decision to construct a small cult room in the large house in Sector IV was undoubtedly inspired by similar cult rooms commonly found in Hellenistic palaces²⁰³ and especially by the cult room (perhaps in honor of the ruler cult) of Palace II located nearby on the Pella acropolis. It has been noted by many²⁰⁴ that the layout and furnishing of the houses of the Pella elite were inspired by the residential quarters of the palace, which feature a large peristyle and was probably surrounded by numerous dining chambers.²⁰⁵ The cult room of Palace II is in the form of a large exedra located at the northeast corner of the east peristyle, and it is interesting to note that with House IV the room identified as a shrine is in a similar location at the corner of the

²⁰³ Cult rooms have been noted at Aigai (possibly to Herakles), Pergamon (for the divine ancestor, Dionysus), and were probably present at the Ptolemaic palace in Alexandria. See Nielsen 1994; Hoepfner 1996, Kunze 1996, pp. 109-129; and Bouzek 1996, pp. 213-220.

²⁰⁴ For recent bibliography see Heermann 1980.

²⁰⁵ The palace has not been fully excavated, but multiple banquet rooms situated off the peristyle are likely present based on comparisons with other palaces, particularly with the one at Aigai/Vergina.

peristyle in the direct line of sight as one walks down the north colonnade.²⁰⁶ Likewise, the decision of the owner of House IV to honor Poseidon with a cult shrine was apparently influenced as well by royal precedence: Demetrios Poliorketes felt a special affinity with Poseidon and celebrated this connection with coins bearing the image of the god.

As seen with Alexander, who claimed Herakles as his ancestor, individual gods were frequently promoted by Hellenistic rulers and often were the focus of divine ancestor cults. Alexander himself became the object of cult worship with an *Alexandrium* at Priene and perhaps also at Pella if we may judge from a marble statuette of an Alexander/Pan found outside of the House of Dionysos (Sector I, insula 1). At the Palatitsa palace in present day Aigai (ancient Vergina), there is evidence that the tholos located off the larger peristyle was dedicated to the tutelary divinity, Herakles.²⁰⁷ At Palace V at Pergamon, the Attalid dynasty honored their divine ancestor, Dionysos, with a cult room at the northeast corner of the peristyle.²⁰⁸ According to Athenaeus, Dionysos was also honored as a divine ancestor by the Ptolemies, who had a chamber dedicated to the god on their *thalamegos*, or pleasure barge.²⁰⁹ Aphrodite too was given special honors on the *thalamegos* in the form of a rotunda-shaped shrine, which contained a

²⁰⁶ The room identified as a cult room at the palace at Pergamon is in approximately the same location at the northeast corner of the peristyle.

²⁰⁷ The room contained an inscription with a dedication to Herakles. See Nielsen 1994, pp. 82-83, and Hoepfner 1996, p. 15.

²⁰⁸ The identification of the room is based on the Dionysiac mosaic and the presence of a herm base or altar against the back wall. See Nielsen 1994, pp. 106-107, and Hoepfner 1996, p. 25.

²⁰⁹ The chamber was used for dining and was apparently large enough for thirteen couches. It also contained a niche in which royal portraits were displayed (Ath. 5, 205-206).

marble statuette of the goddess.²¹⁰ As demonstrated at both Priene and Delos, Dionysos and Aphrodite were popular subjects for mosaics and sculpture displayed in houses. While these two deities are eminently suitable for domestic display on account of the themes of wine and love, which they represent, their popularity may also be attributed to their special status among many of the Hellenistic monarchs. Thus, not only is it possible that the establishment of cult rooms in Hellenistic palaces encouraged the growth of domestic cult practices among the general populace, but the deities promoted by Hellenistic monarchs became fashionable as well.

The debate regarding the story of Lysippos crafting a statuette of Herakles for Alexander still continues; however it cannot be disputed that Alexander, through his conquests, opened up the Greek world to new civilizations and cultures. While perhaps not initiating the impetus for the display of sculpture within the home – by the fourth century we already begin to see increased opulence in houses – the introduction of new gods and new religious practices certainly had its part. Through this examination of bronze statuettes from domestic contexts, which focused on the circumstances of their discovery, including their exact location, the objects with which they were found, as well the themes they represent, it is evident that they were used for a variety of needs which life in the fourth century and Hellenistic period demanded: for decoration, in the service of household cult, and possibly with the burgeoning ruler cult.

²¹⁰ Ath. 5, 205. For a sketch of what the *thalamegos* and Aphrodite shrine looked like, see Pfrommer 1996, pp. 98-99, figs. 1-2.

CHAPTER 3

Bronze Statuettes from Greek Imperial Domestic Contexts

In contrast to the paucity of Hellenistic bronze statuettes found in domestic contexts, those attributed to Greek Imperial houses and villas are far more numerous (Chart 1). The majority come from either hoards or other secondary deposits, such as wells and cisterns, which reveal little about their original context. On the other hand, we have ample evidence of the appearance and use of bronze figurines in houses and villas in the Roman West, not only from renowned sites such as Pompeii and Herculaneum but also from provincial areas, particularly present-day Germany and France.¹ It is mainly from these finds that scholars have been able to determine not only what types of Roman-period bronze statuettes were on display in the home but also the purposes they apparently served. This information may provide some evidence on the cultic use and decorative display of Greek Imperial bronze statuettes, particularly those discovered in ambiguous contexts such as caches or well deposits. Occasionally it has been assumed that domestic bronze statuettes in the Roman East followed the same pattern of use and display as those found in houses in the Roman West.² Yet traditional Greek artistic and religious practices undoubtedly remained strong, and this study will address not only the

¹ Beyond initial excavation reports, Boyce (1937), Orr (1972 and 1978), and Fröhlich (1991) have provided invaluable information on the inventory of bronze statuettes found at Pompeii and Herculaneum, in particular those found in *lararia*. H. Kunckel (1974) has conducted studies on the Roman *genius* and is currently preparing a similar study on *lares*. More in-depth studies need to be pursued on the finds from Campania particularly regarding their manufacture, iconography and distribution of types. Excellent studies on bronze statuettes found outside of Italy, particularly in the northwest provinces, have been carried out by Kaufmann-Heinimann (1998) and Boucher (1976).

² Dontas identifies the Kos bronze statuettes from the Casa dei Bronzi and the Damsa site as *lararium* figures, however, no *lar* statuettes were found (Dontas 1989, pp. 55-56).

degree of continuity between the use of bronze statuettes in Hellenistic and Greek Imperial domestic contexts, but perhaps more importantly whether the Greek inhabitants adopted any Roman domestic religious practices involving the use of bronze statuettes.

Distinguishing between bronze statuettes used in domestic cult and those that were predominantly decorative, even with finds from secondary contexts, can be accomplished by various means. Size clearly can aid in separating household shrine figurines from statuary that was displayed elsewhere in the house or garden.³ To be displayed in a traditional *lararium*, either a niche or shrine, cult statuettes had to be of a limited height. Those found elsewhere in the Roman Empire, e.g. Campania, Germania and Gaul, generally measure no larger than thirty cm in height. Iconography is another determining factor, although it is not conclusive in all cases. Statuettes of Zeus, Fortuna, Sarapis, and Isis, figures that frequently were the focus of domestic cult, were unlikely to have been displayed merely as decoration. Conversely, given their secular nature, it is unlikely that works such as the copy of Myron's Diskobolos (cat. no. 44) and the Dancers found at Ambelokipi (cat. nos. 39 and 45) would have been displayed in a household shrine. Such works no doubt formed part of the owner's collection of decorative works and would probably have been on display in various areas of the house and garden.⁴ More difficult to categorize are minor mythological figures including Herakles and associates of Dionysos and Aphrodite, as well as the two deities themselves. In the Hellenistic period, these two divinities were frequently on display in houses and not only

³ Dwyer 1982, p. 121. Larger residences, such as royal villas and palaces, may not have had such restrictions regarding the size of their household shrines and cult statues.

⁴ For sculpture displayed in Greek and Roman houses, see Isager 1993, Bartman 1991, Neudecker 1988, Zanker 1979b and Catling and Waywell 1977; for garden statuary see Albertocchi 1997, Hill 1981, Ridgway 1981, and Jashemski 1978.

served religious needs but in all likelihood were increasingly admired as well for their decorative properties and their associations with symposium activities. Consequently, with these ambiguous figures, distinguishing between these two functions – cultic and decorative - is best determined on a case-by-case basis.

While the study of Roman bronzes has proceeded at a rapid pace over the last twenty to thirty years, little is known of the bronze-making industry on mainland Greece after the Roman conquest. There is ample evidence that a flourishing art trade existed between Greece and Rome and the finds from the Mahdia and Antikythera shipwrecks clearly attest to the export of bronze statuary to Rome. The Roman fondness for works by certain Greek masters is well known both through literary sources and archaeological finds;⁵ however, we know little about local acquisition of bronzes and whether inhabitants of Imperial Greece were equally desirous of collecting and displaying famous works of art.

As in the previous chapter, the Imperial Greek bronze statuettes discussed in this chapter were discovered within the boundaries of modern Greece. They were found over a considerable geographical range, however most, not surprisingly, come from Athens. Many of the Imperial Greek statuettes were discovered in destruction debris or in hoards and focus mainly will fall on the largest groups, namely those from the Casa dei Bronzi and in Damsa on Kos, the hoard from Paramythia, various caches from the Athenian Agora, and the hoard from Ambelokipi. The geographical range allows me to briefly delve into the question of the degree to which local preferences for certain deities factor in the choice of gods and goddesses that an individual has on display in his house.

One feature that many of the Imperial Greek statuettes have in common is a *terminus ante quem* of the mid to late third century AC; a considerable number from Athens date to the time of the Herulian sack in AD 267. Thus, the bronze statuettes discussed in this chapter date overwhelmingly to the second, possibly third century AC. Few examples can be confidently dated any earlier and therefore there is a noticeable absence of bronze statuettes securely dated to the first and second centuries AC. To a certain extent this imbalance may be attributed to chance; the Herulian sack was so catastrophic that a number of bronzes have been preserved in the destruction debris. On the other hand there are major signs of economic and societal unrest in the Hellenistic period and this also must have contributed to a decline in artistic activity.⁶ Consequently, aside from the evidence of Roman domestic religion from Delos, there is little material evidence from the rest of Greece that could inform us on the introduction of Roman domestic cult practices during the critical period following the establishment of Roman rule on mainland Greece.

Roman Domestic Cult and the Use of Bronze Statuettes

In Italy, bronze statuettes were often used in the service of Roman domestic cult. In the houses and villas buried by the eruption of Vesuvius these bronze statuettes typically have been easy to identify due to the fact that they were clearly set apart as a distinct group, were commonly displayed in a niche or shrine (*lararium*) and may have

⁵ See above page 5, footnote 12.

⁶ See in particular Alcock 1993 and 1994, and Hoff and Rotroff 1997. For Athens, see Stewart 1979.

had an altar or votives preserved nearby.⁷ *Lararia* in Pompeii and Herculaneum, usually found in the atrium or kitchen, were the focal point of daily ritual activities, carried out either by the *paterfamilias* or by the household slaves,⁸ as well as the location of special festivities often associated with a marriage, the birth of a child or a maturation ritual.

Unlike Greek and Hellenistic domestic cults, which appear to have been less formalized or universal, Roman household religion was characterized by some common parameters. The Roman household shrine, or *lararium*, receives its name from the *lares*, the guardian spirits of the house and household, who were frequently displayed in the shrine, either in painted or sculpted form. They took the form of young men wearing short chitons who typically were portrayed in a sort of dancing pose, raised on tiptoe with one arm held high supporting a rhiton. Another indigenous Roman spirit frequently associated with *lararia* is the *genius*, typically depicted as a youthful male wearing a toga and holding a phiale or cornucopia and who was responsible for protecting the *paterfamilias*, specifically with ensuring his sexual fertility. These two figures, the *lar* and *genius*, considered to be the most prevalent figures of Roman household cult, are not always found among the bronze statuettes on display in *lararia*. At Pompeii and Herculaneum, *lar* statuettes appeared in approximately 1 out of every 3.5 *lararia* indicating that their presence was by no means mandatory.⁹ It must be mentioned, however, that such figures along with the figure of a snake, a protective deity and also a sign of good fortune, were occasionally rendered in paint, which is less likely to have

⁷ For recent scholarship on Roman domestic religion see in particular the publications by D.G. Orr and P. Foss. For domestic religious practices on Delos, refer to Bulard (1926). A very useful comparative study on Greek and Roman domestic cults was carried out by Nilsson (1954).

⁸ See in particular the publications by Foss (1994 and 1997).

been preserved to the present day. Thus, the rate of their appearance stated above is probably too low.

Other deities, both domestic and foreign, were also honored in Roman household religious practices. Similar to the Greek deity Hestia, the Roman goddess of the hearth Vesta held a place of honor among the household deities and, like Hestia, was worshipped at the hearth fire and was rarely rendered in physical form. In contrast, other Roman household deities or *penates* were customarily represented either in sculpted or painted form and were displayed together in a *lararium*, typically in the form of a niche or *aedicula*. While there is no set configuration of deities displayed in *lararia*, for personal choice and regional traditions played a role in which figures were honored, certain gods and goddesses were obvious favorites.¹⁰ Divinities were frequently included in household shrines for various reasons. They may have been promoted by the imperial family (e.g. Venus under the Julio-Claudians), or because of their role as civic patrons or due to the family's religious beliefs, such as devotion to Egyptian gods. Among the bronze statuettes found in Italian *lararia*, the most prominent deities are Minerva, Mercury, Venus, Jupiter and Harpokrates, while slightly less numerous are Herakles, Fortuna and Isis-Fortuna (see Chart 2).¹¹

An important study carried out by Kaufmann-Heinimann reveals the regional character of *lararia* contents in the Roman Empire.¹² While there are some similarities between Campanian and Gaulic/Germanic *lararia* contents – the number of Jupiter,

⁹ Although *lares* traditionally were conceived of in pairs, a few houses only had one displayed in the household shrines.

¹⁰ Kaufmann-Heinimann 2002, p. 108.

¹¹ The subject matter of *lararium* paintings is not included in this study. See Orr 1972 and 1978, and Fröhlich 1991. For Delos, see Bulard 1926 and Bruneau 1970.

genius, Diana, Minerva, and Fortuna are notable – there are some rather striking differences. In the northern provinces, *lares* were infrequently represented, while Mercury was exceptionally favored. Especially intriguing is the novel appearance of Mars, Neptune, and Victory (perhaps not too surprising considering the increased presence of the Roman army), and aside from a few rare appearances of Isis-Fortuna, Egyptian deities are rarely found. Clearly, geographical, cultural and social considerations strongly determined the character of *lararia* found in various regions of the Roman Empire.

Statuettes from Kos – the Casa dei Bronzi and Damsa Bronzes

Of the bronze statuettes known from Greek Imperial contexts only a few – approximately ten percent – were discovered in the process of excavating an actual house. Among this small group, four statuettes, as well as a bronze bust, were discovered during excavation of the Casa dei Bronzi on Kos in 1942.¹³ The statuettes represent Mars, Isis-Aphrodite, Isis-Fortuna, and Isis (cat. nos. 8-11, figs. 10-16), and the bust has been identified by Maria Luisa Morricone as Geta (cat. no. 12).¹⁴ Judging from similar stylistic traits exhibited by the Mars, Isis-Fortuna and Isis-Aphrodite statuettes, it is probable that they were locally produced, perhaps in the same workshop. Coins found in the house, issued by Gallienus and Salonina and dating between AD 253 and 268,

¹² Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998 (p. 193) and 2002 (p. 106).

¹³ In the excavation report, Luigi Morricone (Morricone 1950) mentions only three statuettes. The bronze bust also attributed to the Casa dei Bronzi was published by M. L. Morricone (Morricone 1979-1980). Dimitrios Bosnakis lists a fourth statuette from the Casa dei Bronze, that of an Isis (Bosnakis 1994-1995, pl. 10a).

¹⁴ Morricone 1979-1980.

suggest that the house burned down shortly after the middle of the third century AC.¹⁵

The date also serves as a *terminus ante quem* for the bronze statuettes and bust.

Another cache of bronzes, consisting of an Isis-Fortuna, a running Artemis, an Asklepios (cat. nos. 13-15), and a bronze bust of Caligula (cat. no. 16), was found on Kos in the Damsa district in 1984.¹⁶ They were discovered in the Agora in debris lying above the remains of a shop, and according to Giorgios Dontas the bronze statuettes and bust once belonged to a *lararium* from a nearby house.¹⁷ Coins found in the underlying building suggest a destruction date of the shop shortly after the middle of the third century AC, which suggests to Dontas that the bronzes were deposited there at approximately the same time or shortly thereafter.¹⁸ Of the four bronzes from the Damsa site, only two have been published: the bust by Dontas¹⁹ and the Isis-Fortuna statuette by Bosnakis.²⁰ Photos and descriptions of the remaining two statuettes depicting Asklepios and a running Artemis are currently not available and therefore will not be discussed here.

The bronze statuettes from the Casa dei Bronzi are in an excellent state of preservation, complete with bases,²¹ and are one of the finest assemblages of bronze statuettes found in Greece. The size and assortment of deities, especially the presence of Isis-Fortuna, suggest that they belonged to a household shrine. Similarly, in her

¹⁵ Morricone 1950.

¹⁶ *ArchDelt* 42 (1987) p. 640; Dontas 1989.

¹⁷ Dontas 1989, p. 55.

¹⁸ Dontas 1989, p. 55.

¹⁹ Dontas 1989.

²⁰ Bosnakis 1994-1995.

²¹ During my examination of the Casa dei Bronzi statuettes, I was unable to view the Isis-Aphrodite and Isis figurines, or any of the bases. However, Bosnakis (1994-1995) provides good illustrations of the three female statuettes complete with their bases. I have no knowledge of whether the Mars figurine was found

publication of the Geta bust, M. L. Morricone proposes that the bust as well was the focus of domestic cult activities.²² The presence of a portrait of a member of the Roman imperial family indicates that the owners held close ties to Rome. Yet, the assemblage has few hallmarks of a traditional Roman household shrine; missing are *genii* and *lares*. The absence of these figures, however, is perhaps not too unusual. At Delos, Pompeii and Herculaneum, *lares* were occasionally represented in fresco, and additionally there are numerous examples of house cult assemblages, particularly those outside of Campania, that do not include *genii* or *lares*.²³ The overwhelming emphasis on Isis suggests instead that the owner was a closer adherent to eastern cults than to the traditional Roman deities. The Mars figure as well, although faintly reminiscent of the Mars Ultor cult statue, has closer affinities with eastern examples of the god of war and the bronze statuette was undoubtedly locally produced.

The Mars statuette (cat. no. 8, figs. 10-13) is finely worked with a considerable amount of attention given to rendering the dress and armor. In addition to the Corinthian helmet, cuirass, greaves and sandals, the figure would have had a shield strapped to the left forearm and, as an excavation photo reveals, a spear in the lowered right hand.²⁴ Adding to the splendor of the figure, gold foil adorned the greaves, chiton, cuirass and helmet (much of it has flaked off) and the eyes may have been inlaid with silver. The technical finesse of the bronze craftsman who made the Mars figure is also evident in the

with its base, although an excavation photograph clearly shows a spear held in his right hand (Morricone 1950, p. 317, fig. 86).

²² Morricone 1979-1980, p. 374.

²³ For *lararia* inventories from Campania, see Boyce 1937, p. 107 and Fröhlich 1991, pp. 356-358. For *lararia* outside of Italy, particularly those found in Germany, see the studies carried out by Kaufmann-Heinimann.

²⁴ Morricone 1950, p. 317, fig. 86.

manner in which the statuette was cast and constructed. Like many bronze statuettes of considerable size (the Mars figure measures 26 cm in height) it was hollow cast and was constructed using a piece-mold process. The figure was assembled from at least three pieces: the body and two legs (fig. 13).²⁵ The torso is hollow and discolored patches on the skirt may indicate where chaplets were employed during casting and later patched. The separately cast legs were attached to the chiton skirt by horizontal struts. This seemingly elaborate process was undoubtedly more economical, using less bronze, than statuettes cast whole, such as the similar-sized bronze statuette of a warrior from Corinth (cat. no. 71).

Mars figurines are extremely rare from the *lararia* of Italy but are much more numerous from those found in the provinces. Both Kaufmann-Heinimann and Boucher have noted the large number of Mars statuettes from Gaul and Germany, a situation that must owe itself to the heavy presence of the Roman army.²⁶ An interesting comparison is offered by another bronze statuette of Mars found in Pergamon. It was discovered in 1963 along with two other bronze statuettes, a Herakles and Satyr, during excavation of a Hellenistic/Roman terrace house.²⁷ They were discovered in a disturbed layer, which did not allow for establishing a date by context. Based on stylistic analysis, Pinkwart proposes a date for the Pergamon Mars of no earlier than the second half of the first century BC.²⁸

²⁵ A microscopic examination and a x-ray would no doubt reveal further details on the casting and construction of the bronze statuette.

²⁶ Boucher 1976, p. 133. See in particular the map showing the distribution of Mars statuettes throughout the Roman Empire (Map XVI, pp. 376-377).

²⁷ Pinkwart 1972, p. 115.

²⁸ Pinkwart 1972, p. 136.

The Pergamon Mars wears a simple muscle cuirass with gorgoneion, Corinthian helmet, greaves and a cloak draped over his left shoulder. He is depicted in contrapposto with right arm upraised holding a spear, his left arm held at his side, over which trails the end of his cloak. When compared to other bronze statuettes representing the Mars Ultor type, the Pergamon Mars follows the conventional form to a considerable degree. By contrast, the Kos statuette is noticeably different. Rather unusual is the lowered and slightly convoluted position of the right arm and hand, which once held a spear. Even more apparent is the dynamic pose of the figure. There is a strong sense of movement created by the exaggerated s-curve of the body, the torsion of the figure and the lively yet elegant manner in which the god steps forward. The finely sculpted features of the face have been enlivened by the wild profusion of curls of his beard and hair. Judging from the pose and artistic style, the Mars from the Casa dei Bronzi was inspired less from classicizing examples, as the majority of Mars bronze statuettes were, and finds closer parallels with baroque elements found in Hellenistic and Imperial Greek sculpture produced in the region. The style in general is very reminiscent of Pergamene sculpture.²⁹ While the Kos Mars statuette has some affinities with the Mars Ultor cult statue, perhaps drawn from a similar prototype, it cannot be considered a direct copy.

Of particular interest is the elaborate cuirass worn by the Mars from Kos. The muscle cuirass with two rows of *pteryges* is conventional in form, but a few formal and decorative elements are idiosyncratic and suggest that the statuette was manufactured sometime during the first half of the second century AC. These elements include the acanthus leaf decoration across the abdomen, specific structural and decorative features

²⁹Cf. the Hellenistic portrait of a Ruler and a Hermaphrodite, Smith 1991, nos. 181 & 187.

of the *pteryges*, and the square neck. Cuirassed statues of Trajan are the first to consistently exhibit two of these elements: the acanthus leaf and the short bar hinges decorating the upper row of *pteryges*.³⁰ As well, portraits of Hadrian frequently adopt these features with a significant number also displaying a square-necked cuirass. According to C. C. Vermeule, a considerable number of Hadrian's marble cuirassed statues that are similar in form to the Kos Mars statuette were produced in the east with two fine examples from Istanbul and Olympia.³¹ A third example from the Agora at Thasos similarly displays a plain cuirass with gorgoneion fitted with a square neck and two rows of *pteryges* decorated with pendant foliate designs very much like the Kos statuette.³² Anton Hekler notes further that cuirassed portraits from Hadrian's reign often emphasized the *pteryges* hinges, rendered in relief, which became a distinctive decorative element.³³ Like Vermeule, Hekler observes that many of these cuirassed statues were found in the east, specifically Athens, suggesting that again these are regional features.³⁴ Cuirassed statues of two subsequent emperors, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, exhibit acanthus leaf embellishments and square necklines, but rarely the distinctive *pteryges* hinges. In addition to wearing a similar type of cuirass, the Kos statuette also compares well with portraits of Hadrian found in the eastern Mediterranean, which exhibit a similar exaggeration of pose and sense of movement.³⁵ Based on these

³⁰ Vermeule (1959) lists three cuirassed portraits of Trajan that have these features (figs. 35, 38 and 126).

³¹ Vermeule 1959, nos. 180-191.

³² Vermeule 1966, no. 179A.

³³ Hekler 1919, pp. 229-230.

³⁴ Hekler 1919, pp. 229-232.

³⁵ Cf. Vermeule 1980, no. 65 (from Perge), no. 67 (currently held in Bursa Museum), and no. 69 (Olympia Museum).

comparisons, the Kos bronze statuette was made in the eastern Mediterranean, perhaps on Kos itself, and may be dated to the Hadrianic period.

Two bronze statuettes of Isis-Fortuna are known from Kos, including the large and elegant figure from the Casa dei Bronzi (cat. no. 9, figs. 14-16) and the smaller figure from Damsa (cat. no. 13). The fusion of Fortuna, the Roman personification of fortune or luck, and the Egyptian divinity Isis, a more universal deity but whose main attraction was perhaps as a savior goddess, resulted in a deity who was particularly suited for domestic worship. Small-scale representations of Fortuna abound in the Hellenistic and Roman world, but the popularity of the combined form of Isis-Fortuna appears to have been predominantly restricted to Italy and parts of the eastern Mediterranean.³⁶

Rather small and unassuming, the Damsa Isis-Fortuna (cat no. 13) at 10.3 cm does not have the visual impact of the larger (31 cm) and more refined Casa dei Bronzi statuette (cat. no. 9, figs. 14-16). The Damsa Isis-Fortuna has a petite slender body with a comparatively large head and rounded face. She is swathed in clothing, which tends to hide her small frame. Over a long chiton, a himation is wrapped about her body and gathered at her chest in an Isis knot; a heavy cloak is draped over her left shoulder and slung low across her abdomen. Her headdress consists of a diadem and Isis crown, and she grasps a tall slender cornucopia in her left hand and a rudder in her right. The type is relatively common: numerous bronzes have been found in Italy, particularly at Pompeii and Herculaneum, as well as in southern regions of the northern Roman provinces; terracottas are known from Egypt; and coins with her image were issued from the

Alexandrian mint during the mid-third century AC.³⁷ Although the statuette may have been made in a local workshop, the figure was inspired by a more conventional and universal representation of the goddess.

The statuette of Isis-Fortuna from the Casa dei Bronzi (figs. 14-16), although immediately recognizable as an amalgamation of the two deities by her headdress and the attributes she carries, is rather atypical particularly in her dress and sculptural style. Instead of the himation draped low across her body and draped over her left arm or pinned at her left shoulder, as is traditional with most Isis-Fortuna representations, the Casa dei Bronzi figure wears the loose himation pinned at her left shoulder, which envelopes much her body in the manner of a cloak. In her outstretched left hand she holds a very small cornucopia,³⁸ which is not at all similar to the tall sinuous cornucopia commonly found cradled in the goddess's left arm. Judging by the position of her right hand she held a rudder by her side, a common attribute of the goddess, and she wears the traditional headdress, a combination of a stephane and a tall Isis crown or basileion. In addition to the unusual aspects of dress, the rendering of the figure is also intriguing. The arms are especially long and sinuous, so too is the neck. Enveloped in the folds of her himation, the goddess's body appears especially broad and substantial contrasting sharply with the delicate features of her small face. While certain aspects of the dress and crown have been crafted with a great deal of detail, the modeling of the face, neck and arms has

³⁶ See graph in Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, p. 193, fig 138. The majority of coins and bronze statuettes depicting Isis-Fortuna originated from Italian and Eastern Roman Empire contexts (see LIMC V, 1990, pp. 784-786, nos. 303-315, s.v. Isis (T. Tam Tinh).

³⁷ LIMC V, 1990, p. 784, nos. 303-305, pl. 520-521, s.v. Isis (T. Tam Tinh).

³⁸ Currently detached. Bosnakis 1994-1995, pl. 9.

been executed with greater interest in fashioning smooth polished surfaces than in creating a naturalistic representation of skin, muscle and bone.

The Isis-Aphrodite statuette from the Casa dei Bronzi (cat. no. 10)³⁹ displays similar stylistic details and is of a type that appears equally rare.⁴⁰ While Isis-Aphrodite statuettes in general are not uncommon – a number of examples have been found in Egypt and Syria – they regularly depict the goddess nude, most likely in preparation for her bath or having just completed it.⁴¹ Somewhat unusually, the Kos example is rendered in the pudica pose, yet the goddess is fully dressed making her attitude, often interpreted as a vain effort to cover her nakedness or more likely a coy attempt to draw attention to it, a mere pretense. Rather appropriately, however, a short-sleeved chiton clings closely to her body revealing her breasts and the soft swell of her belly and hips; her right hand is raised towards her breasts, while her lowered left hand grasps the excess folds of a himation that is wrapped about her hips. She wears an Isis crown, almost an exact replica of the one her companion Isis-Fortuna wears, as well as a vulture crown, which sits low on her head and consists primarily of two rounded wing-like projections that flare out to either side. This combined headdress is commonly seen on nude representations of Isis-Aphrodite.⁴²

³⁹ For an illustration of the bronze statuette including its base, see Bosnakis 1994-1995, pl. 9.

⁴⁰ A close parallel to the Isis-Aphrodite statuette, apparently from the same series, appeared in the Royal Athena Galleries' publication *Gods and Mortals*, p. 41, no. 151.

⁴¹ LIMC V, 1990, nos. 249-254, pl. 517, s.v *Isis* (T. Tam Tinh).

⁴² LIMC V, 1990, nos. 252, pl. 517, s.v *Isis* (T. Tam Tinh).

The small number of extant Isis-Aphrodite statuettes of the clothed pudica type do not have precise findspots, yet most are generally attributed to Syria.⁴³ Venus was frequently honored in houses and villas in Rome and Campania, no doubt through her role as the goddess of physical love,⁴⁴ protector of gardens,⁴⁵ at Pompeii as the city's patron deity, and under Augustus as his divine ancestor, but in the eastern Mediterranean, Aphrodite was associated with indigenous deities, particularly Astarte and Isis, and thus had a long history of acceptance into the domestic sphere. As the focus of a divine ancestor cult, as Aphrodite was under the Ptolemies, or venerated by household women for her role in sexual and marital relations, images of Aphrodite and her retinue were especially popular in the Hellenistic East Greek world. This perhaps accounts for her wide acceptance into the Roman household cult in the Eastern Empire.⁴⁶ As noted by Dimitris Bosnakis in his study of Egyptian gods on Rhodes and Kos, Aphrodite's fusion with Isis, again perhaps mainly restricted to the Eastern Empire, may have occurred more readily on Kos due to the island's geographical proximity and close cultural ties to Egypt during the Hellenistic and early Imperial periods.⁴⁷ Yet, the statuette type links it more closely to Syria and Phoenicia, where the cult of Aphrodite and Adonis was especially strong.

⁴³ Jentel 1981; *LIMC* II, 1984, nos. 34-39, s.v. *Aphrodite in peripheria orientali* (M.-O. Jentel); *LIMC* V, 1990, no. 255a-e, pl. 517, s.v. *Isis* (T. Tam Tinh). One example, no. 255b, comes from the de Clerq collection with a tentative place of origin of Amrith, Syria.

⁴⁴ Lloyd-Morgan 1986, pp. 182-184.

⁴⁵ Jashemski 1978, p. 124.

⁴⁶ Burkhalter (1990) has noted a surge in the veneration of Venus/Aphrodite in Roman Egypt, a trend which he mainly attributes to Egypt's Roman population. However, considering the overwhelming number of Venus statuettes attributable to Egypt and Syria and the status the goddess held under the Ptolemies, it is inconceivable that local preferences did not influence the household cult practices of immigrant Romans.

⁴⁷ Bosnakis 1994-1995.

Both the Isis-Fortuna and Isis-Aphrodite statuettes from the Casa dei Bronzi exhibit unusual stylistic and iconographical details not found on bronze statuettes of these two goddesses from outside the Eastern Mediterranean region. The Isis-Aphrodite statuette reveals certain cultural ties with Syria and Phoenicia, however stylistically it does not compare well with bronze statuettes from that region. The Isis-Aphrodite and Isis-Fortuna bronze statuettes from the Casa dei Bronzi are more closely associated with local artistic traditions and were probably made in one of the island's workshops.

According to Dimitrios Bosnakis, another bronze statuette (cat. no. 11) was discovered while excavating the Casa dei Bronzi.⁴⁸ It represents what might be termed a more conventional Isis type, a version that the Classical Greeks may have developed upon first encounter and acceptance of her cult. She wears a chiton and himation with what appears to be a modified Isis knot at the center of her chest. Like a Classical Greek goddess, she stands in contrapposto with her bent left knee breaking through the front of her drapery and her right arm raised as if holding a scepter. In contrast with the Isis-Fortuna and Isis-Aphrodite from the Casa dei Bronzi, both of which share similar lithe forms and elongated proportions, the Isis statuette with its stockier proportions and classicizing style is a product of a different workshop and is similar to earlier depictions of the goddess. Representations of Isis holding a scepter are rare, although a close comparison can be found on a relief scene decorating a first-century BC altar found in the Pythagoreion on Samos.⁴⁹ The stance and distinctive dress of the Kos statuette also recalls a Hellenistic relief from Rhodes in the British Museum depicting Isis, right hand

⁴⁸ Bosnakis 1994-1995, p. 62, pl. 10.

⁴⁹ *LIMC* V, 1990, no. 195, pl. 511, s.v. *Isis* (T. Tam Tinh).

on hip and left hand grasping a scepter, standing before a seated Sarapis.⁵⁰ The style and composition of the Isis statuette suggest that it either was made in a bronze workshop that manufactured classicizing works of art or was produced considerably earlier perhaps in the first century BC to first century AD. Both options are equally possible, although it is worth recalling the fondness that later Greeks and Romans had for collecting and displaying “antique” works of art.⁵¹

While the Isis-Fortuna statuette from Damsa (cat. no. 13) is based on a type with widespread popularity, the bronze statuettes from the Casa dei Bronzi appear to have been influenced to varying degrees by local cultural and artistic trends. The Mars statuette, while similar to the Mars Ultor statue in Rome, displays some rather anomalous features including the lowered spear-bearing hand and a preference for dynamic sinuous lines. The cuirass worn by the god and the sculptural style of the figure indicate that the Mars statuette closely follows regional artistic traditions. The Isis-Fortuna, Isis-Aphrodite and Isis statuettes (cat. nos. 9-11) are rare types, infrequently found beyond the eastern Mediterranean region, and were likely produced as a result of the strong ties Kos enjoyed with neighboring cultures located in Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt.

In contrast, the fifth bronze sculpture attributed to the Casa dei Bronzi, the bronze bust of Geta (cat. no. 12), the ill-fated brother and co-emperor of Caracalla, suggests an adherence to Roman cultural traditions. According to M. L. Morricone the small size of

⁵⁰ LIMC V, 1990, no. 194, pl. 511, s.v. Isis (T. Tam Tinh).

⁵¹ Of special interest are Porphyry's remarks concerning Clearchus of Arcadia who honors images of Hermes, Hekate and other divine images, which he inherited from his ancestors (Porph. Abst. 2.16). Cicero also mentions ancient family heirlooms held in the family chapel of Heius of Syracuse (Verr. II, 4, 7).

the bust indicates that it was the object of private veneration.⁵² This, however, presents a dilemma as Geta suffered a *damnatio memoriae*. A similar case exists for another small bronze bust found on Kos: a portrait of Caligula from Damsa (cat. no. 16). Georgios Dontas, who published the bust in 1989, notes that portraits of Caligula are relatively numerous and include a number of comparable small bronze busts.⁵³ The situation is unusual considering that, like Geta, Caligula also was given a *damnatio memoriae*. Since the busts were found in a private not a public context and originated in a Roman province and not in the Roman heartland, perhaps the requirements of the *damnatio memoriae* were not so closely observed. One might also ask whether these two emperors were the focus of a private imperial cult, or were they simply honorary portraits on display in the homes of admiring subjects?

While the more prominent public aspect of the imperial cult has been the focus of a considerable amount of scholarship,⁵⁴ information on the origins and character of the imperial cult in the private sphere are relatively lacking. Ancient authors, including Pliny the Younger,⁵⁵ Horace,⁵⁶ and Tacitus,⁵⁷ occasionally refer to imperial portraits on display in the home,⁵⁸ and there is a small but growing number of statues and busts of imperial family members excavated from or associated with Roman houses to which the two Kos bronze busts may be added. Some of the most intriguing finds include a group

⁵² Morricone 1979-1980, p. 374.

⁵³ Dontas 1989, pp. 52-54. For additional portraits of Caligula, see Boschung 1989.

⁵⁴ For scholarship prior to 1978, see Peter 1978. More recent publications include Santero 1983; Price 1984; Fishwick 1991a and 1991b; Bergmann 1998; Beard, North and Price 1998; Gradel 2002.

⁵⁵ *Ep.* x 8; x 70-1.

⁵⁶ *Carm.* IV, 5, 31-32.

⁵⁷ *Ann.* 1, 73.

⁵⁸ See also Santero 1983, Scott 1930 and 1932.

of Julio-Claudian bronze busts from Rome;⁵⁹ marble busts of Pertinax, Gordian III (?), and Constantius I Chlorus from a Late Roman villa in Antioch;⁶⁰ marble imperial portraits ranging from Augustus to Philip the Arab from a villa at Chiragon;⁶¹ a portrait of Commodus⁶² and marble busts of Tiberius and Livia⁶³ from two houses in Ephesus. While this limited amount of literary and archaeological evidence clearly attests to the display and veneration of imperial portraiture within the confines of Roman households, the exact nature and purpose of the rituals performed are less well understood.

According to J. M. Santero, one of the few scholars to address this issue, private cult activities are typically more difficult to detect and, indeed, understand principally because such activities were spontaneous, occasional and took place outside the confines of organized public worship.⁶⁴ Disregarding any discussion of the precise origins of the imperial cult in general, Santero postulates that “the private worship of Augustus, as that of the succeeding emperors, appears very early under the guise of the worship of the *genius augusti* or the *imago principis* which was often included *inter lares familiares*.”⁶⁵ Santero does not explicitly state the motivation behind the private veneration of the emperor and members of the imperial family, and in fact he may not see a great deal of religiosity behind the private worship of the emperor: “it was a religion of adulation of the emperor through his images and statues which were considered sacred with a more

⁵⁹ Hill 1939. Of the five found, Hill identifies four as representing members of the Julio-Claudian family.

⁶⁰ Brinkerhoff 1970.

⁶¹ Espérandieu 1908, pp. 33-95, nos. 893-1011.

⁶² Fleischer 1972-75, pp. 438-439.

⁶³ Robert 1982.

⁶⁴ Santero 1983, p. 112.

⁶⁵ Santero 1983, pp. 114-115. Ovid mentions as well that *imagines* of Augustus, Livia and Tiberius were on display in his own *lararium* (Pont II. 8,1).

practical and symbolic meaning rather than an authentic religious sentiment.”⁶⁶ His insistence on the sanctity of the imperial busts and the connection of the worship of the emperor to that of the *genius augusti* and *lares augusti*, both of which were concerned with the continuing well being and prosperity of the emperor and his family, suggest otherwise.

In contrast to Santero, Otto Gradel, in his book Emperor Worship and Roman Religion, indicates that while there is clear evidence for the presence of imperial portraits in private houses, it is compelling to note that none have been found in the *lararia* contents of houses in Pompeii and Herculaneum.⁶⁷ He does point out that there are literary references to the presence of imperial portraits in *lararia*, such as Ovid’s possession of portraits of Augustus’ family⁶⁸ and the bust of the child Augustus given to Hadrian by Suetonius,⁶⁹ but concludes that portraits of living emperors appeared to have been the norm and that this practice may have been predominately confined to the environs of Rome.⁷⁰ Since the imperial cult was often directed towards living emperors, Gradel asserts that portraits of them in private contexts would more appropriately have been made of less permanent materials, such as painted images on walls or on wood panels, which could have easily been replaced upon the emperor’s death.⁷¹

For evidence of private cult activities directed to the imperial family found outside of Italy, it is worthwhile to mention the discovery in 1980 of a domestic shrine

⁶⁶ Santero 1983, p. 119.

⁶⁷ Gradel 2002, p. 204.

⁶⁸ Ov. Pont. 2.8; 4.9.

⁶⁹ Suet. Vit. 2.5 and Aug. 7.1.

⁷⁰ Gradel 2002, pp. 204-205.

found in a Late Roman house in Ephesus.⁷² The shrine consists of a large niche in which were found busts of Livia and Tiberius, both dating to the early part of the first century AC. The designation as a domestic shrine seems assured by the presence of a large bronze snake, the *genius loci*, that was found on the ground in front of the niche. L. Robert, who published the finds in 1982, remarks that, on the one hand, the display of imperial portraits demonstrates the loyalty of the house occupants, but there was a deeper religious sentiment involved as well. Veneration of the emperor ensured the protection of Roman citizens and the peace, stability and prosperity of the Roman Empire, whereas Livia, in her guise as the new Hera, Vesta and Demeter, was supplicated to promote the welfare of families and crops.⁷³ Yet it is not clear whether this shrine provides evidence of a domestic imperial cult. This was not the worship of the living emperor but of Livia and Tiberius, who had been dead for over two centuries. Obviously portraits of deceased emperors displayed in private contexts were not always the focus of imperial cult, but as the Ephesus finds suggest they still could have served a religious function.⁷⁴ Duncan Fishwick, in his article “Ovid and Divus Augustus,” asserts that Roman citizens may have supplicated deceased emperors to act as intercessors with the gods.⁷⁵ He points out that this was not an uncommon occurrence in the Greek world as the inhabitants were known to have prayed to Agamemnon, Alcestis and Alexander, and also to their deceased

⁷¹ Gradel 2002, 199-201. Gradel acknowledges that a number of small-scale imperial portraits exist and would have been appropriate for display in houses, yet declines to state one way or another on whether they were used for cult or decorative purposes.

⁷² Robert 1982.

⁷³ Robert 1982, p. 130.

⁷⁴ There are instances when emperors were still given honors after death. In particular, Augustus and members of his family represent a unique case: the birthdays of Augustus and Livia were still being honored in the late second century AC in Pergamon and in the late 3rd century AC there is a reference to a priest of Tiberius in the Lycian assembly (Price 1984, p. 61).

relatives, for assistance.⁷⁶ Fishwick emphasizes that it was to “righteous dead” that the living typically directed their prayers,⁷⁷ and while it may be easy to imagine Geta in this role, by the end of his life Caligula could hardly have been considered righteous, at least by the inhabitants of Rome. The inhabitants of the Roman provinces may have held other views of these emperors and even under Roman rule they continued to engage in traditional local religious practices, which would have been foreign to Roman eyes.

Personal choice likely played a considerable role on which imperial portraits a Roman citizen would display in his house. In his discussion on the imperial portraits found in a Late Roman villa in Antioch, Dericksen Brinkerhoff proposes that the collection probably belonged to an official.⁷⁸ Although he erroneously bases this assumption on the belief that private citizens would not possess them, his original hypothesis is not unreasonable.⁷⁹ Imperial portraits found with those of priests or priestesses, such as the marble busts of Antoninus Pius and a priestess found in a Late Imperial house on the Areopagus,⁸⁰ suggest that participation in a religious cult, particularly an imperial cult, might also effect which imperial portraits could be found in a given house. Personal affiliations may have been behind the decision for the display of the Caligula bust in the Kos house at Damsa. Also found at the Damsa site was a bronze statuette of Asklepios, which led Dontas to postulate that the group of bronze statuettes and the Caligula bust might have come from the house of Gaius Stertinius Xenophon or

⁷⁵ Fishwick 1991b, p. 37.

⁷⁶ Fishwick 1991b, p. 37.

⁷⁷ Fishwick 1991b, p. 37.

⁷⁸ Brinkerhoff 1970, pp. 11-12.

⁷⁹ Santero details literary evidence that suggests average citizens did possess imperial portraits (1983, pp. 114-115).

⁸⁰ Shear 1973, pp. 168-172.

his brother Q. Stertinius, both of whom were well-known physicians in the employ of the Julio-Claudian emperors.⁸¹ Yet, as stated above, the statuettes and bust were found overlying a building that apparently was destroyed shortly after the middle of the third century AC leaving some two hundred years between the manufacture of the bust, the lifetime of the two brothers and the presumed destruction of the house in which the bronzes were displayed. This extended period of display may not be so unusual. Elizabeth Bartman, in her article “Sculptural Collecting and Display in the Private Realm,” proposes that such collections of imperial portraits not only demonstrated the piety of the house owner towards the imperial family, but also “commemorated the owner’s relationship with the imperial house.”⁸²

While this discussion may answer some of the questions regarding the Caligula and Geta busts from Kos, others must remain unanswered. Considering their original Late Imperial contexts and, more importantly, the fact that both emperors received a *damnatio memoriae*, it is extremely doubtful that either was the focus of private imperial cult activities. They may have served some other religious purpose, such as intercessor with the gods, but to modern observers the choice of these two emperors – Caligula who was vilified and Geta who was only co-emperor and who was murdered at a young age – is odd to say the very least. These circumstances would seem to support the conclusion that Caligula and Geta and by extension their portraits would not have been venerated by the Roman populace. Yet other factors influenced which emperors were honored by individual citizens. For example, as noted by Dontas, a considerable number of small

⁸¹ Dontas 1989, p. 56.

⁸² Bartman 1991, pp. 76-77.

bronze busts of Caligula are extant and, like the example found at the Casa dei Bronzi, may have been owned by private citizens and not displayed in public. While Caligula's public portraits were re-cut or destroyed, private portraits of the emperor may not have been subject to the same fate. It is also worth emphasizing that these portraits were found far from Rome where imperial political intrigues typically took place. Political and religious sentiments were by no means universally held in the far-flung Roman Empire and therefore it should not be considered too extraordinary to find these two emperors still held in some esteem in some areas of the empire.

The Paramythia Bronzes

Offering yet another perspective on the types of bronze statuettes from Greek Imperial domestic contexts are the so-called Paramythia bronzes (cat. nos. 17-26) discovered in northwest Greece in 1791-1792.⁸³ Approximately twenty bronzes were found in the cache and the majority is now in the collection of the British Museum and represents a range of major and minor deities. The presence of a *lar* (a rare occurrence on mainland Greece), the size of the statuettes (ranging between 16.2 and 34 centimeters in height), and the predominant presence of deities support Swaddling's statement that the bronzes once formed the contents of a *lararium*.⁸⁴ Considering the large number of

⁸³ Swaddling (1979, p. 103) notes that the bronzes were found not at Paramythia, but a few kilometers away in the village of Labovo. She deduces that at least twenty bronzes were discovered in 1791-1792, after which they were sold to various dealers and collectors. Six bronzes were sold to Count Golowkin (representing Jupiter, Juno, a bearded faun, Cupid, a Hekataion and Hercules) but their current location is unknown. Fourteen eventually ended up in the collection of the British Museum, the majority of which Walters published in the British Museum Catalogue of Bronzes (Walters 1899, nos. 272-281, 1446).

⁸⁴ On the basis of subject matter and size, at least two of the bronze statuettes may not have served as *lararia* figures: the figure of Odysseus escaping beneath a ram in the British Museum (H. 5.6 cm) and a bearded faun (current location unknown - see above reference). Figures from Dionysos' *thiasos* were

bronze statuettes preserved, it is unlikely that they were all displayed together or that all were cultic in nature. The inventories from Pompeii and Herculaneum indicate that *lararia* containing three to five statuettes were the norm with a few houses displaying as many as eight or nine. More than likely, the Paramythia bronze statuettes were displayed in a number of different locations, either in separate shrines or scattered around the house and garden.

At Pompeii, the character and function of multiple shrines is elucidated by P. Foss in his article “Watchful *Lares*: Roman Household Organization and the Rituals of Cooking and Eating.”⁸⁵ More a feature of larger houses and villas, the existence of multiple shrines of varying size and ornamentation located in both private and public areas of the house suggests to Foss that each was utilized by distinct members of the household, from lowly slaves to high-ranking family members. While this exact scenario may not be appropriate for the Paramythia bronzes (the known bronze statuettes are of a similar high quality), the suggestion that they inhabited different (sacred?) locations is highly probable. As mentioned by Swaddling, the Paramythia Hekataion⁸⁶ was more appropriately displayed at the entrance to a house. Furthermore, numerous marble and bronze statuettes of Herakles, Venus and Eros found at Pompeii and Herculaneum

infrequently included in *lararia*. At Pompeii, a Priapos and Silenos were found in the *lararium* of House VII, 15, 3 and a terracotta Priapos was found with a Mercury in House I, 4, 5 (Fröhlich 1991, p. 356). More often, statuary representing Pan, satyrs, and nymphs were found in Roman gardens. Whether such representations primarily served a decorative or cult function is debated. See Jashemski 1978, pp. 123-124, Hill 1981, and Dwyer 1982.

⁸⁵ Foss 1997.

⁸⁶ Current location unknown.

demonstrate that certain deities were especially favored for garden statuary, either for decorative purposes or, when found with an altar and/or votives, as cult objects.⁸⁷

One statuette that has received surprisingly little attention is the *lar* (cat. no. 25). Relatively common in Italy and to a certain degree in the northern and western Roman provinces,⁸⁸ only two *lar* statuettes are known from mainland Greece.⁸⁹ Their rarity is underscored by the fact that not only have few been found during excavations, but also they are scarcely to be found among the stray finds on display in Greek museums. The absence of these traditional Roman cult figures in Imperial Greece, aside from painted examples found on the island of Delos, has rarely been commented upon, yet it provides invaluable evidence on the overwhelming lack of Roman character to these domestic household shrines. As such, unless otherwise indicated by the presence of a *lar* or *genius*, prototypical Roman domestic cult figures, household shrines from Greek Imperial contexts should not be referred to as *lararia*.

Easily recognizable by his stance and characteristic dress, the Paramythia *lar* is nonetheless distinguished by his tall elegant proportions and the finely draped folds of his chiton. Furthermore, instead of the usual high boots worn by western *lar* statuettes, the Paramythia example wears sandals. Rather exceptionally, in style and attitude it deviates from other examples of dancing *lares* (*lares compitales*), whose energetic dancing pose is intensified by the torsion of the body and wildly fluttering of the chiton skirt. Contrarily,

⁸⁷ Jashemski 1978, especially pp. 121-125.

⁸⁸ A very useful discussion on the iconography and dating of *lar* statuettes was presented by S. Boucher and H. Oggiano-Bitar at the 12th International Congress on Ancient Bronzes (Boucher and Oggiano-Bitar 1995).

⁸⁹ See cat. no. 32, found in the Athenian Agora.

the Paramythia *lar* steps forward in a quiet stately manner, and in pose and dress he exhibits none of the exuberance typically displayed by western examples.

In addition to the *lar*, a number of the other Paramythia bronze statuettes also demonstrate a marked Roman character. The seated Hermes (cat. no. 24), a type that is not uncommon, has parallels from the House of the Golden Cupid in Pompeii⁹⁰ and from numerous *lararia* from Augst.⁹¹ The Castor figure (cat. no. 19), admittedly is based on a Greek prototype, but a classicizing version was especially favored by Romans, examples of which have been found throughout the Mediterranean. Two marble statues demonstrating the same pose and crisp classicizing style are known from Carthage and Lepcis Magna.⁹² Likewise, Sarapis (cat. no. 21), although most popular in the eastern Mediterranean, also had a strong following in Italy as demonstrated by finds from Campania, Ostia and Rome.

Also from Paramythia are two mature male deities, standing in an almost identical pose although reversed, who have commonly been identified as Zeus (cat. no. 22) and Poseidon (cat. no. 23). Both types are widely known: Poseidon would have held a dolphin in his lowered hand and a trident in his right, Zeus frequently was depicted with a thunderbolt or occasionally an eagle in his lowered hand with a scepter in his opposite hand. Without their original attributes, identifying the two figures is extremely difficult. In either case, the two statue types, particularly that of Zeus, enjoyed widespread

⁹⁰ Adamo-Muscettola 1984, p. 12, fig. 3.

⁹¹ Examples are known from Bavay, Besançon, Brèves, Homburg-Saar and Montorio (Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, figs. 189, 192, 193, 231 and 257). A seated Hermes in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, dated to the second century AD, is very close in pose and style to the Paramythia statuette [LIMC V, 1990, no. 962d, s.v. Hermes (G. Siebert)].

⁹² Nista 1994, pp. 162-163 and p. 175.

popularity and many bronze statuettes have been found throughout the Roman Empire.⁹³ It is therefore not unusual to find statuettes representing one or both deities among the Paramythia hoard. Nonetheless, it must be emphasized that the inclusion of Zeus was more likely prompted by local sentiment than by his universal popularity. Located nearby is the famed sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona. Although the focus of cult activities revolved around the oracle in the form of an oak tree and not a cult statue, a number of votive bronze statuettes depicting the god in the same stance as that of the Paramythia bronze statuettes have been found both at Dodona and in the general vicinity.⁹⁴

Another bronze from Paramythia that demonstrates a close connection with Dodona is the statuette of a female goddess identified as either Dione or her daughter Aphrodite (cat. no. 20), both of whom were worshipped at the sanctuary. Depicted in a languid pose and dressed in a fine chiton that does little to hide the contours of her body, the statuette is a variant of the Aphrodite-Urania type.⁹⁵ Rather unusually, the figure of a dove is perched on her head as if a crown, a feature that is not common to other representations of Aphrodite. Dione rarely appears in art and thus the attribution of the Paramythia statuette is based not so much on visual similitude with other works of art than a rejection of the identification as Aphrodite. Doves were apparently sacred at Dodona long before the introduction of the Olympian gods and continued to be venerated

⁹³ For a discussion on the possible origins of the Zeus statue type, see Boucher 1976, pp. 67-69. For the distribution of the type, see Boucher 1976, Map IV, pp. 352-353.

⁹⁴ Bronze statuettes from Avlon (Devambež 1937, pp. 65-69); from Dodona (Walter-Karydi 1991, pp. 243-259); from Goliama Rakovitza, Bulgaria (*Antike Bronzeplastik*, no. 7); silver statuette from Dodona [*LIMC* VIII, 1997, p. 346, no. 244, pl. 229, s.v. Zeus (I. Leventi and V. Machaira)].

⁹⁵ *LIMC* II, 1984, pp. 28-29, nos. 182-184, s.v. *Aphrodite* (A. Delivorrias et al.). See also *LIMC* II, 1984, pl. 168, s.v. *Aphrodite in peripheria orientali* (A. Delivorrias et al.).

afterwards in association with Dione.⁹⁶ The priestesses of Dione were called “doves” and the bird eventually became associated with Aphrodite as well.⁹⁷ A bronze statuette of a priestess holding a dove was found at Dodona⁹⁸ and terracotta votives depicting either votaries or priestesses cradling doves in their hands were discovered in the vicinity of the Temple of Aphrodite.⁹⁹ In light of the lack of sculptural comparanda depicting Aphrodite and Dione with this unusual headdress, an attribution of the Paramythia goddess is still open to debate. Given the prominence of Aphrodite in the domestic sphere, both in the Greek and Roman worlds, the identification as Aphrodite is perhaps more appropriate.

Discovered in a secondary context, the Paramythia hoard offers art historians and archaeologists a tantalizing glimpse into the domestic sculptural décor of a wealthy Imperial Greek house. On the one hand, it is maddening to work with such an extraordinary group but have little knowledge of their original function and setting, while on the other hand, had they not been hoarded away their chances of surviving to the present day would have been greatly diminished. Obviously the group as a whole shares some commonalities: they were once on display in a house or villa and they were hidden during a time of crisis because of the inherent value of the bronze material. Information on the statuettes and the relationship they had with one another, e.g. function and artistic origin, must be formulated without consideration of their primary context. Only a few remarks can be said with certainty regarding the statuettes’ original function. Some of the bronze statuettes were used in the service of a domestic cult as indicated by

⁹⁶ Thompson 1982, pp. 155-156; Dakaris 1971, p. 107.

⁹⁷ Thompson 1982, p. 156.

iconography: the *lar* and Hekataion. Many of the others, which depict Graeco-Roman and Egyptian deities, may have served a similar purpose, given their popularity in the *lararia* found elsewhere in the Roman Empire, but others, such as the statuettes of Apollo and Venus untying her sandal, may have been equally admired for their decorative qualities.

Bronze Statuettes from the Athenian Agora

The richest source of bronze statuettes from Roman Greece, not surprisingly, is Athens. A considerable number have been found in the Athenian Agora and have been intermittently published in the excavation reports in Hesperia. Discovered during systematic excavations, all apparently were found in either secondary or disturbed contexts, yet many can be confidently assigned to an original domestic context on the basis of their visual presentation and iconography. Similarly, the hoard of bronze statuettes found in the Ambelokipi district of Athens, one of the most spectacular finds of its kind, offers intriguing evidence on the types of bronze statuettes one might find in an Athenian house or villa during the Greek Imperial period. Information on how they were exhibited and consequently on their function as religious or decorative items is not immediately forthcoming. Hopefully, additional information on the appearance and decoration of Athenian houses, including the use of bronze statuettes, should be forthcoming. Over the past several years, the Greek Archaeological Service has carried out rescue excavations in preparation for the construction of the Athenian Metro. The

⁹⁸ Carapanos 1890, p. 159, pl. IV.

⁹⁹ Dakaris 1996, p. 20.

wealth of materials found has been only partially revealed in the exhibit “The City Beneath the City” at the Goulandris Museum.¹⁰⁰ For the present study, I will concentrate on the finds from the Athenian Agora and conclude with an abbreviated discussion of the Ambelokipi hoard.

In 1949, while excavating the well of a bath complex located to the west of the Areopagus, excavators discovered five small bronze statuettes (cat. nos. 27-31, figs. 17-27) in a layer associated with the Herulian sack of AD 267.¹⁰¹ The group consists of an Aphrodite (Anadyomene type), Eros, Harpokrates, Telesphoros and a standing female figure wearing a peplos and holding a cornucopia, which Thompson identified as an Eirene based on similarities with the statue group of Eirene and Ploutos by Kephisodotos.

The bath where the statuettes were found is located in a small valley bound by the Areopagus to the east, the Hill of the Nymphs to the west and the Kolonos Agoraios to the north. Beginning in the 6th century BC, this area was the location of small houses and workshops where various craftsmen, including coroplasts, marble-cutters, blacksmiths and bronzeworkers carried out their businesses.¹⁰² By the Greek Imperial period, large houses and villas of the elite occupied the more desirable slopes of the surrounding hills.¹⁰³ The bath complex, built sometime in the late second or third century AC, most likely served this local community.¹⁰⁴ When the Herulians sacked Athens in AD 267, this area was devastated, and at some point, either just prior to or after the event, the five bronze statuettes were deposited in the well. Given the proximity of

¹⁰⁰ City Beneath the City.

¹⁰¹ Thompson 1950, p. 333.

¹⁰² Young 1951; Agora XIV, pp. 170-191. For bronzeworkers in the Agora, see Mattusch 1977a.

¹⁰³ Young 1951, p. 139.

¹⁰⁴ Young 1951, p. 282.

these houses and villas to the findspot of the bronzes, it is probable that they once belonged to one of these households and that some if not all were in the service of domestic cult activities.

At first glance, the assemblage of bronze statuettes is notable for its eclecticism. The statuettes range in style and quality of craftsmanship from the elegant and polished Eirene and Harpokrates to the more simplified and somewhat awkward Venus and Eros. According to Homer Thompson, who first published the bronzes in 1950, the statuettes range chronologically with the Aphrodite and Eros dated as early as the first century AC and the rest considerably later to the third century AC.¹⁰⁵ A thorough examination of the finds should provide a more precise date of manufacture for at least a few of the Agora bronze statuettes and inform us on the artistic and religious character of Athenian domestic bronzes of the Greek Imperial period.

The extremely well preserved Eirene figure (cat. no. 27, figs. 17-22), missing only the scepter held in the right hand, is arguably the most interesting in the group. According to Thompson, the figure was inspired by the bronze statue group of Eirene and Ploutos by Kephisodotos, which stood nearby in the heart of the Agora. The original by Kephisodotos has not survived, but we have a good indication of what it looked like through Roman copies, the best known of which is that in the Munich Glyptothek. The Agora bronze statuette echoes the Munich copy in general pose, dress and body type. Both stand on the left leg with the right knee slightly bent breaking through the heavy folds of her drapery. Both wear a heavy peplos, cinched in creating a *kolpos*, and a mantle, pinned at the shoulders, falls down the back. In addition to the somewhat old-

fashioned choice of a peplos to clothe Eirene, Kephisodotos also gave her a massive build, which is echoed in the small bronze. Supplementing our knowledge of Kephisodotos' sculpture are a number of Panathenaic amphorae that depict the statue.¹⁰⁶ The amphorae are inscribed with the name of the archon Kallimedes thereby providing a date of 360/359 BC for their manufacture as well as supplying a *terminus ante quem* for the original bronze monument. These vases illustrate further attributes of the statue, such as the wreath on her head and, like the small bronze, a scepter held in her right hand.

While the resemblance to the Kephisodotos statue is marked, the identification of the bronze statuette as Eirene is problematic. Firstly, the change in appearance between the bronze statuette and Kephisodotos' Eirene is remarkable and suggests that we do not have a traditional representation of Eirene. Ploutos is absent and therefore her gaze has shifted so that she now faces forward. The loose flowing locks of hair tumbling down onto her shoulders seen on the Munich copy are completely missing and her headdress has been considerably altered. She now wears a diadem with her mantle pulled up to cover much of her hair and a small hole, located just behind the diadem, indicates that a central ornament rose above her head. Eirene has never been so elaborately represented.

If her identity is to be sought elsewhere, there are a number of goddesses in the Greek and Roman pantheon who carry a cornucopia as an attribute, including the Roman version of Eirene – Pax – as well as Tyche and Fortuna. Pax, principally worshipped in connection with the emperor and therefore more concerned with state rather than private cult, was usually depicted holding a sheaf of wheat and a cornucopia or a caduceus. The

¹⁰⁵ Thompson 1950, p. 332.

¹⁰⁶ Eschbach 1986, pp. 58-70, pls. 16-19.

Roman goddess Fortuna is almost always identifiable due to another attribute, a rudder, which she holds by her side. Occasionally she will hold a caduceus rather than a cornucopia and in her other hand a sheaf of wheat or patera. Her standard mode of dress is a chiton with a himation pulled diagonally across her chest or draped loosely across her hips and looped around her left forearm. Rarely is she shown holding a scepter and dressed in a peplos.

Unlike representations of Roman Fortuna, the iconography of the Greek goddess of fortune, Tyche, appears less standardized. In addition to the well-known Tyche of Antioch, the Greek goddess was depicted in a pose very similar to that of Eirene and Ploutos. Pausanias comments on a Tyche and Ploutos group in Thebes made by the Athenian Xenophon, considering it “no less clever than that of Kephisodotos,” implying that the two statue groups were similar in design.¹⁰⁷ A third century AD relief from Melos, depicting Tyche with a scepter in her right hand and Ploutos cradled in her left, provides clearer evidence on how closely the two personifications could resemble one another in art.¹⁰⁸ This image was also minted on Melian coinage.¹⁰⁹ From Elis, comes another coin depicting Julia Domna on the obverse and a standing Tyche with a scepter in her right hand and a cornucopia in her left on the reverse.¹¹⁰ In his travels around Elis, Pausanias identified a sanctuary of Tyche with a cult statue made of gilded wood with the face, hands and feet made of marble¹¹¹ and presumably this is what is represented on the Elian coin. Within Athens, Pausanias refers to a statue of Tyche near the Prytaneion

¹⁰⁷ Paus. 9, 16, 2; Agora III, p. 67.

¹⁰⁸ Traversari 1993, fig. 22, Harrison [1962] 1980, pp. 270-271, fig. 64.

¹⁰⁹ Traversari 1993, fig. 23.

¹¹⁰ Franke 1984, p. 323, pl. 50

¹¹¹ Paus. 6, 25, 4.

made by Praxiteles, however, we have no indication as to its appearance.¹¹² Nonetheless, there is clear evidence that the statuette from the Athenian Agora bears a strong resemblance to representations of Tyche. But what of the connection to the statue of Eirene and Ploutos from the Athenian Agora?

In his article, “Tyche and the Fortune of Cities in the Greek and Roman World,” Pieter Broucke observes that by the Hellenistic period, the goddess’s popularity as a civic protective deity had grown to such a degree that almost every city had its own Tyche.¹¹³ He further remarks that when adopted by various cities in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, Tyche is often assimilated with local deities and when represented in art, she frequently assumes some of their traditional iconographic features and vice versa. One rather unusual amalgamation of Tyche and a local deity occurred at Cyrene. In the third century BC, the mythological founder of the city, Aristaios, took on certain attributes of Tyche, notably a mural crown and cornucopia, and thus assumed the role of the city’s protector.¹¹⁴

If the bronze statuette did originally belong to a household shrine, then the identification of Tyche seems appropriate. Tyche was honored with private as well as public offerings since, like Roman Fortuna, she was supplicated to bring good fortune to the individual as well as to the civic community in general. In the Greek East, during the Hellenistic and Imperial Greek periods, small-scale images of Tyche were abundant.

¹¹² Paus. 1, 43, 6.

¹¹³ Broucke 1994, pp. 35-49.

¹¹⁴ Broucke 1994, p. 42, fig. 13.

Engraved gems and amulets with her image were worn and statuettes were installed in household shrines in hopes of warding off evil and bringing good luck.¹¹⁵

In Athens, it was possible that Tyche could assume certain characteristics belonging to Eirene, a deity which by the fourth century BC had gained special favor and was honored with her own cult in the Agora. The two were already associated by reason of their role as *kourotrophos*, or nurse to Ploutos, implying that both could offer wealth and prosperity through their cult, and thus it is only natural that iconographically the two bear certain similarities as well. Additionally, an Attic inscription records that in 333/2 and 332/1 BC Eirene, Tyche and Demokratia shared a cult and received offerings, which no doubt encouraged Athenians to more closely connect one with the other.¹¹⁶

The elaborate headdress of the Agora statuette, which for ease of identification will be called Tyche, presents another conundrum. Representations of Eirene typically depicted her with a modest hairstyle and wearing a simple wreath, while Tyche often wore a *polos* or, to symbolize her role as protector of a city, a mural crown. The stephane and veil exhibited by the Agora statuette are in fact more reminiscent of Roman Fortuna, although, since the bronze statuette was found in the Greek East and the figure does not grasp a rudder, the prototypical attribute of Fortuna, the appellation of Tyche is more appropriate. Additionally, it should be noted that the change in headdress was perhaps inspired not by more standard images of Fortuna, but possibly by representations of Isis/Fortuna. A central ornament, which was inserted into the hole located just behind her stephane, was not preserved (fig. 20). Given the size and location of the hole, the

¹¹⁵ Pollitt 1994, p. 15.

¹¹⁶ *IG* II² 1496.107, 127, 131, 140-41; Smith 1997, p. 169.

most likely option is an Isis crown (*basileion*), such as the ones worn by the Casa dei Bronzi statuettes (cat. nos. 9-10, figs. 14-16). The fusion of Isis with deities such as Fortuna and Aphrodite is well known, particularly due to the numerous sculptures, both large and small, discovered throughout the Roman world but particularly in the eastern Mediterranean and Italy. Such elaborate combination headdresses are not uncommon and provide further visual evidence of the syncretistic nature of Hellenistic and Roman religion.

As mentioned above, Tyche remained a popular figure throughout the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. Eirene, on the other hand, never achieved such fame. What then could account for a revived interest in her cult in the Roman period and have prompted a desire to reproduce her image in art? In Athens, there is evidence that her cult remained active until, or at least received renewed interest in, the last half of the second century AC. Under Hadrian, Athens began once more to mint new bronze coinage and sometime after ca. AD 140, a coin was issued bearing the head of Athena on the obverse and on the reverse is Kephisodotos' Eirene and Ploutos group.¹¹⁷ As representations of wealth and prosperity, Eirene and Ploutos apparently were considered appropriate symbols for the prosperity of the Antonine age.¹¹⁸ It was during this period, sometime during the second half of the second century AD when the coins were in circulation, that I believe the Tyche bronze statuette from the Agora was made.

Comparisons with contemporary imperial portraits, such as those of Sabina or one of the

¹¹⁷ Agora XXVI, pp. 113, 125, pl. 18.

¹¹⁸ Agora XXVI, p. 125.

Antonine empresses, who were represented wearing a diadem and veil after being deified, also support a date of the mid to late second century AD.

The Tyche bronze statuette assuredly was locally manufactured and the sculptor who created it likely was very familiar with Kephisodotos' bronze group, which Pausanias tells us was located somewhere between the monument of the Eponymous Heroes and the Temple of Ares.¹¹⁹ Reproductions of Eirene and Ploutos are rare in Greek and Roman art implying that the statue group was less well known outside of Athens. Due to Pausanias, we at least know that the original was still on display in the Agora in the second century AD and its popularity still powerful enough to have inspired a local artist to create a small bronze statuette based in part on Kephisodotos' cult statue.

Another rather unusual statuette from the Athenian Agora bronze group is that of Telesphoros (cat. no. 28, fig. 23), a minor figure associated with the cult of Asklepios. While votives representing Telesphoros, either depicted alone or as the companion of Asklepios, are well attested, household cult figures are rare. Yet, the appearance of Telesphoros within the confines of a house should pose no objections considering that as early as the fourth century BC and continuing well into the Greek Imperial period Asklepios could be found in household shrines.¹²⁰ The private devotional aspect of Asklepios' cult, which no doubt prompted many to display his image within the confines of their houses, must have extended as well to images of Telesphoros. The inclusion of Telesphoros was perhaps prompted by the renown of the Asklepeion located nearby on the south slope of the Akropolis and the house owner's devotion to the cult. The

¹¹⁹ Paus. 1, 8, 2.

popularity of this figure within the private sphere may be broader than this one find suggests. Another small bronze statuette of Telesphoros excavated from the Athenian Agora (cat. no. 96) was found in a disturbed Late Greek Imperial context but in close proximity to the houses on the lower reaches of the northern slope of the Areopagus.¹²¹ It too may have been displayed in a small household shrine, but the limited nature of the finds precludes any further discussion of their possible origins.

Measuring only 6.7 cm in height, the Telesphoros statuette is finely crafted and shows a considerable amount of naturalistic detail. The small youth wears his characteristic cloak with the peaked cap pulled over his head. Soft folds of drapery cling to his body, which still exhibits the pudginess of childhood. Animated by a lively intent expression, the facial features are similarly rounded and youthful. Characterized by careful naturalistic modeling and a dark gleaming patina, the Telesphoros bears certain similarities with the Tyche figure and, as proposed by Thompson, may be contemporaneous. Given the proximity of the Asklepeion as well as the strong bronze-making industry in Athens, the statuette was probably locally produced.

Together with the Tyche and Telesphoros statuettes mentioned above, Thompson also includes the Harpokrates figure (cat. no. 29, figs. 24-25). It too shows a considerable degree of craftsmanship and is in an excellent state of preservation. Stylistically there is a certain degree of correspondence between the Harpokrates statuette, the Tyche and Telesphoros figures, and they were all undoubtedly produced in the same local workshop. Numerous small-scale bronzes of Harpokrates have survived,

¹²⁰ Cf. Marble statuette of Asklepios found at Olynthus (*Olynthus* XII, pp. 130-137, pls. 115, 116, 118, 119) and the wooden image of Asklepios belonging to Nikias (*Theoc.*, *Epiqr.* 8).

the majority of which come from the eastern Mediterranean and Italy. The Agora statuette depicts Harpokrates in a fairly typical Graeco-Roman pose with his right finger raised to his mouth and left arm cradling a cornucopia. In a manner similar to other Harpokrates statues, the Agora figure is nude save for an animal skin (faun?) draped across his chest and tied over his left shoulder. Otherwise the child god is unadorned without the usual miniature crown and occasional jewelry. Rather, the statuette exhibits a rich interplay of texture and color: the contrast of the rough animal skin and the braided and curly hair against smooth glossy skin, eyes inlaid with silver against the darker color of the natural bronze of the surrounding face. Also unusual is the rigid upright stance of the Agora statuette. Typically, Harpokrates is rendered in an extremely languid fashion with one hip outthrust and displaying a strong torsion in the torso of the body. The stiff frontal pose of the Agora figure may be an attempt at rendering the figure in a more classicizing manner, perhaps in a fashion similar to a marble statue of Harpokrates from Hadrian's villa at Tivoli.¹²² Equally curious is the heavy rounded modeling of the face and body. Although not often exhibited by other Harpokrates statuettes, this taste for soft rounded forms is noticeable among depictions of Eros. This stylistic trend is particularly evident in second-century AC sculpture from Greece as demonstrated by two works from Thessaloniki, a marble statue of Eros, a marble sarcophagus adorned with Erotes,¹²³ and a third-century AC bronze statue of Eros in Tirana.¹²⁴ A date of the second century AC is also appropriate for the Agora Harpokrates.

¹²¹ The Telesphoros was found with a small bronze Hermes (currently missing) just south of South Stoa I.

¹²² LIMC IV, 1988, no. 39a, pl. 243, s.v. Harpokrates (T. Tam Tinh, B. Jaeger and S. Poulin).

¹²³ LIMC III, 1986, nos. 791, 970, pls. 654, 663, s.v. Eros (A. Hermary).

¹²⁴ LIMC III, 1986, no. 192, pl. 619, s.v. Eros (A. Hermary).

The Eros bronze statuette from the Agora (cat. no. 30, fig. 26), which presents a figure of comparable size and subject to the Harpokrates figure, produces quite another effect. The figure, although rather chubby, appears more solidly built with little indication of the soft fleshiness of baby fat. The torso is broad and rather flat and the arms and legs are equally unmodeled. He stands in a relaxed attitude in a slight contrapposto with his left arm held out, the hand clenched to hold a now missing object (quiver?). His right arm is held at his side and unusually a lagabolon twines up his arm, its characteristic curving shape twining up and around his shoulder to the back of his head. More suited to hunters, satyrs and Pan, the lagabolon is not an altogether strange attribute for Eros, who is an occasional companion to Dionysos and members of his *thiasos*.¹²⁵ Clearly demonstrating the identity of the youth are the wings protruding from his back and the central braid adorning his head.

The Eros figure, with its quiet relaxed pose, tall proportions and solid body contrasts markedly with the shorter, more plastic rendering of the Agora Harpokrates. A date of manufacture of the first century AC for the Eros statuette, as suggested initially by Thompson, is probably correct. Terracotta statuettes of Eros from Myrina dated slightly earlier to the first century BC exhibit similarly proportioned body types and the same subtle contrapposto stance.¹²⁶

As one might imagine, Aphrodite, one of the more popular Hellenistic and Roman/Greek Imperial divinities, was included among the bronze statuettes found in the Agora well deposit (cat. no. 31, fig. 27). Found with its base, the figure is complete

¹²⁵ For examples of Eros with a lagabolon, see LIMC III, 1986, p. 993, nos. 316, 319, s.v. Eros/Amor, Cupido (A. Hermary).

except for the mirror she once held in her right hand. The surface of the bronze is in poor condition and shows little evidence of the smooth patina of the Tyche, Telesphoros and Harpokrates statuettes. The figure does not recreate a specific type but rather is a compilation of two: the Aphrodite Anadyomene and Aphrodite at her toilette. According to D. Brinkerhoff, the Anadyomene type was especially favored in northwest Asia Minor, a situation not unexpected considering the close proximity of the Aphrodite Anadyomene painting by Apelles on Kos.¹²⁷ The type was also well known in the west, no doubt due to the fame of the original, which spread through copies, both large and small.¹²⁸ Similarly, the subject of Aphrodite at her toilette, more specifically the goddess seen arranging her hair in front of a mirror held at arm's length, was especially admired in the east as demonstrated by the numerous bronze statuettes found in Syria and Egypt.¹²⁹ The composite figure in Athens – a half-draped Anadyomene Aphrodite with mirror – is rather unusual, but in general is in keeping with the creative artistic traditions that developed in the Hellenistic world.

Although found in a third century AC context, the Aphrodite statuette undoubtedly dates considerably earlier. Many iconographical and stylistic elements of the statuette associate it more closely with Late Hellenistic representations of the goddess. While both the Aphrodite Anadyomene and Aphrodite at her toilette types originated even earlier during the first half of the Hellenistic period, the intermingling of types, as demonstrated by the Agora statuette, was a feature more characteristic of late

¹²⁶ LIMC III, 1986, no. 41a, pl. 612, no. 292, pl. 624, s.v. Eros (A. Hermary).

¹²⁷ Brinkerhoff 1978, p. 68.

¹²⁸ Aphrodite Anadyomene, both nude and half-dressed, also appeared on imperial coinage (Vermeule 1988, p. 141).

¹²⁹ LIMC II, 1984, nos. 100-111, pl. 163-64, s.v. Aphrodite in peripheria orientali (A. Delivorrias et al.).

Hellenistic sculpture.¹³⁰ Additionally, the pose and body type of the Agora Aphrodite is more representative of late second to first century BC examples. Typically, late Hellenistic versions of the goddess, such as the Aphrodite Anadyomene statues from Cyrene and Courtrai, depict the goddess standing relatively straight with little of the bodily contortions of earlier examples. Along with the erect, almost two-dimensional, posturing of the body is a concurrent elongation of the forms, most evident at the hips and thighs, which the Agora Aphrodite also exhibits. There are also considerable similarities with the Venus de Milo, which exhibits a sort of restrained classicism clearly discernable in the erect posture, delicate facial features and conservative hairstyle. A close comparison may be drawn to a second-century BC marble statue of Aphrodite from Delos,¹³¹ which demonstrates the same body type, as well as a similar hairstyle. The Agora Aphrodite is more slender, particularly at the shoulders and torso, and numerous Greek terracotta statuettes dating from the second and first centuries BC demonstrate the same slender proportions. The overwhelming similarities between the Agora statuette and the Aphrodite sculptures mentioned above suggest that the Agora bronze statuette could have been made as early as the second to first century BC. Thompson's date of the first century AC is equally feasible when considering the promotion of the goddess under Augustus and the Julio-Claudians.¹³²

Contemplating this diverse assemblage of bronze statuettes from the Athenian Agora as a whole brings forth a number of provocative questions. Was this collection assembled over a period of some two hundred years as suggested by their varying dates

¹³⁰ Brinkerhoff 1978, p. 109.

¹³¹ LIMC II, 1984, no. 412, pl. 39, s.v. Aphrodite (A. Delivorrias et al.).

of manufacture? Or, does it provide further evidence of the trade and fashionableness of Greek works of art, which were so admired by Roman and Greek Imperial patrons? This last question raises yet another problem regarding the identity, i.e. ethnicity, of the owner. Unlike the Paramythia bronzes, which project a more Roman character particularly through the presence of the *lar*, the Athenian finds are less informative in this respect and the identity of the owner – Greek or Roman – will likely remain unknown. What is rather telling is the strong local character of at least two of the statuettes, the Tyche and the Telesphoros. The owner of the bronzes was presumably an adherent of the cult of Asklepios, which was active in Athens at least into the third century AC. Telesphoros figures, either rendered alone or in the company of Asklepios, traditionally served as votives and his appearance among the household gods is rather unusual. Their appearance in a domestic setting may have been a local Athenian phenomenon. Even more astonishing is the appearance of the Tyche figure. Although produced in Athens, the figure reflects more generally the syncretistic nature of Hellenistic and Roman religion and, as well, is a reminder of the power of long-standing local cults or at the very least of enduring artistic traditions. The figure's missing headdress (a *basileion*?) suggests that the deity may have been linked with both Eirene and Isis, an association that may be supported in part by the presence of Harpokrates.¹³³

Some if not all of these bronze statuettes were probably produced in Athens. Prior to the Hellenistic period bronze-making workshops were located in the southwest corner of the Agora and in the area around the Hephaisteion. A study by Carol Mattusch,

¹³² On this subject see Lloyd-Morgan 1986.

however, clearly indicates that between the second century BC and the end of the third century AD there are no signs of bronze-making activity anywhere in the Agora.¹³⁴ Clearly this does not mean that Athens did not produce any bronze objects during this period, but this major upheaval of the bronze-making industry in the Agora where it was traditionally located requires some clarification.

In the early Hellenistic period throughout Greece there are signs of major disruptions in Greek society, most notably a radical decline in rural settlements.¹³⁵ Susan Alcock, in her study Graecia Capta, remarks that perhaps due to a mixture of geological, ecological and societal disruptions, some rural inhabitants may have moved to nearby cities or were drawn abroad to the burgeoning cities in the eastern Hellenistic kingdoms.¹³⁶ Death from warfare and disease and the enslavement of defeated populations also likely contributed to an overall decline in the population of Greece.¹³⁷ In third-century BC Athens there are signs of an economic depression, which is reflected in the decline of art production, and a corresponding emigration of artists to more prosperous centers to the east, such as Rhodes and Pergamon.¹³⁸ Athens experienced a brief revival, probably due to the establishment of Delos as a colony in 166 BC, but was devastated when attacked and sacked by Sulla in 86 BC.

The disruption of the bronze industry in Late Hellenistic Athens must have been caused in large part by the sack of 86 BC. As the city center, the Agora must have been

¹³³ For the popularity of the cult of Isis in Athens, especially in Greek Imperial period, see Walters 1988, pp. 61-63.

¹³⁴ Mattusch 1977a, p. 341.

¹³⁵ Alcock 1993, pp. 37-40.

¹³⁶ Alcock 1993, 89.

¹³⁷ Alcock 1993, pp.89-90.

¹³⁸ Stewart 1979, pp. 3-7.

one of the major focal points of the attack and subsequent looting. There are considerable signs of destruction debris and the area probably recovered at a slow pace.¹³⁹ Major disruptions occurred in the ceramic and marble sculpting industries and it is possible that a number of craftsmen were killed in the attack or enslaved and sent abroad.¹⁴⁰ The bronze foundries in the Agora appear to have been equally devastated. The latest signs of bronze-making in the Hellenistic period occurred in the last half of the 2nd century BC in the so-called Industrial District in the southwest corner of the Agora.¹⁴¹

By the end of the first century BC, the sculpture and ceramic industries in Athens had recovered and there is evidence of an escalating export industry supplying Romans with copies of Classical works and Neo-Attic reliefs.¹⁴² The bronze industry also must have recovered but apparently was relocated outside of the Agora. After the sack, the workshops located in the Agora may have disappeared for various reasons: a loss of workers, heavy damage to the area, a decline in business or a combination of all three. By the time Athens and its industries had recovered, the Agora was undergoing new construction and reorganization under Augustus, for example, the transfer of the Temple of Ares and the Southwest Temple, which may have prevented many bronze workshops from returning to their traditional working quarters. It was only much later, after the Herulian sack of 267 AD, that bronze foundries reappear in the area of the Agora and

¹³⁹ See Hoff article in Hoff and Rotroff 1997.

¹⁴⁰ Stewart 1979, p. 78. For the decline in pottery and sculpture production, see the articles "From Greek to Roman in Athenian Ceramics," by Susan Rotroff and "Classical Encounters: Attic Sculpture after Sulla" by Olga Palagia in Hoff and Rotroff 1997.

¹⁴¹ Identified by Mattusch as the House H Foundry (Mattusch 1977a, pp. 365-368).

¹⁴² Stewart 1979, p. 79.

these apparently were predominantly used for melting bronze and for the production of small utilitarian objects.¹⁴³

The Hoard from Ambelokipi

Offering a broader view of Athenian bronze statuettes from the Greek Imperial period is the Ambelokipi hoard found in 1964 (cat. nos. 35-51).¹⁴⁴ A complete publication of the finds has yet to appear, but a preliminary report was presented by Krystalli-Votsi at the 12th International Congress on Ancient Bronzes in 1992.¹⁴⁵ Photos of the bronzes were initially published in the excavation report, but many were heavily encrusted and some in fragmentary condition. Since their discovery, a few have been randomly published, and photos of some of the newly cleaned bronzes have appeared.¹⁴⁶ Under these circumstances, a thorough discussion of the bronzes is not feasible and thus only a few remarks regarding iconography and general appearance will be made here.

The hoard from Ambelokipi is extraordinary not only for the number of bronze statuettes found (17), but also for the variety of sizes and types. Unlike the Paramythia and Agora assemblages, which betray a certain amount of similarity of theme and appearance, the Ambelokipi bronze statuettes range in size from 20 to 67 centimeters and in subject matter from mortal to divine. Clearly, this hoard includes both cult statuettes as well as larger works, perhaps mainly decorative in nature, and may indeed represent a

¹⁴³ Mattusch 1977a, pp. 367-372.

¹⁴⁴ *ArchDelt* 20 (1965), pp. 103-107, pls. 58-71.

¹⁴⁵ Krystalli-Votsi 1995.

¹⁴⁶ *BCH* 94 (1970) p. 884, figs. 4-7; *ArchDelt* 23 (1968), pp. 9-10, pl. 5. See individual bibliographies in the catalogue section below.

house owner's entire collection of bronzes, which the owner hid away in order to safeguard them from invaders, possibly the Herulians, or from some other catastrophe.

On the basis of their size and subject matter, it is reasonable to imagine that some of the Ambelokipi bronzes were once on display in the owner's courtyard or garden.¹⁴⁷ As demonstrated by ample finds from Campanian sites, Roman garden statuary frequently consisted of certain standard motifs. Not surprisingly, Dionysos, a vegetation deity, was especially favored, as were members of his *thiasos* – Priapos, Pan and satyrs.¹⁴⁸ In the Casa Romana on Kos, one of the few houses in the Greek East in which garden/peristyle sculpture was found, figures especially suited to an outdoor setting were found: nymphs, satyrs, Eros and a Herakles herm.¹⁴⁹ The Child Dionysos (cat. no. 42) and Dionysos with Scepter (cat. no. 49) from Ambelokipi fall under this category, and considering their relatively large size, measuring in height 47 and 61 cm respectively, they may have been on display outside rather than within the house.¹⁵⁰ A seemingly related figure is the Boy with Flute (cat. no. 35), which recalls the marble statues of children (small satyrs?) from Sperlonga and the Mahdia shipwreck, which possibly adorned the edge of a fountain.¹⁵¹ The presence of Dionysos and members of his *thiasos* in a courtyard/garden setting begs the question of the religiosity of such figures. One the

¹⁴⁷ In contrast to Italian houses and villas, few Hellenistic and Greek Imperial houses apparently were equipped with fully landscaped gardens, most likely due to the drier climate and limited water resources. Houses at Olynthus, Eretria, Priene, and on Delos typically had paved courts and courtyards; by and large domestic gardens were likely restricted to small beds and potted plants. Much more common were gardens associated with public buildings and sanctuaries. See Ridgway 1971 and 1981.

¹⁴⁸ Hill 1981 and Dwyer 1982.

¹⁴⁹ Albertocchi 1997.

¹⁵⁰ Manfrini-Aragno (1987) has provided a thorough discussion on the style and iconography of the Dionysos statuettes from Ambelokipi. The Dionysos with Grapes and Dionysos with Scepter (cat. nos. 37 and 49) are relatively well-known types and were apparently produced in the 1st to 2nd century AC (Manfrini-Aragno 1987, pp. 62-64 and pp. 72-73). Contrarily, the Boy with Flute and Child Dionysos (cat. nos. 35 and 42) have few parallels (Manfrini-Aragno 1987, pp. 130).

one hand, scholars such as Foss and Dwyer support the identification of such gardens as sacred landscapes and refute the notion that garden sculpture was simply decorative.¹⁵² On the other hand, Jashemski, while admitting that the ancient owner may not have readily distinguished between religious and decorative objects, does differentiate objects that clearly were cult images from those that apparently were not.¹⁵³ In regards to the worship of Dionysos, she concludes that little evidence is present to connect Dionysiac rites with Dionysiac imagery on display in private gardens.¹⁵⁴ The finds from Ambelokipi, discovered outside their primary context, can lend little insight into this question.

Another figure that may have stood outside rather than in the house is the Herakles/Alexander statuette (cat. no. 50).¹⁵⁵ Measuring an imposing 66 cm, the statuette commands attention as well for its fine craftsmanship and the engaging manner in which the powerful figure has been rendered. Herakles/Alexander poses in a languid fashion with his right hand turned outward and propped on his hip, the slightly open palm perhaps once held his club. A lionskin covers his head and is tied around his shoulders with its length wrapped around his proffered left arm. His left hand is loosely clasped and is reminiscent of portrayals of Herakles holding the apples of Hesperides, a theme that is eminently suitable for display in a garden.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵¹ B. Andreae in *Das Wrack*, pp. 365-374; Ridgway 1981, p. 14, figs. 5-7.

¹⁵² Foss 1997, p. 214; Dwyer 1982, pp. 123-126.

¹⁵³ Jashemski 1978, pp. 115-139.

¹⁵⁴ Jashemski 1978, pp. 123-124.

¹⁵⁵ A statuette of Alexander the Great was also found in the Casa Romana on Kos (Albertocchi 1997).

¹⁵⁶ For Herakles on display in Greek and Roman gardens, see Ridgway 1981, pp. 25-26 and Jashemski 1978, pp. 121-123.

A separate group, distinguished by size and subject matter, may be assigned a household cult function. This group includes the Sarapis bust, Harpokrates, and the nude male deity with outstretched arms identified in the initial report as a Dionysos (cat. nos. 48, 51, and 46). The first two, the Sarapis and Harpokrates, should provoke no disagreement regarding their function as they clearly are the focus of a cult that received a considerable amount of attention in the domestic sphere throughout the classical world. Based on the famous Bryaxis statue in Alexandria, the Sarapis bust is one of many known from throughout the Roman world and may have been imported from Egypt. Another bronze bust of the deity, extremely close in appearance, was found in Alexandria and is currently in the Graeco-Roman Museum.¹⁵⁷ In contrast, the Harpokrates is highly unusual betraying few similarities with more conventional representations of the youthful deity. The crown he wears and the gesture he makes with his right hand – one finger raised to his mouth – confirm his identity. Yet the tall figure, still exhibiting the plumpness of a child, paired with a rather small head gives the impression of a youth somewhat older than the usual type. Noteworthy as well is the casual yet elegant pose, legs crossed and the left hand propped on his hip. The figure and pose are based on fourth-century Greek prototypes, such as the Pothos attributed to Skopas and similar adolescent representations of Eros, with whom Harpokrates was occasionally associated. Traditionally, Harpokrates is depicted in playful juvenile poses, which exhibit a high degree of standardization. Clearly, the innovative bronze from Ambelokipi was manufactured under the influence of an artistic tradition that relied more on earlier

¹⁵⁷ LIMC VII, 1994, no. 93a, s.v. Sarapis (G. Clerc and J. Leclant).

mainland Greek styles than those from Ptolemaic Egypt, suggesting that the statuette was more than likely locally produced.

The third figure (cat. no. 46) depicts a nude youth whose outstretched arms once held an attribute in one or both hands. At first glance, the figure could easily be identified as either Dionysos or Apollo, both of whom were frequently depicted as a slightly effeminate youth with long hair. More telling is the position of the arms and the figure's distinctive hairstyle. Displaying a similar pose and the exact same rolled and bound hairstyle are a small number of Apollo statues, which portray the god holding a cithara or with one resting at his side.¹⁵⁸ His opposite hand often holds a *plektron* or, in one version, a *phiale*, either of which seems appropriate for the Ambelokipi statuette. As with many of the other representatives of this Apollo type, most of which date to the early Imperial period, the pose, hairstyle and artistic style of the statuette recall Archaic and Severe Style depictions of Apollo. Surprisingly, neo-Attic bronze statuettes, which were so admired at Pompeii and Herculaneum, rarely have been found in Greece. Although there is ample evidence for the presence of neo-Attic workshops in Athens, the majority of works produced were increasingly shipped abroad.¹⁵⁹

The remaining statuettes – Poseidon, Dionysos, Castor/Pollux and Athena (cat. nos. 36, 37, 40, and 47) – are either of a size or subject that tend to disqualify them as traditional domestic cult figures. Dionysos (cat. no. 37) rarely makes an appearance in the *lararia* of Italy or the northern Roman provinces, however his presence in Greek houses is well founded and the figure would be equally suited for display either in the

¹⁵⁸ LIMC II, 1984, nos. 35 (Casa del Citarista), 39, 42, 304 (Casa delle Pareti Rosse), s.v. Apollo (E.Simon).

garden or home interior. Similarly, the Lateran Poseidon (cat. no. 36) may not have been suitable for a household shrine, principally on the basis of its larger size, but that does not necessarily mean that it was not the focus of a domestic cult.

An interesting case is presented by the statuette of Athena (cat. no. 47), patron goddess of Athens. While Minerva was frequently found among the *lararia* inhabitants of much of the Roman Empire, she is surprisingly absent from the bronze statuettes found in Greek domestic contexts in either the Hellenistic or Greek Imperial period. In Athens, perhaps Athena's role as the city's patron deity inhibited the introduction of a domestic cult in her honor or otherwise discouraged the display of her image in the private sphere. It is worth recalling that the Varvakeion Athena statuette was found in the apse of a late Roman house in Athens,¹⁶⁰ yet there is still debate whether the statuette was an object of veneration or if it was merely commemorative. Interestingly, the Ambelokipi Athena does not imitate a well-known type but appears to be a compilation of Early Classical and Classical styles produced in a Neo-Attic workshop around the first century AC.

The fourth figure (cat. no. 40), which depicts a nude, beardless youth wearing a *pilos*, was initially compared with Polykleitos' Doryphoros, but is closer to representations of the Dioskouroi. The figure's pose, nudity, and *pilos*, are comparable with the Castor figure from Paramythia and with other representations of the twin brothers, which, as stated above, were highly conventional.

The last group consists of minor mythological characters and human figures, which may have served a variety of needs within the Greek Imperial household. Two

¹⁵⁹ For the art industry in Hellenistic and Greek Imperial Athens, see Stewart 1979, p. 78-79.

¹⁶⁰ Schuchhardt 1963.

seated figures, incomplete and badly preserved, were originally identified as a Herakles (cat. no. 38) and Aphrodite (cat. no. 43). Their identities are still open to question until complete descriptions and photos of the cleaned statuettes appear, but a few preliminary remarks regarding their possible identities will be made here. As correctly indicated by Krystalli-Votsi, the seated male figure wearing a length of cloth around his hips cannot be identified as Herakles who was commonly depicted nude.¹⁶¹ The stout body, heavy beard and broad flat facial features suggest instead a Silenos.¹⁶² The seated female figure is depicted in a relaxed manner leaning forward with the right arm bent slightly behind so that the right hand rests either on her hip or the support on which she sits. She appears half-naked with only her hips and legs enveloped in drapery. The semi-nudity and pose is vaguely reminiscent of Aphrodite, who is occasionally shown seated on a throne or a rock.¹⁶³ Nymphs, however, were also depicted in a similar manner and were popular subjects for garden and fountain statuary.¹⁶⁴

A particularly striking figure is the so-called Hermes with ram (cat. no. 41), which E. Raftopoulou and Krystalli-Votsi would rather identify as a tradesman.¹⁶⁵ He wears an *exomis* and carries a lamb draped over his left forearm, while a small dog rests by his feet. The arrangement recalls standard representations of votaries presenting their offerings, a theme that is eminently suitable for dedications at sanctuaries, but is rather surprising here. Did the Ambelokipi Tradesman also serve as a votive offering?

¹⁶¹ Krystalli-Votsi 1995, p. 278.

¹⁶² The type does not appear to be widely common. One example is known from Augst (Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, p. 103, no. 56).

¹⁶³ *LJMC* II, 1984, nos. 813, 823, 863, 868, s.v. *Aphrodite* (A. Delivorrias et al.).

¹⁶⁴ For a brief discussion on the seated nymph type, frequently paired with a dancing satyr, see Hill 1981, p. 90, figs. 7-9.

¹⁶⁵ Raftopoulou 1978, p. 44; Krystalli-Votsi 1995, p. 278.

Viewed in its entirety, the Ambelokipi hoard presents an intriguing picture above all for the diversity of bronze statuettes and offers a rare glimpse into the religious and artistic tastes of a third-century AC Athenian family. The iconographical range is considerable, particularly in comparison with the assemblage of bronze statuettes from the Athenian Agora. While Egyptian deities were among the finds at both sites, the overwhelming presence of Dionysos and members of his *thiasos* among the Ambelokipi hoard is remarkable but, in general, is in keeping with the decorative programs of Hellenistic Greek houses. In the Roman west, Dionysos (i.e. Bacchus) was infrequently included in *lararia*, but was considered highly appropriate for decorating a garden or dining setting.

Many of the other deities found in the Ambelokipi hoard, including Athena, Apollo, Poseidon, Herakles/Alexander and Castor or Pollux, were honored to varying degrees in houses elsewhere in the Roman Empire, but a few clearly can be tied more closely to Hellenistic Greek household cult traditions. On Delos, there are numerous instances of apotropaic imagery, predominantly clubs and *pilos* helmets, clearly referring to Herakles and the Dioskouroi as protectors of the household.¹⁶⁶ These household protective deities were infrequently rendered in sculptural form during the Hellenistic period,¹⁶⁷ but in the Roman world Herakles was quickly adopted for inclusion among the Roman household gods or for display in the garden. By comparison, representations of the Dioskouroi are surprisingly rare among Italic Roman *lararia*. The bronze statuette from Ambelokipi as well as the Castor figure from Paramythia are highly unusual and are

¹⁶⁶ Apotropaic imagery found in Delian houses is discussed by Bruneau (1964 and 1970, pp. 642-648). See also Nilsson 1954, p. 79.

perhaps more in keeping with local customs considering the enduring popularity of the twin brothers in Greece proper.

The presence of genre figures – the child with flute, the two dancers, the seated Silenos, and the seated female figure (cat. nos. 35, 38, 39, and 45) – should not be surprising in light of the popularity of similar subjects found decorating houses at Priene, Delos and Pompeii, yet surprisingly few such bronze figures are known from Greek houses. As clearly demonstrated by Jashemski, Hill and Dwyer, members of Dionysos' *thiasos* and other figures closely linked to nature were favored subjects for courtyard/garden statuary.¹⁶⁸ Similarly, the flute player and two male dancers, related to numerous other Hellenistic and Roman bronze statuettes depicting men and women in the midst of a dance, are thematically linked to the festivities that took place in dining areas. As illustrated by various scholars, particularly Wrede and Pfisterer-Haas, these dancing figures were connected with the religious celebrations held in honor of Ptolemaic rulers, frequently venerated as the new Dionysos and Isis.¹⁶⁹ Though promulgated by Ptolemaic religious festivities, this class of sculpture, including slaves, dwarves and other physically deformed individuals, held widespread popular appeal, which likely transcended their initial religious connotations.

Unlike the finds from Kos, Paramythia and the Athenian Agora, the Ambelokipi hoard is a rich and varied collection of material, which encompasses not only bronze statuettes used in domestic cult but also statuettes of varying sizes and subject matter that no doubt were primarily decorative. When fully published, the Ambelokipi hoard will

¹⁶⁷ For Herakles statuettes from Delos, see Harward 1982, pp. 129-131.

¹⁶⁸ Jashemski 1978, pp. 123-124; Hill 1981, pp. 86-87; and Dwyer 1982, pp. 123-126.

add considerably to our understanding of the production, trade and consumption of Greek bronze statuettes not only within Athens itself but also across the Mediterranean.

Conclusions

Viewed in their entirety, the Greek Imperial bronze statuettes discussed in this chapter provide important evidence above all for the private religious practices of the inhabitants of Greece. The use of bronze statuettes as decorative objects, a trend well established elsewhere in the Roman Empire, is at least verified by the finds from Ambelokipi and possibly also from Paramythia. The scope of this study has been limited to objects that date overwhelmingly to the second and early third centuries AC and a void remains regarding the presence and character of bronze statuettes in Greek houses of the early empire. On the other hand, these finds do present an extensive picture of the private use of small bronzes some two centuries after the establishment of Roman rule. They suggest that while there was a considerable degree of continuity of indigenous private religious practices, some Roman domestic cult practices were embraced.

Determining whether the owners of the bronze statuettes were Greek or Roman immigrants is less easy to establish. Bronzes discovered in secondary contexts are even more difficult to categorize. Even the ownership of the Casa dei Bronzi is open to question, although Dontas presents an intriguing argument that the owner of the Damsa bronzes was a Greek physician, either Gaius Stertinus Xenophon or his brother Q. Stertinus.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁹ Wrede 1988; Pfisterer-Haas in *Das Wrack*, pp. 469-504; Raeder 1984, pp. 22-24.

¹⁷⁰ Dontas 1989, p. 56.

In reviewing the bronzes from Greek Imperial domestic contexts and in particular comparing them to Hellenistic finds, one inescapable fact is the sheer number of statuettes that have come to light (Chart 1). While there is abundant evidence of bronze statuettes being hidden away by owners in the turbulent time of the third and fourth centuries AC, hoards of Hellenistic date are comparatively unknown. Perhaps this paucity of evidence indicates the relative lack of large collections of bronze statuettes within the majority of Hellenistic houses. By comparison, there was a dramatic increase in the number of bronze statuary, and no doubt items of other materials, on display in Greek Imperial houses.

Given the popularity of Aphrodite and Dionysos in the decor of Hellenistic houses, it should come as no surprise that these two deities and members of their entourages continued to be favored in Imperial Greece. Aphrodite was widely popular, found among the statuettes from Kos, Paramythia and the Athenian Agora, and her prominence assuredly increased under Roman rule due to Julio-Claudian dynastic claims as well as later Roman empresses who presented themselves in the guise of the goddess. No less important was Aphrodite's role as goddess of sexual desire, a feature that was of great importance to women of the household.¹⁷¹ The case with Dionysos is perhaps less clear as most of our evidence in houses comes from the Ambelokipi hoard. The god Dionysos may not have been actively worshipped in the home, but he and members of his *thiasos* still had their place in the household but were especially appropriate for display in outdoor and dining areas.

¹⁷¹ Lloyd-Morgan 1986, pp. 182-184.

Two figures that were honored in Greek homes of the Hellenistic period, Tyche and Asklepios, retained their popularity in the Greek Imperial period as demonstrated by the finds from Kos and the Athenian Agora. Tyche, who was worshiped in earlier Greek houses as indicated by inscriptions but rarely given corporeal form, rapidly increased in importance particularly when associated with other divinities such as Isis and Aphrodite. Herakles and the Dioscourai, minor deities who were originally enlisted to protect the house and storeroom, retained their traditional duties in the Greek Imperial period and were increasingly depicted in sculptural form.¹⁷²

Interestingly, a considerable number of bronze statuettes from Greek houses of the Imperial period depict deities that were rarely found or referred to in Greek Hellenistic houses. Chief among these are the Egyptian deities Sarapis, Isis and Harpokrates. Although the cult of Isis was by no means unknown in Hellenistic Greece, her cult and that of Sarapis expanded and increased in importance tremendously in the Greek Imperial period. The widespread popularity of these Egyptian cults is highlighted by the fact that included among all the assemblages of bronze statuettes found in Roman Greece, there is at least one Egyptian deity present in each group.

Many of the other deities that first make their appearance in domestic contexts seem to have been inspired by local cults. Regional workshops could have produced a number of bronze statuettes that were based on local cult statues, but more importantly the house or villa owner must have felt a personal connection with nearby cult centers, which affected his or her choice of household deities. On Kos, Isis was especially

¹⁷² Herakles was frequently found among the *lararia* contents from Italy, the Dioscourai less so: a bronze statuette was found in a villa at Boscoreale (Hill 1949, p. 222) and another in the so-called Caseggiato dei

avored, as demonstrated by inscriptions and archaeological finds, and her role as a savior god undoubtedly contributed to her prevalence among the finds from the Damsa site and the Casa dei Bronzi. The site of Liboni, where the so-called Paramythia bronzes were found, is only a short distance from Dodona, the great cult center dedicated to Zeus and Dione. The female deity with dove crown, Aphrodite or less likely Dione, is undoubtedly connected to the cult center at Dodona, whose priestesses were commonly referred to as doves. Local Athenian artists were similarly active manufacturing bronze statuettes based on local cult figures. The artist who produced the Tyche statuette brought together traditional representations of Tyche and Isis/Fortuna, and combined them with a local cult image of Eirene, who within Athens was receiving renewed interest in the second century AC.

Not surprisingly, given the strong Greek cultural heritage that continued unabated under Roman rule, only a few bronze statuettes of distinct Roman character have been discovered in Greek houses. These include the Mars from the Casa dei Bronzi and the *lar* figures from Paramythia and the Athenian Agora.¹⁷³ In light of these three figures, we can more easily address the question of the ethnicity of the house owner. The presence of the Mars Ultor statuette among the Casa dei Bronzi finds strongly suggests that the owner was Roman and perhaps was involved in the army. Similarly, the *lares* are indigenous Roman creations, protective deities that guarded individuals, specific locations (e.g. roads, fields and houses) and also the Roman state. The infrequent appearance of *lares* among the bronze statuettes found in Greece suggests that they were

Molini in Ostia (Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, p. 294, fig. 258).

¹⁷³ To these might also be added the bronze busts of Geta and Caligula found on Kos (cat. nos. 12 and 16).

not accepted by the general populace and their use must have been restricted to a small minority living in Greece. The *lar* statuette from the Athenian Agora, with its lively pose and fluttering skirt, follows Roman examples to a considerable degree and may have been brought to Greece by its Roman owner. Rather uncommon is the Paramythia *lar*, which exhibits a different manner of dress and a more restrained classicism in the execution of the figure and drapery leading one to conjecture that it was locally manufactured.

Examining the range of bronze statuettes discussed in this chapter, it is obvious that overt signs of Roman religious customs are infrequent (Chart 3). The overwhelming majority of bronzes from the Greek Imperial period represent deities and mythological characters that were venerated in Hellenistic houses or at the very least had been accepted by the Greek populace in general. One startling change that occurred under Roman rule was the tremendous increase in the appearance of bronze statuettes in Greek houses. With only a limited number of assemblages available to study, it is difficult to determine whether they form a representative sample for all of Greek Imperial society or whether they belonged to a rarified few who had the desire and means to fill their houses and household shrines with expensive bronzes statuettes.

CHAPTER 4

Bronze Statuettes from Sacred Contexts

The discovery of bronze statuettes within the confines of a sanctuary or other sacred locations does not provoke much discussion in regards to their original function as has occurred with the statuettes found within Hellenistic and Greek Imperial domestic contexts. As demonstrated by numerous finds, small bronzes found at sanctuaries functioned as votives and were deposited there either in hopes of divine favor or in gratitude for a recent event or accomplishment, for example success in athletic contests.¹ Votive bronze statuettes of Geometric, Archaic and Classical dates are especially numerous as demonstrated by finds from Olympia, Arcadia, Delphi, Dodona, Thebes, Athens and Samos. Studies carried out on Geometric and Archaic bronzes in particular have resulted in not only a fairly detailed chronological discussion of these objects but also a fuller understanding of regional workshops.²

Information on how votive statuettes were originally displayed has been gleaned from literary and archaeological evidence as well as from the statuettes themselves. Brita Alroth has presented a summary of the evidence dating from the Geometric to the Classical period in the article “The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines.” She clearly establishes that small votives could have been displayed hanging from the ceiling or even from trees but more frequently were placed either on votive benches, tables, or shelves, on or around the altar, or occasionally in a votive pit.³ A considerable amount of her

¹ Studies on Greek votives include Rouse [1902] 1976, Brommer 1985, Linders and Nordquist 1987 and Alroth 1989.

² See above page 7, footnotes 17-18.

³ Alroth 1988.

archaeological evidence pertains to the display of terracotta votives,⁴ yet a few bronze votives have been found as well. Perhaps the best known are the sphyrrelaton statuettes from a small temple at Dreros.⁵ They were found on a low bench, possibly an altar, adjacent to a slightly taller table, which held terracotta figurines, a bronze gorgoneion, pottery and ash. Also remarkable is the small kouros or Apollo from the temporary cult building at Kalapodi.⁶ The bronze figure was set in lead on the corner of an architectural block apparently reused as an altar. Both on and in front of the altar were found other votives including a terracotta protome and figurine, clay vessels and jewelry. Elsewhere, small columns were utilized for the display of statuettes as clearly illustrated by a rare surviving few that retain votive inscriptions and in one case the bronze base plate of the original statuette.⁷ Such evidence, which clearly illustrates how and where votives were exhibited, is rare and the vast majority of bronze votive figurines were discovered in secondary contexts where they were apparently deposited as a result of the periodic removal of votives that took place when temples and treasuries became overcrowded.

While objects from secondary deposits are commonly difficult to date using scientific means, pre-Hellenistic votives have been comparatively easy to identify and categorize primarily on the basis of well-established chronological stylistic criteria.

Hellenistic and Greek Imperial votive bronze statuettes also have been found predominantly in secondary deposits, but few have been dated by associated finds. At

⁴ From Eloro in Sicily, terracotta figurines were discovered arranged on low benches in a sanctuary likely dedicated to Demeter and Kore; figurines from the Demeter sanctuary on Acrocorinth possibly were originally displayed on wooden shelves; finds from Ayia Irini on Cyprus were arranged around the altar; and a terracotta bull was set on the corner of the altar at Kommos (Alroth 1988, pp. 199-202).

⁵ Marinatos 1936; Beyer 1976; Alroth 1988, p. 200.

⁶ Felsch 1980; Alroth 1988, p. 199, figs. 4-5.

⁷ E.g. a small column with bronze base plate and votive inscription by Telesinos from the Athenian Akropolis: Straten 2000, p. 192. From Italy, a limestone pedestal with bronze plaque inscribed with a votive dedication from Polulos: Hill 1969, pp. 76-77, figs. 6-7.

best, deposits from some sanctuaries that suffered a known destruction or sack date can be provided with a *terminus ante quem*. The situation, although similar to that of pre-Hellenistic votive statuettes, is more complicated due to the difficulties of distinguishing between Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronze statuettes. While stylistic analysis is difficult, consideration of iconography and in some cases dress and hairstyle can sometimes aid in determining a statuette's date of manufacture.⁸ Another obstacle to their study is the fact that, unlike the abundance of votive bronzes from earlier eras, relatively few bronze statuettes of Hellenistic and Imperial date have been found at Greek shrines and sanctuaries. This situation may have been caused by changes in votive practices, looting and destruction of sanctuaries in the late Imperial period or both.

For well over a century foreign archaeological schools, and more recently the Greek Archaeological Service, have made concerted efforts to excavate and study the finds from the major Greek sanctuaries. The bronze statuettes discovered have received a fair amount of attention with some having been published in the formal site publications while others have been mentioned in articles, dissertations and books. Yet, aside from Alroth's publications,⁹ very little attention has focused on an overall analysis of Hellenistic and Greek Imperial votive bronze statuettes. In this chapter, it is worthwhile to dedicate some discussion to the iconographic range of votive bronzes, much in the same vein as Alroth's methodology, as well as to the issue of attempting to date some of the statuettes. A more interesting topic, one which I would like to pursue in some depth, regards the general appearance of the Hellenistic and Imperial Greek votives, in

⁸ For various approaches to dating bronze statuettes, see Braemer 1979 and 1995, Zadocks-Josephus Jitta 1984, and Galestin 1995. See in particular the Acta of the 12th Congress on Ancient Bronzes, Nijmegen (Mols 1995), which focused on the dating of Roman bronzes.

⁹ Alroth 1987 and 1989.

particular how they compare and contrast with earlier votive bronze statuettes. Lastly, it is important to delve into the question of the comparative lack of votive bronze statuettes from the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. Does the decline reflect a change in the long held tradition of offering bronze figurines at religious sites or does it signify a waning importance of sanctuaries in general? What of the destruction and looting that many sanctuaries suffered during the Roman conquest and subsequent invasions? Did many of the Hellenistic bronze statuettes on display at the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries eventually end up decorating the houses and villas of the conquering Romans? A thorough analysis of the material evidence from just one sanctuary cannot adequately address all these issues. Instead, a broader review of finds from a range of sanctuaries and shrines should be sufficient to provide some answers.

Votive Bronze Statuettes from Panhellenic Sanctuaries

To date, the greatest number of post-Classical votive bronze statuettes has been discovered not at Delphi, Olympia, or Athens but at the sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona.¹⁰ The site was first excavated under Constantin Carapanos who worked there from 1875 to 1877.¹¹ Most of his attention was concentrated around the still visible ruins of the basilica, Hieria Oikia and Bouleuterion, and also the southern extremity of the sanctuary

¹⁰ This scenario will likely change with future excavations and publications. The post-Geometric bronzes from Olympia are currently being prepared for publication by Ulrich Sinn and will no doubt add considerably to our knowledge of votive dedications of the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods.

¹¹ S. Mineyko also had received permission to work at Dodona and was to share the work with Carapanos. However, they had a falling out after Carapanos published some of the finds under his own name, mentioning Mineyko only in passing. The exact whereabouts of many of the objects from Mineyko's collection from Dodona are not known. A few objects apparently were acquired by the Berlin Museum and published by Kekulé von Stradonitz and Winnefeld in 1909. For a discussion of the early excavations, see Greifenhagen 1981 and Dieterle 1999.

where he uncovered two colonnades and a series of statue bases.¹² As indicated by the limited nature of his published reports, much of his interest lay in the objects he found and less so in interpreting the buildings he discovered or in establishing the character and history of the sanctuary.¹³ Additionally, Carapanos was less diligent in recording the appearance, number and location of objects found and subsequently the true extent of the finds cannot be established. It is known that he discovered a number of votive statuettes in the vicinity of the basilica annex, which misled him to believe that the basilica itself was the Temple of Zeus and Dione.¹⁴ Subsequent studies on the Carapanos collection of Dodona material has proven to be rather difficult as the finds are currently split between various museums (e.g. Athens, Paris and Berlin) and, as demonstrated by Adolf Griefenhagen, Carapanos was not averse to acquiring Greek antiquities and then identifying them as Dodona material.¹⁵

Subsequent work on the sanctuary was undertaken by Georgios Soteriades beginning in 1913, but the most extensive excavations were carried out beginning in the 1920s by Demetrios Evangelides and later by Sotirios Dakaris, both of whom published sporadic reports but provided no comprehensive interpretation of the site and its artifacts.¹⁶ Since their discovery, a number of the bronze statuettes, particularly the beautifully crafted and well-preserved Archaic examples, have been the focus of a considerable amount of scholarship.¹⁷ A few fourth-century bronzes attributed to

¹² Dakaris 1996, p. 10.

¹³ Carapanos' major publication, *Dodone et ses Ruines*, appeared in 1878 but included only a portion of the objects he uncovered. A smaller report focusing on a selection of bronze statuettes and oracular lead tablets was published in *BCH* (Carapanos 1890).

¹⁴ Dakaris 1996, p. 11; Alroth 1989, p. 74.

¹⁵ Griefenhagen 1981, p. 7.

¹⁶ For a comprehensive listing of Dodona publications, see Alroth 1989, pp. 73-78 and Dieterle 1999.

¹⁷ Kekulé von Stradonitz and Winnefeld (1909), Vokotopoulou (1973), Tzouvara-Souli (1979), and Walter-Karydi (1981).

Dodona are relatively well known – a Poseidon in Berlin and a Warrior in Athens (cat. no. 106) – but some doubts remain as to their precise origin. The bronze statuettes dating from the fourth-century BC and Hellenistic period found by Carapanos and by subsequent excavators (cat. nos. 55-63, figs. 31-40) have received little notice. A glance at these bronze figurines reveals in general why they have attracted only sporadic attention.

A group of statuettes (cat. nos. 55-59) published by Carapanos in 1890 appear to date perhaps as early as the late fifth century BC but the majority probably date to the fourth century and later.¹⁸ They present an intriguing range of subjects, many of which are quite original; all, however, are rather technologically unsophisticated and modest in size, measuring no taller than 14 cm. Aside from a few iconographical details, the statuettes are rather undistinguished and lack any sort of stylistic indicators that might specify whether they are Hellenistic or Greek Imperial in date.

A mature male (cat. no. 58) with a full beard, thick hair swept back from his face, and wearing a himation was identified by Carapanos as a priest based on the fact that he wears a wreath of oak leaves and poses with arms outstretched, the left hand loosely clasped perhaps to hold a patera. Although lacking any striking stylistic features that might pinpoint a precise date of manufacture, the type in general recalls the many philosopher portraits of fourth-century Athens.

Equally curious is the statuette of a slender bearded male dressed in a short sleeveless tunic (cat. no. 59). He grasps a knife in his raised right arm and is apparently depicted in the act of making an animal sacrifice. Facial and bodily details are only roughly indicated and the head in particular is formed with broad linear strokes rather

than truly modeled. The unusual subject and apparent provincial style of the figure prevent any in-depth discussion regarding the date of the statuette.

The most fanciful figure of this group is the rather jovial Herakles evidently depicted in the midst of a dance (cat. no. 57, figs. 33-34), which may have been inspired by satyr plays centering on the hero.¹⁹ Similar bronze figures are known, typically of satyrs who are likewise depicted with one arm flung upwards and a leg kicked up to the side.²⁰ One wonders if a specific dance is being depicted or whether the pose was simply a generic device to indicate revelry. The Dodona figure is surprisingly lean and smooth, an uncharacteristic representation of the usually powerful figure. Nevertheless, the identification of Herakles is assured by the club and the lionskin, which envelops his raised left arm.²¹

Two of the female statuettes (cat. nos. 55-56, figs. 31-32) are much more generic and indeed it is difficult to determine if they are intended to represent deities, priestesses or devotees. The somewhat awkward figure of a woman wearing a chiton with a himation swathed about her left arm and draped across her hips (cat. no. 55) may date to the latter part of the fifth century BC. Yet, the pose and convoluted style of drapery were especially popular during the fourth century as demonstrated by similar figures found on the Mantinea statue base, the Demokratia stele and numerous Attic votive reliefs. The

¹⁸ Carapanos 1890, pp. 159-161, pls. 3-5.

¹⁹ As suggested to me by Christina Salowey.

²⁰ Small bronze figures rendered in a similar fashion include a Late Hellenistic statuette of a Dancing Satyr in the Burton Y. Berry Collection, Indiana University Museum of Art ([Highlights of the Burton Y. Berry Collection](#), p. 26, no. 25), an Etruscan figure of a Young Slave from the Antiquarium collection in Berlin (Neugebauer 1921, pp. 102-103, fig. 55), and a Satyr from the Pomerance Collection (Mitten and Doeringer 1967, p. 178, no. 182).

²¹ Dakaris has identified a temple to Herakles at Dodona (Temple A) on the basis of some of the votive offerings and a carved metope illustrating Herakles fighting the Hydra of Lerna (Dakaris 1996, pp. 19-20); P. Franke also supports a temple of Herakles at Dodona, although Alroth remains doubtful (Franke 1961, p. 155; Alroth 1989, p. 74).

same argument can be made for the tall slender female figure (cat. no. 56, figs. 31-32), sometimes identified as Aphrodite, standing in quiet repose cradling a dove in her left hand.²² The long heavy folds of her chiton pool about her feet while her head and upper body are shrouded in a himation. This rich interplay of drapery highlighting the contrast between the lightly crinkled fabric of the underlying chiton with the heavy folds of the cloak was favored by fourth-century artists but remained popular throughout the Hellenistic period.²³

An intriguing bronze from Dodona is the partially preserved figure of a Comic Actor (cat. no. 60). Judging from the position of his one remaining leg, he is depicted running at full stride with arms raised above his head. A review of related figures, such as the Comic Actor from Olynthus (cat. no. 1), suggests that he too most likely held a serving tray above his head. As with the Olynthus bronze statuette, the overwhelming majority of comic actor figurines, both in bronze and terracotta, were found in domestic and funerary contexts,²⁴ but these popular figurines were also dedicated at shrines and sanctuaries.²⁵

The following bronze statuettes (cat. nos. 61-63, figs. 35-40) stand out in sharp contrast to those mentioned above by virtue of the elegant style and fine craftsmanship they exhibit. The statuette from Dodona depicting Ptolemy III in the guise of Hermes

²² Numerous figures in terracotta depicting women holding doves have been interpreted by Dakaris as Aphrodite and have been used as evidence to identify the temple where they were found (Temple *lambda*) as dedicated to Aphrodite (Dakaris 1996, p. 20). However, Alroth notes that such terracotta figures were found at other locations around the sanctuary and therefore should not be used to signify the presence or exact location of a temple to Aphrodite (Alroth 1989, pp. 73-74).

²³ This trend can be seen on Delian sculpture of the late 2nd to 1st century BC, e.g. the statue of Diodora dated to the late 2nd century BC and the private portrait of Kleopatra dated c. 138/37 BC.

²⁴ Webster 1978, pp. 44-91; *Olynthus* XIV, nos. 378-382; *Delos* XXIII, pp. 262-263, nos. 1217-1219; Goldman and Jones 1942, p. 399.

²⁵ *Thebes* V, pp. 114-126, pls. 26-27; *Corinth* XVIII, iv, pp. 195-199, 244-247, pls. 53-54; Burn 1997, p. 86, fig. 128. See also cat. nos. 77-78 below.

(cat. no. 63, fig. 39-40) is a relatively well-known type with numerous examples having been discovered in Egypt.²⁶ Its discovery at Dodona is not unusual considering the dynastic and political ties between Epirus and Ptolemaic Egypt, particularly during the reign of King Pyrrhus.²⁷ Wearing a chlamys and lotus-leaf crown with two wings affixed to either side of his head, the figure clearly represents the god Hermes, but prevalent as well are distinctive Ptolemaic facial features: full round face, deep-set eyes and bulging forehead. A close comparison can be made to a bronze statuette of Ptolemy III in the Württembergischen Landesmuseum Stuttgart, which depicts the ruler in the act of throwing a discus. Like the many other statuettes of Ptolemy III in the guise of Hermes, it too is said to have come from Lower Egypt, specifically from Alexandria.²⁸ A similar origin for the Dodona Ptolemy III/Hermes is probable.

Two of the most charming bronze statuettes found at Dodona are the Boy with Dove and Ball Player (cat. nos. 61-62, figs. 35-38). The Boy with Dove is the focus of an article by Dorothy Burr Thompson, in which she discusses its origin and date of manufacture.²⁹ She relates that in general there is a noticeable rise in the appearance of children in art beginning in the Late Classical period, and votives of children were frequently dedicated at sanctuaries of deities considered Kourotrophoi: Asklepios, Aphrodite, Demeter and Artemis.³⁰ Judging by the soft modeling and realistic proportions of the Boy with Dove as well as comparisons with marble and terracotta statues and reliefs found at Attic sites, Thompson suggests that the statuette was made in

²⁶ Pedrizet 1911, pp. 30-31, pls. 15-16; Edgars 1904, p. 3, no. 27638, pl. 1; Svenson 1995, p. 249, nos. 184-185, pl. 28; Kyrieleis 1975, p. 170, no. C15, pl. 27.

²⁷ Athenaeus remarks that Ptolemy I and Berenike were honored with sacred precincts at Dodona (Ath. 5, 203). Furthermore, the reign of King Pyrrhus was supported by Ptolemy II, the step-father of his wife Antigone.

²⁸ Lehman 1988, pp. 290-301.

²⁹ Thompson 1982.

an Attic workshop in the late 30's or early 20's of the fourth century BC.³¹ Only briefly does she mention the statuette of a Ball Player (cat. no. 62, figs. 37-38), which, like Dakaris, she considers to be somewhat later in date. While both statuettes represent boys who wear distinctive braided hairstyles bound up on top of their heads,³² the two differ dramatically in other respects. The Boy with Dove stands quietly in a contemplative pose, his attention focused solely on the dove held in his left hand. There is a considerable degree of naturalism in the modeling of the body particularly in the slim stature and the rendering of the soft musculature. In contrast, the Ball Player is represented in the midst of throwing a ball, although the action appears somewhat stilted. The stockiness of the figure gives the impression that the boy is younger than the Boy with Dove; the soft fleshiness of a young child is suggested through the use of incised lines on the lower belly and around the neck to indicate plump folds of baby fat. By comparison, the chest and shoulders are surprisingly broad and the limbs appear muscular rather than actually chubby. This rather mature physique, which betrays perhaps a lack of interest in depicting the true appearance of a child's body, is more suggestive of sculptural trends of the late fifth or early fourth century BC rather than the early Hellenistic date as proposed by Thompson.³³

This analysis of the bronze statuettes found at the sanctuary of Dodona confirms observations made by other scholars and produces new insights as well. First is the appearance of some rather novel subjects among the votive offerings, namely the two children and the comic actor, subjects that rarely appear in votive deposits of the

³⁰ Thompson 1982, pp. 157-159.

³¹ Thompson 1982, pp. 159-160.

³² Thompson relates that the braided hairstyle marks the children as votaries who are in the service of a deity (Thompson 1982, p. 157). See also Rühfel 1984, pp. 213-243, and Gonzenbach 1957, p. 31.

Geometric, Archaic and Early Classical periods. This trend has been noted at other sanctuaries. As demonstrated by Alroth, from the Classical to the Hellenistic period there was a subtle shift in the range of subjects of votive offerings; votives depicting children increased dramatically in number as demonstrated by finds from Athens, Elateia, Amyklai and Epidauros, and those of comic actors and grotesques were especially favored at Athens and Elateia.³⁴ Also observable among the later Dodona finds is the rather clear division between the first group discussed (cat. nos. 55-59), characterized by unconventional forms and somewhat careless workmanship, and the last four statuettes (cat. nos. 60-63), which represent more standard types and are considerably more sophisticated in execution. The first group, seemingly homogeneous, may have been locally produced and reserved for local consumption considering that bronzes of a similar style have not been discovered at other sanctuaries. Conversely, the remaining statuettes – the two children, comic actor and Hermes/Ptolemy III – were likely imports brought to the sanctuary by visitors from outside the immediate area. D. B. Thompson has proposed that the Boy with Dove was dedicated to Dione by a visitor from Athens at a time when Athenians were heavily patronizing the sanctuary (343 to 325 BC).³⁵ Similarly, Athens may have been the main production center of the very popular comic actor figures,³⁶ although they have been found at numerous localities throughout northern and central Greece (see cat. nos. 1, 77-78).³⁷

³³ Thompson 1982, p. 157.

³⁴ Alroth 1998.

³⁵ Thompson 1982, p. 161.

³⁶ Uhlenbrock 1990, p. 48.

³⁷ Webster 1978, p. 117.

In the Hellenistic period, the sanctuary of Zeus and Dione at Dodona suffered two major attacks, by the Aetolians in 219 BC and by the Romans in 167 BC.³⁸ The severity of the destruction by the Romans has not been precisely determined, but archaeological evidence indicates that the sanctuary revived to a degree with repairs clearly having been carried out on the Prytaneion and theater. The sanctuary continued to receive visitors, including Emperors Hadrian and Julian, but it never regained its former vitality and popularity. The sanctuary was closed under the decree of Theodosius I who outlawed the practicing of ancient cults and ordered all pagan temples destroyed; in AD 391 during the consulate of Symmachus, the sacred Oak of Dodona was felled bringing an end to the oracle. A survey of the diverse votives found at the sanctuary reveal that that vast majority date prior to the third century BC and provide material proof of the decline of the sanctuary during the Late Hellenistic and Roman periods. Yet during the fourth century and the early part of the Hellenistic period, the sanctuary of Zeus and Dione at Dodona continued to attract visitors, many no doubt local residents, but several from afar who likely brought votive offerings from their homeland.

Surprisingly, both Delphi and Olympia, two sanctuaries that retained their popularity but lost some of their former political and religious glory, also produced few votive bronze statuettes from the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. From the sanctuary at Delphi and the surrounding vicinity, four bronze statuettes (cat. nos. 64-67) are known, with a fifth figure, an Aphrodite (cat. no. 68), only loosely attributed to Delphi. The majority came to light around the turn of the last century and while the general findspots are known for most, little else regarding their original disposition was

³⁸ According to Cassius Dio, Dodona also was damaged during the Mithridatic War of 86 BC (Cass. Dio Fragments of Books 30-35, 101, 2). A review of the history of the sanctuary can be found in the

recorded. Although most were found within the sanctuary temenos, they were not discovered together in a cache of votive deposits, but rather were found at various locations in contexts that provide little information regarding their original disposition.

An especially attractive statuette depicting a mature male nude (cat. no. 64, figs. 41-43) provides the best evidence for votive use. It was found not at Delphi but nearby at Pylaea. It was discovered in the dromos of a large Mycenaean tomb and judging by the figure's nudity and long hair, it has been traditionally identified as a deity, possibly Apollo or Dionysos.³⁹ The lack of attributes and the unusual pose – arms aloft, the left raised high and curving slightly towards the head, the right bent and held closer to the torso – prevent an unequivocal identification. Another possibility is that it may represent a hero. The statuette was found in proximity with a Mycenaean tomb and is highly suggestive of devotion to a hero or tomb cult, an activity that was not unusual in Late Classical and Hellenistic Greece.⁴⁰

In his publication of the bronzes from Delphi, Claude Rolley discusses the iconography and style of the statuette, which he also uses as a basis for dating the work.⁴¹ He notes that while the proportions, the relaxed stance, and the form of the head recall the work of Lysippus, the treatment of the musculature is much softer, indeed almost effeminate, and has obvious parallels with the sculptural style of Praxiteles. Based on this analysis, he dates the statuette to the first half of the third century BC. Even in its ravaged state, the statuette is exceptional. The form is elegant, the movement graceful and areas where the original bronze surface has been preserved reveal a considerable

dissertation by Dieterle (1999).

³⁹ Delphi V, ii, p. 164.

degree of workmanship. Even minor details such as the pupil and iris have been carefully delineated. In its original state it must have been truly remarkable.

From within the sanctuary of Delphi, found at the southeast corner of the temenos, comes another fine statuette representing Athena (cat. no. 65, figs. 44-45). According to Pedrizet it was discovered in the remains of a house,⁴² although an earlier report indicates that the house is Byzantine in date and the bronze statuette appears to have been found beneath a nearby retaining wall.⁴³ The goddess is depicted holding a small owl in her outstretched right arm and undoubtedly a spear, now missing, in her lowered left hand. Her dress is less commonplace apparently consisting of a fine textured chiton beneath a diagonally draped himation and most intriguing of all an aegis slung around her left shoulder. Although the edge of the aegis is not enlivened by snakeheads, as is the norm, it does curl up slightly, and the gorgoneion is prominently placed over the front of her left shoulder. In his discussion of the statuette, Rolley cites the unusual dress as well as the asymmetrical position of the aegis as indications of a Hellenistic date.⁴⁴ Yet, as clearly demonstrated by Kaufmann-Heinimann, Archaic and Classical artists occasionally depicted Athena with her aegis draped over one arm or shoulder, but the overwhelming majority of bronze statuettes appear to have been made in the Roman Imperial period and were based on the Early Classical Cherchel Athena.⁴⁵ The small

⁴⁰ At nearby Orchomenos the so-called Treasury of Minyas became the focus of a later cult beginning possibly as early as the Hellenistic period and continuing into the Greek Imperial period. For a discussion of tomb cults and hero cults in general see Alcock 1991, pp. 447-467 and Kearns 1990, pp. 65-99.

⁴¹ *Delphi* V, ii, pp. 164-165.

⁴² *Delphi* V, i, p. 38.

⁴³ "Nouvelles et Correspondance," *BCH* 18 (1894), p. 195.

⁴⁴ *Delphi* V, ii, p. 167. Another statuette of Athena in the collection of the Indiana University Art Museum demonstrates the same casual positioning of the aegis, albeit on a much more monumental and dynamic figure of Athena. W. Rudolph has dated the bronze to the late 2nd to 1st century BC (Neils 1992, p. 187).

⁴⁵ Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, pp. 54-55, fig. 25.

copies differ in many minor respects – dress, position of arms and selection of attributes – but two close parallels are known from Stara Zagora, Bulgaria and Tartous, Syria.⁴⁶

In sharp contrast to the elegant and innovative figure of Athena is a rather robust figure of Artemis found in the gymnasium (cat. no. 66, figs. 46-47). Dressed in her traditional hunting garb consisting of a short-sleeved, knee-length chiton and calf-length boots, she is depicted striding forward with her right hand raised to pull an arrow from the quiver hanging down her back. Her left arm is held at her side with the hand loosely clasped to grasp a now missing bow. According to Lilly Kahil, this type originated in the Hellenistic period, however unlike the Delphi version, Artemis typically wore a cloak rolled around her waist rather than just a simple chiton.⁴⁷ The style of dress of the Delphi statuette is more commonly found on the so-called Louvre-Ephesus type, examples of which are known from Corinth and Athens.⁴⁸ The admixture is not unusual and in general this restful pose, while not as popular as the subject of Artemis giving chase, was well known in Roman art and copies large and small abound throughout the Roman world. More than likely, the Delphi Artemis was also produced in the Greek Imperial period.

Equally prosaic are two other bronze statuettes attributed to Delphi, a seated Isis with Horus in the Louvre Museum (cat. no. 67) and a nude Aphrodite (cat. no. 68). Neither figure shows much originality or technical finesse. Rolley finds parallels for the Isis and Horus group in Alexandrian works;⁴⁹ however, by the Greek Imperial period, Greek artists were no doubt crafting their own versions of the divine pair. The Aphrodite

⁴⁶ Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, figs. 25, nos. 7 & 12; *LIMC* II, 1984, p. 1049, no. 3, pl. 768, s.v. *Athena* (H. Cassimatis).

⁴⁷ *LIMC* II, 1984, p. 641, no. 203, pl. 462, s.v. *Artemis* (L. Kahil). E. Simon suggests that the type is based on a Late Hellenistic version (*LIMC* II, 1984, p. 804, no. 24a, pl. 592, s.v. *Artemis/Diana*).

statuette (cat. no. 68) has been loosely attributed to Delphi but is worth mentioning for another reason. The workmanship is unexciting and in fact the statuette is a common type with two known parallels in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens (cat. nos. 112-113, figs. 94-97). The three bronzes are of approximately the same height (12.9 to 13.8 cm) and vary only in the smallest of details. Clearly, they were cast using the same prototype. Bronze statuettes depicting the goddess in the same pose, although displaying a different body type and sculptural style, are known from the eastern Mediterranean, particularly Egypt.⁵⁰ The three bronze statuettes found in Greece were probably locally produced.

Aside from Dodona and Delphi, Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronze votive statuettes from other major sanctuaries are disappointingly sparse. This is evident from the limited number of publications on the metal finds from various sanctuaries, although the situation will likely change with forthcoming publications, most notably for the Athenian Agora and Olympia.⁵¹ From Olympia, I am aware of only one published Hellenistic bronze statuette from this major sanctuary (cat. no. 69).⁵² The standing male nude was discovered by Dörpfeld during regular excavations and presented as a gift to Count Kurhessen, who was visiting Olympia at that time. Aside from this general information, nothing more is known regarding its discovery. The bronze surface is partially corroded and the statuette is missing both arms, the left leg and head. According

⁴⁸ LIMC II, 1984, nos. 266-283, pls. 467-469, s.v. *Artemis* (L. Kahil).

⁴⁹ *Delphi* V, ii, p. 164.

⁵⁰ LIMC II, 1984, p. 162, nos. 170-181, pl. 166, s.v. *Aphrodite in peripheria orientali* (M. Jentel).

⁵¹ N. Leipen is working on the metal objects from the Athenian Agora and U. Sinn on the post-Geometric bronzes from Olympia.

⁵² Bol 1984. Bol states at the beginning of his article that although numerous buildings and statue bases were erected at Olympia during the Hellenistic period, bronze statuary is comparably scarce. Within the Olympia museum itself I found only one possible bronze of Hellenistic date, a Standing Youth (inv. no. BE

to Peter Bol, the left arm was held out to the side parallel to the ground while the right arm was most likely held closer to the torso. While there is a Polykleitan feel to the structure of the body, Bol likens the modeling of the figure, particularly the posterior side, to late Hellenistic sculpture and places its date of manufacture around the early first century BC. Based on the position of the raised left arm, Bol suggests that it represented either a deity (Zeus) or an athlete.

The site of Nemea also has produced surprisingly few bronze statuettes. Only one is known that dates to the Hellenistic period (or perhaps later), and rather appropriately it represents the child hero Opheltes (cat. no. 70, figs. 48-49) who was venerated at the sanctuary. The small bronze figure depicts a young child, perhaps no more than one year in age, who sits upright with his right arm raised in a sign of benediction. Depictions of Opheltes are not common, and in creating the statuette the artist may have looked to representations of other divine children as models. The closest in appearance to the Nemea Opheltes are seated figures of Harpokrates, which in age and general pose are extremely similar.⁵³ The hairstyle as well, which consists of a central lock or knot above his forehead and four locks falling down onto his upper back, is similar to hellenized versions of Harpokrates,⁵⁴ although it undoubtedly originated with portraits of Eros. While the Nemea Opheltes is suitably plump and childlike, the modeling of the figure overall is rather lackluster. Little effort has been expended in rendering small details such as fingers and toes, and the soft fleshy folds so common to young children are almost completely absent. The statuette was discovered in a channel filled with material

862/M951). A bronze statuette of Hermes, possibly Hellenistic in date, is listed in the Olympia photo archives of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens (inv. no. B 10350).

⁵³ LIMC IV, 1988, pl. 245, s.v. *Harpokrates* (T. Tam Tinh, B. Jaeger and S. Poulin).

⁵⁴ Cf. Harpokrates from the Athenian Agora (cat. no. 29, figs. 24-25).

dating to the sixth century AD but dates considerably earlier. Stephen Miller has proposed a Hellenistic date, although, considering the cursory modeling, a Greek Imperial date is equally conceivable.

Votive Bronze Statuettes from Civic Sanctuaries and Rural Shrines

Bronze statuettes discovered within the vicinities of major civic centers, which may have been deposited at city sanctuaries and shrines, are slightly more abundant but knowledge of their original setting and purpose is incompletely understood. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a number of bronze statuettes have been discovered in the Athenian Agora but most were found in dumps or disturbed contexts. Considering that the Agora was the location of civic and commercial buildings, innumerable sacred spaces and was surrounded by residential quarters, determining the original placement and function of the bronze statuettes found there remains conjectural. From the Acropolis, the location of the city's major cults, few Hellenistic and Greek Imperial bronze statuettes are known. A bronze figurine of Aphrodite (cat. no. 102, figs. 84-85) was discovered to the east of the Acropolis, and may have originated from one of the many small shrines dedicated to Aphrodite dotting the slopes of the Acropolis.⁵⁵

At the site of Corinth, famed for its bronze industry, an astonishingly small number of bronze items has been found. The devastation and pillaging wrought by the Romans undoubtedly account for the absence of small valuable items, including bronze statuettes, but remarkably few Greek Imperial bronzes have been discovered as well, although this situation may change with increased excavations carried out beyond the city center. The most noted bronze statuette found at Corinth, an armed warrior (cat. no. 71),

was discovered in 1925 to the west of the Fountain of Glauke. It probably served as a votive and may have been deposited at the nearby Temple of Apollo. The youthful warrior is beardless and wears a chiton, cuirass, and Corinthian helmet. Even though it was found in a Late Imperial destruction level, C. Mattusch has convincingly argued for a Hellenistic date, predominantly on the basis of the unusual cuirass, pose and modeling of the figure.⁵⁶

Aside from Olympia and a few major commercial centers in the northwest corner of the Peloponnese, southern Greece has produced only a handful of small votive bronze statuettes. Two notable examples were found on the Acropolis at Sparta, both of which depict Athena (cat. nos. 72-73) and apparently were intended for the sanctuary of Athena Chalkioikos.⁵⁷ In the initial publication, Guy Dickens associates the armed female figure with the school of Praxiteles simply on the basis of the pose and modeling of the body and suggests that it was made in the late fourth or third century BC. In contrast, Rolley judiciously states that the style and workmanship of both statuettes, which in general are rather banal, cannot be used as suitable criteria to precisely date the bronzes. At the very least, it can be stated that they were made as early as the mid-fifth century BC, although there is nothing to rule out the possibility that they were produced as late as the first century BC by a workshop specializing in classicizing works.

In the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods votive bronze statuettes also continued to be offered at smaller shrines and sanctuaries throughout Greece, but, as is the case with large sanctuaries, they too appeared in smaller numbers. Artemis proved

⁵⁵ Paus. I, 27, 3.

⁵⁶ Mattusch 1992 and 1993.

⁵⁷ In the initial excavation report, Guy Dickens identified one of the bronze figures as an armed Aphrodite based on Pausanias' report of a shrine to warlike Aphrodite located on the Spartan Acropolis (Dickens

especially popular having been found at Pistiana (near Arta or ancient Ambrakia) in the vicinity of a “funerary enclosure”⁵⁸ (cat. no. 74, figs. 50-51), in Arcadia at an Artemesion (cat. no. 75, figs. 52-53), and at Pagonda (cat. no. 99).⁵⁹

The Artemis from Pistiana (cat. no. 74, figs. 50-51) is perhaps the most conventional in form and depicts the goddess in pursuit of prey. She lunges to her left, her short tunic rippling with her movement, her right arm raised and the left at her side. The pose in general has parallels with at least two fourth-century models, the Louvre-Ephesus type and the Artemis of Versailles type attributed to Leochares.⁶⁰ The dress of the Pistiana figure has more in common with the simple chiton worn by the Louvre-Ephesus type, rather than with the Versailles type, which depicts the goddess wearing a rolled cloak draped over her shoulder and wrapped around her waist. One unusual addition in the dress of the Pistiana Artemis is the animal skin tied over one shoulder and enfolding her waist. This feature is a common attribute for the so-called Artemis/Amazon type, also depicting the goddess in hunting mode, and which was especially favored in central Greece.⁶¹ Local manufacture of the Pistiana Artemis is therefore more than likely, a hypothesis also advanced by Tzouvara-Souli, who would like to associate it with the cult statue of Artemis Agroteras at Ambrakia.⁶²

The Artemis statuettes from Arcadia (cat. nos. 75, figs. 52-53) and Pagonda (cat. no. 99), although demonstrating markedly different artistic styles, are evidently based on

1907-1908, pp. 142-146). Rolley’s identification of the two figures as Athena is more probable, especially on consideration of their findspot in the Heiron of Athena Chalkioikos (Rolley 1977, p. 169, figs. 8-9).

⁵⁸ Hammond 1967, p. 154. Found with ash deposits, iron knives, local ceramic vessels and a bronze lebes.

⁵⁹ Additionally, two statuettes of Artemis were found at Mycenae but their exact findspots are unknown (cat. nos. 109-110).

⁶⁰ LIMC II, 1984, pls. 465-469, s.v. *Artemis* (L. Kahil).

⁶¹ Examples are known from Athens, Volos and Vereia as well as Delos [LIMC II, 1984, pls. 475-476, s.v. *Artemis* (L. Kahil)].

⁶² Tzouvara-Souli 1979, pp. 26-28, pl. 11.

the same prototype. In a rather unusual pose, Artemis is depicted running with arms outstretched, poised in the act of drawing her bow. She is simply dressed in a knee-length chiton belted high beneath her breasts; the Artemis from Arcadia wears sandals, whereas the Artemis from Pagonda wears low, open-toed boots. Both figures wear the *Melonenfrisur* with a loose knot tied at the crown of the head. The type on which the statuettes are based, which has some similarities with the Louvre-Ephesus type discussed above, was not uncommon in central and northern Greece, and appeared later in Dacia during the Roman Imperial period. A Greek Imperial coin issued at Corinth depicts the same image,⁶³ perhaps in reference to a local cult statue, and possibly accounts for the appearance of a similar bronze statuette in nearby Arcadia. Votive plaques and coin imagery from Thrace attest to its popularity in the north, and from the site of Ostrov in Dacia a bronze statuette of Artemis was discovered, which bears a remarkable similarity with the Pagonda statuette.⁶⁴

As amply demonstrated in the previous two chapters, Herakles was another figure who retained his popularity into the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. While he played an increasingly important role in domestic cult, Herakles was also promoted by Alexander as one of his ancestors and was venerated in many of the Hellenistic kingdoms both at court and among the populace in general.⁶⁵ At the sanctuary of Herakles at Oita near Thebes, there is clear evidence that he continued to be venerated with offerings of

⁶³ Tzouvara-Souli 1979, pl. 11. See also Imhoof-Blumer 1964, p. 18, pl. D, nos. LXVII-LXVIII.

⁶⁴ Alicu 1979, pp. 191-193.

⁶⁵ A considerable number of bronze statuettes of Herakles survive from Hellenistic and Imperial Greece, but the exact findspots and thus true purpose of many are unknown. A review of the bronze statuettes in the collection of the National Archaeological Museum in Athens reveals a large number of Herakles statuettes, which could have easily served as objects of domestic worship or as votives dedicated to a shrine or sanctuary.

sacrificed animals, pottery and bronze votives as late as the fourth century BC.⁶⁶ Three bronze statuettes dating from as early as the fourth century BC survive and include two Comic Actors (cat. nos. 77-78, figs. 56-59) and possibly one depicting the hero himself (cat. no. 76, fig. 54-55). The Comic Actors are similar in appearance to the bronze figurine from House E.S.H. 6 at Olynthus (cat. no. 1, figs. 1-2), differing only in a few minor aspects of mask and hair design. Therefore a similar date of manufacture of approximately the early fourth century BC for both is highly probable. The various uses such figures served – domestic decoration and votive offering – naturally introduces the question of whether these figurines were originally purchased with a specific purpose in mind, or whether they may have originally been utilized in the home and only later were appropriated for votive use.

The nude male figure from the sanctuary (cat. no. 76, figs. 54-55) carries no attributes but has distinctive thick curly hair and a beard reminiscent of portrayals of Herakles. He stands at ease with his right hand propped on his hip and the left extended forward palm facing upwards, which suggests that he once held a patera. The workmanship is somewhat careless and the figure rather generic making it difficult to determine its date of manufacture. Judging from the relaxed pose of the figure and the motif of the hand resting on the hip, an attitude popular with Attic funerary and votive reliefs of the fourth century BC, the bronze figure was made no earlier than ca. 400 BC.

Related to the continuing popularity of Herakles is another interesting aspect of Hellenistic and Greek Imperial religious practices – the increasing popularity of hero cults. In addition to the bronze figure of a male nude (Dionysos? Apollo?) found in the dromos of a Mycenaean tomb at Pylae (cat. no. 64, figs. 41-43), a number of bronze

⁶⁶ ArchDelt 5 (1919) ΠΑΡΑΘΗΜΑ, pp. 25-33; Béquignon 1937, pp. 207-214.

figurines were deposited at sites, particularly in northern Greece, which by subject matter or context identify them as votives for a hero or tomb cult. In a necropolis at Thessaloniki, at a tomb surmounted by a shrine and fitted with a receptacle for offerings, three small votive bronzes were discovered. Rather appropriately they depict a Herakles, the Greek hero par excellence, and two Hermes figures, a deity closely associated with death and the underworld (cat. nos. 82-84). Based on numismatic evidence, the heroon dates to the Greek Imperial period with activity spanning from the end of the second century AD to the second half of the fourth century AD.⁶⁷ All three statuettes are modest in size and appearance, and it appears that the two Hermes figures, although differing slightly in size and appearance, were manufactured in the same workshop and were mass-produced. Such small unobtrusive figures in fact have been found throughout the region and, according to Erik Poulsen, were likely produced in a workshop located within Macedonia (see Appendix).⁶⁸

Another small bronze worth mentioning is a statuette of an Apollo figure, identified by the quiver strapped to his back, found at Mischos (cat. no. 81). It was discovered with a bronze horse, and therefore he is not simply an Apollo figure, but must be associated with the Thracian horseman or rider-god.⁶⁹ Commonly depicted on stelae, this rider-god or hero is typically shown on horseback either in the midst of hunting or advancing towards an outdoor shrine consisting of an altar and tree with snake entwined. According to Robert Turcan, through iconographic and epigraphic references, the

⁶⁷ *Praktika* 1949 (1951), pp. 145-161.

⁶⁸ Poulsen 1977, pp. 31-32. Further discussion on the purpose and date of these figurines can be found in the Appendix.

⁶⁹ *ArchDelt* 47 (1992), B'2 Chronika, pp. 492-493, pl. 136. For a listing of pertinent bibliography on the Thracian horseman, see Turcan 1996, p. 371, note 1. The Thracian horseman is occasionally associated with Apollo either through visual means when he is depicted holding a lyre or by an inscribed dedication (Turcan 1996, p. 249). On the subject see also Gočeva 1986.

Thracian horseman has obvious connections with the healing gods Apollo and Asklepios, but the figure also has strong funerary connotations, perhaps as some sort of protective deity. Thus, is it not unusual to find Thracian horseman monuments at graves but also at shrines dedicated to local heroes or the heroized dead.

Conclusions

Overall, determining distinct patterns in the use and appearance of Hellenistic and Greek Imperial votive bronze statuettes from such a small pool of objects is fraught with difficulties. Regional variations predominate not only in the decision to dedicate small bronze votives but also in regards to what types of figures were preferred. Secondly, even when discovered through careful excavation, the majority of bronze statuettes cannot be accurately dated by their archaeological context as they were often buried at a later date. A considerable number may be assigned an approximate date of manufacture, either by style or iconography, but many cannot be firmly dated. In spite of these difficulties, certain observations regarding their general appearance and manufacture can be made, and several trends may be discerned regarding their votive function.

At Dodona, the practice of dedicating bronze statuettes continued well into the Hellenistic period on a moderate scale in comparison with earlier trends but on a rather substantial level in relation to contemporary votive activities elsewhere. Many of the bronze figurines depict uncommon subjects and unusual iconographical choices (dancing Herakles, Sacrificant, and Priest figures) leading to the strong possibility that they were locally produced and perhaps offered by local visitors. The sanctuary continued to receive visitors from outside Epirus, at least up until the third and possibly second

centuries BC, and this presumably accounts for a small number of bronze votives that betray a more cosmopolitan character. These include the Boy with Dove, Ball Player and Hermes/Ptolemy III statuettes, which stylistically and iconographically compare well with similar figurines found throughout Greece. Bronze statuettes exhibiting marked Roman or Greek Imperial characteristics, whether iconographical, technical or stylistic, are noticeably absent.

The situation at Delphi is considerably different. By and large, the bronze statuettes depict major Olympian deities (as well as Isis) and overwhelmingly consist of well-known prototypes. The presence of such popular imagery presumably stems from the widespread and enduring renown of the sanctuary, which continued to receive visitors well into the Greek Imperial period. Unlike the bronze votives from Dodona, which were not as prevalent after the middle of the Hellenistic period, the bronze statuettes deposited at Delphi continue well into the second or even third century AD.

Stylistically, there is little cohesion within the group of bronze statuettes found at Delphi, and it is plausible that they were produced in regional workshops and were brought to the sanctuary from a visitor's homeland. It has long been established that series of bronze statuettes made from the same original model or based on the same type (and likely within the same workshop) could end up at different sanctuaries located miles apart.⁷⁰ In addition to the series of diminutive Hermes statuettes produced in northwest Greece (cat. nos. 83-84, Appendix nos. A. 1-A. 5), a series of statuettes depicting a nude Aphrodite can also be identified, although their exact place of manufacture cannot be

⁷⁰ This trend has already been touched upon in the previous chapter, the most obvious case being the small-scale bust copies based after Bryaxis' cult statue of Sarapis. The production of multiple copies of bronze statuettes seems to have increased in the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods as has already been noted by numerous scholars: Edgars 1903, Hill 1958, Leibundgut 1984, and Poulsen 1977 and 1984.

established. Three examples exist and include the Aphrodite attributed to Delphi (cat. no. 68) and two others in the Carapanos collection (cat. nos. 112-113), whose exact origins are unknown. All three may have served as votives but were equally appropriate for display in a Greek Imperial household.

Finds from other sanctuaries and shrines are not plentiful enough to provide any sort of discussion regarding the votive activity of each individual sanctuary, although a few trends regarding Hellenistic and Greek Imperial votive activities in general can be distinguished. Two deities, Artemis (cat. nos. 66, 74-75) and Hermes (cat. nos. 63, 83-84, 87, 93, 97, 98, 100 and 105), who were especially prevalent among Archaic and Classical votives at various sanctuaries,⁷¹ continued to hold widespread popularity in the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial periods. Yet, aside from these two gods and those found at Delphi, Olympian gods were infrequently represented perhaps reflecting the waning importance of Greece's traditional pantheon in favor of new and foreign cults.⁷² Similarly, athletic figures are not at all prevalent in sharp contrast to their earlier popularity. Instead, new types appeared and gained favor, particularly young children (cat. nos. 61-62) and comic actors (cat. nos. 60, 77-78), a trend which has been observed in votives in other media.⁷³ Lastly, the growing interest in hero-cults particularly during the Hellenistic period likely contributed to the spread of the cult of the Thracian rider-god (cat. no. 81) as well as a sustained interest in Herakles (cat. nos. 57, 76, 82 and 95), who, rather significantly, was also promoted by the Antigonid dynasty.

⁷¹ Alroth 1989, p. 110.

⁷² For this trend in terracotta figurines, see Ammerman 1990, p. 38.

⁷³ The popularity of comic actors and children is demonstrated by Alroth (1998, pp. 221-224, Tables 1, 2, 6 and 7).

Perhaps the most intriguing observation regarding the use of votive bronze statuettes of the Hellenistic and Greek Imperial period is the low number recovered, especially in comparison with the vast array of Archaic and Classical period bronze statuettes. The decline appears especially noticeable around the middle to latter part of the Hellenistic period and is particularly in evidence in Greek Imperial times. There are a few possible explanations for this situation. As proposed by Renate Thomas, many sanctuaries, famed for their rich treasuries, were plundered by invading armies, most notably by the Romans who transferred vast quantities of art works to Rome's own sanctuaries, public spaces and luxurious private villas.⁷⁴ While this may account for the paucity of material evidence from Greece's major sanctuaries and civic shrines, it does not adequately explain why so few bronze statuettes were discovered in any number of smaller shrines and regional sanctuaries, which by virtue of their relative minor status and provincial settings were doubtlessly spared some of the worst looting. Another reason, or reasons, must be sought to explain the decrease in number of bronze votives deposited in Greek sanctuaries in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

One trend addressed by only a few scholars concerns shifting patterns of votive activity. Brita Alroth and Susan Alcock have approached this subject in two rather different ways. In her article "Changes in Votive Practice? From Classical to Hellenistic," Alroth reviews the types and number of votive figurines (principally terracottas) found at ten sanctuaries from throughout Greece and the islands.⁷⁵ In an attempt to discern strong shifts in votive practices, Alroth looks for combined changes in

⁷⁴ Thomas 1992, pp. 36-37. On the subject of the importation of Greek art into Rome, see in particular Zanker 1979b, Neudecker 1988, Isager 1993 and a series of articles in volume 2 of *Das Wrack* by H. Galsterer, G. Zimmer and T. Hölscher.

⁷⁵ Alroth 1998.

style, motifs, material, deities present, as well as the number and position of the objects themselves. Overall, she notes that there are no clear universal trends present at the sanctuaries for the chronological period observed, although individual sites do demonstrate strong shifts in numbers and types of votives offered.⁷⁶ In the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, a small number of sanctuaries saw sporadic increases in votive activity (Elateia, Epidauros and Pergamon), although the majority of sites does seem to have suffered a general decline in the number of votives. Only a few sites – Perachora, Sparta, and Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros – reveal activity in the Greek Imperial period and then only on a rather diminished scale.

This remarkable decline in the latter part of the Hellenistic period and for much of the Greek Imperial period is also addressed in Alcock's article "Minding the Gap in Hellenistic and Roman Greece."⁷⁷ Whereas, Alroth's study focused principally on terracotta votives from major sanctuaries, Alcock restricted her study to small rural sanctuaries in central and southern Greece and utilized material and observations gained from surface surveys. She notes a persistent pattern of chronological "gaps" at a majority of shrines revealing an absence of religious activity from approximately the third century BC to the third to fourth century AD.⁷⁸ The principal reason behind this decline, she proposes, is the overall decrease in rural settlements and activities and a corresponding rise in the importance of urban centers.⁷⁹ This dramatic shift in the social and religious character of Hellenistic and Roman Greece, amounting to "a major upheaval in the

⁷⁶ Alroth 1998, p. 228.

⁷⁷ Alcock 1994. See also Alcock 1993.

⁷⁸ Alcock 1994, pp. 253-256.

⁷⁹ Alcock 1994, p. 260.

religious landscape,” explains to a degree why some of the major sanctuaries, especially those located in cities, continued to prosper.⁸⁰

Patterns of votive dedications using bronze statuettes observed above do coincide with trends observed by Alroth and Alcock. At Sparta and Thebes, there appears to be almost a complete cessation of votive activity using bronze statuettes shortly after the fourth century BC. Corinth as well has produced only one bronze statuette of note from the Hellenistic period (cat. no. 71), although one wonders how much was lost in the city’s destruction by the Romans. By virtue of their reputation, two major sanctuaries, Dodona and Delphi, continued to receive favor throughout the Hellenistic period; Delphi, one of the most famous, was active well into the Greek Imperial period. As demonstrated by Alcock, in the Late Greek Imperial period there was a resurgence of religious activity at rural sanctuaries, and this conceivably accounts for the use of votive bronze statuettes at a number of small shrines, e.g at Mischos (cat. no. 81) and Thessaloniki (cat. nos. 82-84). Yet, in comparison with the number of Archaic and Classical votive bronze statuettes, the number of later examples, particularly from major sanctuaries and urban shrines, is surprisingly low.

This situation is even more astonishing in light of the rapid increase in the production of bronze statuettes and the utilization of serial production methods that occurred in the late Hellenistic period.⁸¹ While looting may have contributed to the disappearance of a considerable number of bronze statuettes, and there is ample evidence for a decline of religious activity at various sanctuaries and shrines, the radical decrease in the number of votive bronzes is no doubt attributable to an additional reason. The

⁸⁰ Alcock 1994, p. 261.

⁸¹ Webster 1995, p. 257; Seeberg 1988, p. 270.

bronze-making industry was evidently directing much of its attention to the growing demand for bronze appliques and statuettes intended for private consumption, that is to say, for display in houses and villas. Coupled with a growing desire for more luxurious interior spaces, which no doubt included the display of elaborate bronze fixtures, vessels and statuary, the increasing use of bronze statuettes for private religious needs may have played a role in the waning numbers of bronze figurines deposited at public shrines and sanctuaries (see Chart 4). This shift in dedicatory practices may have been simply a matter of changing tastes whereby a terracotta or marble statuette may have been deemed sufficient to dedicate at a shrine or sanctuary, while more costly and decorative bronze statuettes were increasingly desired for the home, either for decoration or religious purposes.