



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

**Non-Citizen Commemoration in Fifth and Fourth Century BC
Attica**

By:

Carrie Sawtell

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Sheffield
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Department of Archaeology

September 2018

Abstract

The present thesis is an iconographic study of funerary monuments that memorialise, votive reliefs that include and decree reliefs that honour non-citizens resident in Attica or involved with Athens in the course of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Non-citizens here include metics (free resident foreigners), slaves, and foreigners. Collected together in this thesis are 173 funerary monuments, 34 epigraphic attestations of non-citizens dedicating, 65 votive reliefs that include non-citizens, and 60 decree reliefs.

While non-citizens were marginalised legally and politically, they contributed to Athenian society and Athens' position in the wider Greek world and their presence in the commemorative landscape was part of their contribution. This thesis employs and expands the 'free spaces' paradigm adapted by Kostas Vlassopoulos (2007), which envisions certain spaces in Athens as facilitating shared experiences between citizens and non-citizens that created shared identities. It argues that the cemeteries and sanctuaries of Attica were, when it came to commemoration, 'free spaces' traversed by both citizens and non-citizens, and that a shared iconography was created and used by citizens and non-citizens alike that both reflected their shared experiences and identities and contributed to those shared experiences and identities.

Contents

List of Figures	9
List of Tables	12
Acknowledgements	13
I: Introduction	15
I.1 Scholarly Context and Contribution	15
I.2 Research Aims	17
I.3 Methodology – ‘Free Spaces’ and Iconography	18
I.4 Thesis Outline	19
II: Foreigners at Home and Abroad	22
II.1 The Development of Legal Statuses prior to Democracy: Citizens and Slaves	23
II.2 Legal Statuses under the Democracy: Citizens and Metics	30
II.3 Athenian Foreign Relations	36
III: ‘Free Spaces’: Framing Non-Citizenship Commemoration	40
III.1 Vlassopoulos’ ‘Free Spaces’ Paradigm and the Agora	41
III.1.1 The Agora	41
III.2 Critiquing and Developing ‘Free Spaces’	44
III.3 Sanctuaries and Non-Citizen Religious Participation	47
III.3.1 Non-Citizen Participation in Athenian Festivals	49
III.3.2 Dedications	53
III.4 The Cemeteries	54
III.5 Iconography and ‘Free Spaces’	56

IV: The Funerary Monuments	59
IV.1 An Overview of Attic Funerary Commemoration	60
IV.1.1 The Archaic Period	60
IV.1.2 The Classical Period	62
IV.2.1 Identifying Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments	69
IV.2.1.1 Ruling Out Citizens: Demotics	70
IV.2.1.2 Remaining Outsiders? Metics and Ethnics	72
IV.2.1.3 The Worthy Ones: Slaves, Adjectives and Names	73
IV.2.1.4 Other Indicators of Non-Citizen Status	75
IV.2.2 Collecting and Organising Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments	76
IV.2.2.1 Existing Catalogues of Funerary Monuments	76
IV.2.2.2 Dating and Further Organisation	78
IV.3 Collected Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments	80
IV.3.1 450-420 BC (F 1)	80
IV.3.2 420-400 BC (F 2-5)	82
IV.3.3 400-375 BC (F 6-26)	84
IV.3.4 375-350 BC (F 27-95)	93
IV.3.5 350-300 BC (F 96-150)	106
IV.3.6 Undated Monuments (F 151-173)	123
IV.4.1 A Shared Iconography: Familial Relationships and Dress	125
IV.4.1.1 Husbands and Wives	126
IV.4.1.2 Parents with Grown or Infant Children	129
and Child Memorials	

IV.4.1.3 Brothers and Sisters?	131
IV.4.1.4 Dress	131
IV.4.1.5 Dying for the <i>Polis</i> : Warriors and Warfare	133
IV.4.2 Peculiarly Non-Citizen Iconography	135
IV.4.2.1 Occupational Pride	135
IV.4.2.2 Mistresses and Maids: Slaves with Slaves	140
IV.4.2.3 Banquet Scenes	141
IV.4.2.4 The Kallithea Monument (F 105)	143
V: The Dedications and The Inclusion of Slaves in Votive Reliefs	146
V.1 Dedications by Metics, Slaves and Foreigners	147
V.2 The Depiction of Slaves as Worshippers on Votive Reliefs	159
V.3 A Dedication by a Whole Foreign Community	183
VI: The Decree Reliefs	184
VI.1 Setting up a Decree	185
VI.2 An Overview of Decree Relief Iconography	190
VI.3 Collected Alliance and Honorary Decree Reliefs for Foreigners	192
VI.3.1 From the Earliest Decree Reliefs to the End of the Peloponnesian War, 450 / 426 to 404 BC (DR 1-14)	193
VI.3.2 From the Restoration of Democracy to the Formation of the Second Athenian League, 403 to 379 BC (DR 15-29)	199
VI.3.3 The Second Athenian League, 378 to 338 BC (DR 30-46)	205
VI.3.4 The Battle of Chaeronea to the End of the Fourth Century BC, 338 to 300 BC (DR 47-60)	212

VII: Concluding Discussion: ‘Free Spaces’ Assessed	218
VII.1 The Iconographic Feedback within a ‘Free Space’	220
VII.2 A Network of ‘Free Spaces’ within Attica	223
VII.3 Attic Artistic Influence across the Greek World and ‘Free Spaces’	225
Appendix I: The Funerary Monuments	229
Appendix II: Votive Reliefs depicting Slaves	282
Appendix III: The Decree Reliefs	299
Bibliography	313

List of Figures

2.1 Map of Attica.	29
4.1 Funerary stele of a woman from Thessaly (?) (F 1).	81
4.2 Funerary stele of Getas, a Scythian archer (F 3).	83
4.3 Funerary stele of Euempolos, a slave (?) (F 4).	83
4.4 Funerary stele of Ktesileos of Erythrea and his wife Theano (F 7).	85
4.5 Funerary stele of Olympichos and Potamon of Thebes (F 8).	85
4.6 Funerary stele of Demokrita of Korinth and Arnion (F 10).	89
4.7 Funerary stele of Hagestor, son of Apollodoros, of Megara (F 12).	90
4.8 Funerary stele of [Ask]epiades, son of Lukophrone, of Miletus (F 14).	90
4.9 Funerary stele of Asia (F 20).	91
4.10 Funerary stele of Gelon (F 21).	91
4.11 Funerary stele of worthy Plangon, a slave (?) (F 24).	92
4.12 Funerary stele of a possible hetaira (F 26).	92
4.13 Funerary stele of Seukes of Bithynia (F 30).	99
4.14 Funerary stele of Erene of Byzantium (F 33).	99
4.15 Funerary stele of Ariston, son of Ariston, of Ephesus (F 35).	100
4.16 Funerary stele of Kosmia of Kelainai, Phrygia (F 42).	100
4.17 Funerary stele of Pamphilos, son of Lampitos, of Miletus (F 54).	101
4.18 Funerary stele of two men from Olynthus (F 56).	101
4.19 Funerary stele of a Phoenician (F 74).	102
4.20 Funerary stele of Thettale, wife of Pyrrhias (F 78).	102
4.21 Funerary stele of Kosmia (F 80).	103
4.22 Funerary lekythos of Pantaleon, a possible priest of foreign origin (F 82).	103
4.23 Funerary stele of worthy and just Soteris, a slave (?) (F 89).	104

4.24 Funerary stele of worthy Pithane, a slave (?) (F 90).	104
4.25 Funerary stele of the midwife Phanostrate (F 93).	105
4.26 Funerary stele of Menes, son of Kallias, of Argos (F 97).	114
4.27 Funerary stele of Hermogenes, Rode and Epigenes of Gerenaïos (F 98).	115
4.28 Funerary stele of Korallion, wife of Agathon (of Herakleia) (F 100).	116
4.29 Funerary stele of Eutyichides of Kios (F 102).	117
4.30 Funerary stele of Dionysus of Ikaria (F 104).	117
4.31 Funerary monument of Nikeratos of Istros and his son Polyxenos, also known as the Kallithea Monument (F 105).	118
4.32 Funerary stele of [Di]okles, son of Diokles, of Cyprus (F 109).	119
4.33 Funerary stele of Onesimos son of Onetor of Lesbos, Protonoe, Nikostrate and Eukoline (F 112).	120
4.34 Funerary stele of Epicharides and Erato of Plataea (F 119).	120
4.35 Funerary stele of worthy Doris, a slave (?) (F 129).	121
4.36 Funerary stele of worthy Karion, a slave (?) (F 132).	121
4.37 Funerary stele of a worthy nurse (F 147).	122
4.38 One of a pair of Scythian archer funerary statues (F 150).	122
5.1 Joint dedication to the Nymphs at Vari.	156
5.2 Votive relief depicting Zeus Meilichios / Philios and Worshippers (VR 5).	179
5.3 Votive relief depicting Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (VR 11).	180
5.4 Votive relief depicting Artemis and worshippers (VR 14).	180
5.5 Votive relief depicting Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (VR 18).	181
6.1 Decree relief honouring Proxenides of Knidos (DR 7).	196
6.2 Decree relief commemorating an alliance between Athens and Samos (DR 15).	200
6.3 Decree relief honouring the sons of Leomestor and Diagoras of Abydos (DR 25).	203

6.4 Decree relief honouring Alketas of Syracuse (DR 31).	206
6.5 Decree relief commemorating an alliance between Athens, Thrace, Paionia, and Illyria (DR 35).	208

List of Tables

3.1 Metic roles in the Panathenaia.	50
4.1 Numbers of metic, slave and undefined non-citizen funerary monuments, organised by date.	80
4.2 Monument types amongst non-citizens between 375 BC and 350 BC.	93
4.3 Monument types amongst non-citizens between 350 BC and 300 BC.	106
4.4 Total number of funerary monuments with surviving iconography, organised by date.	125
4.5 Total of depictions of husband and wife only across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments.	127
4.6 Total of depictions of small family groups (three or four figures) across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments.	128
4.7 Total of depictions of large family groups (five or more figures) across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments.	128
4.8 Total of all warrior and warfare scenes across status and time.	133
5.1 Non-citizen dedications in the Archaic period.	147
5.2 Non-citizen dedications in the Classical / early Hellenistic period.	149-152
5.3 Votive reliefs with slaves depicted amongst the worshippers (VR 1-65).	160-178
6.1 Breakdown of alliance and honorary decree reliefs.	193

Acknowledgements

So many people have supported me through to the submission of this thesis. Within the department I am grateful to Dr. Sue Sherratt for reading through early drafts of some of these chapters and to Dr. Lizzy Craig-Atkins for helping me explore statistical methods to use on my funerary monument data, even if ultimately not used. I am grateful to Tania Gerousi, school administrator at the British School at Athens, for her support and mediation in securing permission to include all the following images, and to the relevant museums for providing images or allowing me to include my own photographs.

I am grateful to all my family and friends who have seen me through the last four years. In particular I would like to thank my partner Joel, my parents Cath and Steve, and my godfather Andrew.

Finally I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Jane Rempel for her continued support and patience, for reading and re-reading drafts, and for invaluable discussions and pep talks. I could not have asked for a better supervisor.

I: Introduction

... lack of Athenian citizenship did not prevent anyone from being a patron of sculpture... The range of patrons in the art world of Athenian sculpture... was certainly not confined to the male, upper-class citizens of Athens (Hochscheid 2015: 290).

This thesis is concerned with the iconographic representation of non-citizens resident in the Athenian territory of Attica and of those foreigners who engaged with Athens in foreign relations or through religious dedication. Its chronological scope is the fifth- and fourth-century BC, throughout most of which Athens was an autonomous democracy based on the direct political participation of its male citizens, with non-citizens – resident foreigners (metics), slaves and foreigners – and citizen women excluded from such political participation (Kennedy 2014: 7; Vlassopoulos 2007: 33; Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015: 2). It is also a period, particularly the fourth-century BC, in which there is a wealth of iconographic material in the form of funerary monuments, votive reliefs and decree reliefs amongst which non-citizens are represented. Using this material, which can all be described as commemoration, this thesis will explore opportunities for non-citizen participation in Athenian society and for identity construction and display.

I.1 Scholarly Context and Contribution

Placed in its scholarly context, this thesis comes at a time when there has been significant interest in the non-citizen residents of Attica and in re-evaluating their experience, participation, identities and influence. A historical tendency to focus on political structures has often left non-citizens out of the history of fifth- and fourth-century BC Attica, or else reduced or simplified their contributions to other areas of Athenian society (E.E. Cohen 2000: 9; Gottesman 2014: 2-4, 210; Kennedy 2014: 1; Vlassopoulos 2007: 33, 39). Recent attention, then, can be characterised as an effort to redress the balance and to see non-citizens not as “passive objects” but as “active subjects” (Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015: 4). Recent studies have either focused on or included the non-citizen population as a whole (e.g. E.E. Cohen 2000; Maurizio

1998; Vlassopoulos 2007; Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015), or else have chosen to focus on a particular group, including metics in general (e.g. Wijma 2014), metic women (e.g. Kennedy 2014), slaves in general (e.g. Klees 1998; Vlassopoulos 2010, 2011, 2015; Wrenhaven 2012), and slave women (e.g. Joshel and Murnaghan eds 1998). While there have been a number of works on the iconographic representation of the ‘barbarian other’ in Athenian vase-painting, including Amazons (e.g. Stewart 1995), Scythians (e.g. Gleba 2008; Ivanchik 2005, 2006) and Thracians (e.g. Tsiafakis 2000) as well as more general studies (e.g. B. Cohen 2000; Miller 1991; R. Osborne 2011; Shapiro 1983), funerary, votive and decree relief iconography, while mentioned in recent studies re-evaluating the positions of metics, slaves and foreigners, has yet to be the exclusive focus of such a study. By focusing on iconography and its potential for presenting a series of datasets – funerary monuments, votive reliefs and decree reliefs – for analysis, this thesis makes a new contribution to recent scholarship on non-citizens resident in Attica and those foreigners engaging with Athens in the fifth- and fourth-century BC, and offers examples of non-citizen self-representation in juxtaposition to them as ‘others’ in the genre of vase-painting.

The iconographic datasets presented in this thesis are all the more important when the difficulty of assigning other forms of evidence to non-citizens is considered. This difficulty has been repeatedly pointed out by Ian Morris (1994; 1998: 193; 2011). Morris (1998: 193) reflects that for ancient historians, “going into the archives and bringing to light the obscured testimony of the oppressed is simply not an option” as it is for historians of more recent periods. Morris (1998: 193-220, 2011: 176-193) has also considered what role certain kinds of archaeological evidence – pottery, housing and burials – can play in making non-citizens, particularly slaves, visible. His conclusion, however, is that assigning such archaeological evidence definitively to a citizen, metic or slave is almost impossible (Morris 1998: 194, 218). For Morris (1998: 194), it is epigraphy, and iconography with it, that can best shed light on the lives of non-citizens, because inscriptions can offer up the status of the individual commemorated or commemorating, though of course there are many inscriptions that do not. While this thesis is an iconographic study, it relies on epigraphy in identifying commemoration with surviving iconography as representing non-

citizens. The relationship between iconography and epigraphy will be a recurrent topic and issue throughout this thesis.

I.2 Research Aims

As already stated, the material under study in this thesis – the iconography of funerary monuments, votive reliefs, and decree reliefs – can all be termed commemoration. Commemoration is defined as “the action or fact of commemorating a dead person or past event,” which may be done using “an object such as a stamp or coin made to mark an event or person” (*Oxford Dictionary of English*). Funerary monuments, of course, serve to commemorate one or more deceased persons. Votive reliefs serve as gifts to the gods but at the same time serve to commemorate or stand as substitute for the rituals, often sacrifice, depicted in the reliefs (Lawton 2017: 17). Decree reliefs serve to decorate decrees that, in the case of the scope of this study, commemorate Athenian alliances with other states or else commend a foreign individual for some service done for Athens (Lawton 1995: 5). Though all these types of commemoration served a different function, they all also served a related function. All were erected in public spaces and designed for an audience. Non-citizens were the patrons of funerary monuments and votive reliefs erected alongside those of citizens in the cemeteries and sanctuaries of Attica, as well as making up the audience viewing the funerary monuments and votive reliefs of other residents and foreigners. While private individuals, regardless of their citizen or non-citizen status, could not commission the reliefs that accompanied some decrees, as decrees were enacted by the *boule* and demos or another official body (see **chapter VI**), non-citizens would have viewed this commemoration alongside citizens, and foreigners were the most common recipients of decrees in general and decrees with reliefs in particular. Furthermore, citizens and non-citizens alike would have worked as the sculptors producing funerary, votive and decree reliefs (E. Harris 2002a: 68-69, 70). Non-citizens, then, were active in the production, patronage and consumption of commemoration in Attica.

The notion that non-citizens had access to the commemorative landscapes of Attica does not in itself constitute a new contribution to the study of non-citizens. The epigraphic evidence here speaks for itself in showing that non-citizens were laid to

rest in the cemeteries of Attica alongside citizens (e.g. E. Meyer 1993; Patterson 2006), were dedicators in Attic sanctuaries alongside citizens (e.g. Raubitschik 1949), and were the recipients of Athenian decrees and their reliefs (e.g. Lawton 1995). The aim of this thesis, rather, is through iconographic analysis to assess what non-citizen access looked like, to what extent commemoration was representative of the non-citizens who erected it or of whom it was erected for. The dominant role of politics in the writing of Athenian history means that citizen ideology has been regarded as the driving force behind the iconography of all genres, from vase painting (mentioned above) to sculpture. Metic, slave and foreign engagement with commemorative iconography, particularly funerary iconography, has been characterised as non-citizens taking up and using citizen images that may not necessarily represent them in an effort to conform to citizen practice (e.g. R. Osborne 1997: 29). Though the iconography of all three genres under study in this thesis is largely idealised and uniform, with some exceptions, this need not be interpreted as non-citizens passively copying citizen iconography. Through characterising the commemorative spaces of cemeteries and sanctuaries as ‘free spaces’ (see below), this thesis will afford non-citizen engagement with iconography greater agency. In the case of funerary monuments and votives, non-citizens actively engaged with and selected iconography to represent themselves. The decree reliefs are somewhat different, many of their honorands never stepping foot in Athens and hence such commemoration being commissioned on their behalf.

I.3 Methodology – ‘Free Spaces’ and Iconography

In order to explore this interpretation of non-citizen iconographic representation, this thesis will adapt a paradigm developed by historians of modern American politics and applied to Classical Athens by Kostas Vlassopoulos (2007) entitled ‘free spaces.’ While citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners were defined in Athenian law, and political participation separated male citizens from all other residents, Vlassopoulos (2007: 33) argues that such distinctions were often difficult to perceive, as citizens, metics and slaves mixed together in many other areas of life, in ‘free spaces.’ Vlassopoulos (2007: 38) defines ‘free spaces’ as “spaces that brought together citizens, metics, slaves and women, created common experiences and interactions, and shaped new forms of identity.” In his article, Vlassopoulos (2007)

chooses to focus on the agora and its capacity to facilitate shared citizen and non-citizen participation in non-institutional politics (see **Chapter III**).

In this thesis, common experiences and identities among citizens and non-citizens are regarded as facilitating a shared iconography in commemorative spaces. In turn, this shared iconography is a reflection of such shared experience and identities rather than the result of passive copying. Sanctuaries and cemeteries are characterised as ‘free spaces,’ the shared identities of mourner and worshipper being fostered in such spaces, along with the shared acts of erecting and consuming commemoration, upon which these shared identities were portrayed. While the separate legal statuses of citizen, metic, slave and foreigner were important in other contexts (see **Chapter II**), they were not necessarily important – or the most important – identities when it came to commemoration.

While the three genres of commemoration considered in this thesis do naturally make use of some different imagery, there are iconographic elements that can be analysed across all of them. The relationships between the figures depicted in each relief will be considered. This includes – as appropriate to the genre and individual relief – familial relationships, status relationships, relationships between mortal and divine figures, and inter-state relationships. It also includes the compositional relationships of figures, such as their size, position and function. Dress and other attributes serve to characterise some figures across the commemorative genres and this will be discussed as relevant to the individual reliefs. The size and quality of monuments and reliefs do not appear to impact subject matter, only how it is rendered.

I.4 Thesis Outline

This thesis will consist of a further six chapters. **Chapters II and III** provide the conceptual and physical settings within which to view non-citizen iconography. **Chapter II** serves to define the non-citizens who are the subject of this thesis – metics, slaves and foreigners – and chart the historical development of their statuses and relationships with Athens prior to and during the fifth- and fourth-century BC. While it is the aim of this thesis to demonstrate that non-citizens participated

together with citizens when it came to erecting and viewing commemoration, and in so doing created shared identities not rooted in their legal status, it is important to acknowledge how their statuses put them at a disadvantage in other ways in order to better contextualise this shared access to the commemorative landscape and a shared iconography.

Chapter III introduces the dimension of space, exploring the sanctuaries and cemeteries and how, while certain participation in these spaces was governed by legal statuses, this was not the case when it came to commemoration. It is in this chapter that the adaptation of the ‘free spaces’ paradigm for this thesis will be explained and explored. It begins by outlining Vlassopoulos’ (2007) original use of ‘free spaces’ and its application to the agora, before moving on to a discussion of how its use in this thesis develops the paradigm, in turn applying it to the sanctuaries, the setting for votives and decrees, and the cemeteries, the setting for funerary monuments. The chapter ends by establishing expectations and issues surrounding iconography and non-citizen use of it in the wake of ‘free spaces,’ laying the groundwork for the following chapters to delve into the iconography in detail.

Chapters IV-VI form the main body of this thesis, analysing and discussing the iconography of funerary monuments, votive reliefs and decree reliefs respectively. Each chapter will cover previous scholarship on the type of commemoration, provide a general iconographic overview, and explain how monuments have been selected for inclusion in this thesis, before describing and analysing individual examples of non-citizen funerary monuments (**F 1-173**), non-citizen dedications (**tables 5.1 and 5.2**), the depiction of slaves on votive reliefs (**table 5.3 – VR 1-65**), and decree reliefs honouring foreigners (**DR 1-60**). The presentation of each dataset will be followed by discussion of particular iconography and interpretational queries.

Chapter VII will provide a comparison of the iconography of all three genres and non-citizen usage and representation across the board. Through this iconographic review, **Chapter VII** will evaluate the designation of sanctuaries and cemeteries as ‘free spaces,’ examining ‘free spaces’ at three levels; that of the individual space; the relationship between different ‘free spaces’ within Attica; the potential role of ‘free

spaces' in maintaining Athenian foreigner relations and explaining Athenian artistic influence in the wider Greek world during the fifth and fourth centuries BC and subsequent centuries. This last zoomed out look invites future application of the 'free spaces' paradigm to the study of the classical world.

II: Foreigners at Home and Abroad: Legal Statuses at Athens and Athenian Foreign Relations

Though this thesis is arguing that the experience of many non-citizens residing in Attica in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC was in some ways comparable to that of citizens and as such contributed to shared identities and a shared iconography, there is no denying that definable legal statuses existed and were enforced. By the first half of the fifth century BC at the latest, when the Athenian democracy was still young, Athenian society was divided into three statuses: citizen, metic and slave (E.E. Cohen 2000: xii, 105; Kamen 2013: 3; Patterson 2007: 153; Watson 2010: 259). Citizen men held a full set of rights, enjoying full protection under the law, being able to vote, and able to run for certain offices (Patterson 2007: 153-156). Citizen women were protected under the law, although their dealings with the law were mediated by their male relatives, and they could not vote alongside their male relatives and so were not truly full citizens (Gould 1980: 43; Patterson 2000: 95; Patterson 2007: 153; Reeder 1995: 23-24). As free or freed persons residing permanently in Attica, metics received protection under the law but they could not vote and, as will be discussed below, were denied other privileges enjoyed by citizens (Akriagg 2015: 155; Kennedy 2014: 1; Whitehead 1977: 7). Finally, slaves were the property of their master, whether citizen or metic, and received no protection under the law, and certainly could not vote (Harris 2002b: 416; Harris 2012: 352-354; Lewis 2018: 25; Wiedemann 1981: 5).

In the third century AD, Athenaeus (272c-d) cites Ktesikles' *Chronicles* as his source for figures from a census conducted at Athens at the end of the fourth-century BC by Demetrius of Phaleron (Kamen 2013: 9). Athenaeus (272c-d) gives the population of Athens at that time as 21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics, and 400,000 slaves. While Athenaeus' figure of 400,000 slaves is now considered to be either erroneous or an exaggeration – even if by Athens he means the entirety of Attica and not just the city – non-citizens made up a significant proportion of the population of Attica, with metics and slaves combined conceivably outnumbering citizens (Akriagg 2015: 158). Just by their numbers alone, the non-citizen population would have had a profound impact on Athenian society both economically and socially, and “reflected

and embodied Athens' connections to wider networks... across the Mediterranean world" (Akrigg 2015: 155).

Being a citizen, metic or slave, then, granted or denied Attic residents the right to participate in politics and determined their level of legal protection. Beyond these limitations, however, there would have been similarities in the experiences of individuals across these statuses, as well as differences in the experiences of individuals of the same status (Vlassopoulous 2007: 33-34). Their status need not always have defined their day-to-day lives, just the vulnerability with which their lives were lived. This thread on the commonality of the experience of many citizens, metics and slaves will run throughout this thesis, essential to the 'free spaces' paradigm and in turn to explaining a shared iconography in commemorative spaces. This chapter, however, will chronicle the development of the legal statuses of citizen, metic and slave prior to and during the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, highlighting the vulnerabilities that threatened metics and slaves that were not reflected in the iconography of funerary monuments or votive reliefs.

Discussion of the three legal statuses considers developments within Athens prior to and during the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, but Athens of course did not exist in isolation. The influx of foreigners who became classified as metics and slaves is testament enough to that (Akrigg 2015: 155). In the interests of maintaining and improving their position in the wider Greek world, the Athenians entered into, or enforced, alliances and relationships with foreign states and individuals. Through commemoration in the form of decrees – and dedications – foreigners outside of Attica, usually with no intention of becoming residents, gained a presence in the heart of the city – on the Acropolis. Athenian foreign relations, then, are covered in this chapter in order to contextualise decree reliefs as a form of non-citizen commemoration in fifth- and fourth-century BC Athens.

II.1 The Development of Legal Statuses prior to Democracy: Citizens and Slaves

The three legal statuses that had developed by the first half of the fifth century BC were about membership of the Athenian community. Citizen men, with their full set

of rights, were full members of the Athenian community. Legally and politically, citizen women, metics and slaves held only partial membership or might not even be regarded as members of the community at all. Defining community membership, who was a member, and what that membership entailed was a concern that predated the birth of democracy at Athens, and was not only of concern in Athens. The rise of the *polis* in the eighth and seventh centuries BC threw the question of membership into sharp relief, though it had undoubtedly been an issue long before this date (Frost 1994: 47-49; Manville 1990: 53-54, 69, 82).

The earliest evidence at Athens of a distinction being drawn between the Athenian population – the full members of the *polis* – and the non-Athenian population – the partial or non-members – is the Draconian Law on homicide of 622/1 BC (Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 7.1; Frost 1994: 48-49; Lape 2010: 9-11). The law decreed that the penalty for murdering an Athenian was to be more severe than that for murdering a non-Athenian, a distinction that would persist into the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, when murdering a citizen still carried a heavier penalty than murdering a metic (Frost 1994: 48-49; Lape 2010: 9-11). While the political rights of Athenian men were not yet equal, with socio-economic status along with descent still determining political participation at this time, the law made clear that the Athenians recognized a difference between themselves and other residents and visitors, long before any official metic status was recognised.

The reforms of Solon in 594/3 BC further codified the rights of citizens over non-citizens at Athens (Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 6-12; Frost 1994; Lape 2010: 11-12; Martin 1996: 84-86; Patterson 2007: 155). At a time of civil unrest, Solon was called upon to reform the law and placate rich and poor alike (Martin 1996: 84-85). The essential points of Solon's reforms with regard to chronicling the development of citizen and non-citizen legal statuses were; the extension of some political participation to all Athenian males; protection from enslavement for debt – though not debt-bondage – for all Athenians; legitimate birth as a prerequisite for citizenship (Frost 1994: 51; Harris 2002b: 415; Kamen 2013: 62-69; Lape 2010: 11-13; Martin 1996: 84-86; Patterson 2007: 155-156, 162). Solon created four classes, membership of which determined the level of political participation male citizens enjoyed (Frost 1994: 51; Martin 1996: 85). Although the Draconian Law already demonstrated a codified

difference between Athenians and non-Athenians, Solon's reforms further qualified the requirements for membership and access to the benefits of that membership (Lape 2012: 13-14). Whilst free Athenian descent had already been a criterion for membership of the citizen body, Solon added the caveat of legitimate birth, meaning the parents of a potential citizen, at least one of who had to be an Athenian, had to be married (Kamen 2013: 62; Lape 2012: 13-14). The reforms made clear that slaves and the illegitimate were to be excluded from membership of the citizen body. For foreigners, marriage provided a means of gaining entry into the citizen body up until the passage of Pericles' Citizenship Law in 451/0 BC (though on the reliability of the evidence for the Citizenship Law see Haake 2013). Such mixed marriages favoured foreign women over foreign men, women having no hope of becoming politically active. Through marriage, however, foreign women ensured political rights for their sons, and perhaps with that came a degree of stability and protection for themselves. With the abolition of debt-slavery, ensuring that in the future no citizen would fall into such an ignoble position, Solon's reforms further set apart Athenian citizens from non-Athenians, and who was and was not vulnerable to being enslaved, at least at home in Athens (DuBois 2010: 80-81; Lape 2010: 12-13; Rihll 1996: 105; Westermann 1955: 4-5; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 101, 103). While the distinction between free and slave had existed long before the sixth century BC, slavery now became associated exclusively with non-citizens and particularly non-Greeks (Bush 1996: 10; Fisher 1995: 67; Joshel and Murnaghan 1998: 16; Lape 2010: 12-13; Rabinowitz 1998: 58; Rihll 1996: 105; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 32). Citizens could still enter themselves, their relatives or their slaves into contracts of debt-bondage to clear their debts, but such contracts were only for a specified period of time and their creditor was not their owner and so did not have the right to sell or bequeath a citizen under contract as they did a slave who was permanently a slave unless they manumitted them (Harris 2002b: 415-417; Lewis 2018: 10, 120). Debt-bondage, unlike enslavement for debt, continued into the Classical period (Harris 2002b: 420).

The institution of slavery in ancient Greece can be traced back to at least the time of the palatial societies of the late Bronze Age, with references to slaves occurring some 150 times in the Mycenaean Pylos tablets (DuBois 2010: 78; Garlan 1988: 25-26; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 9, 28). The extent to which slave labour was utilized

in the early Iron Age after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilization is uncertain due to a lack of evidence, but slaves appear in the Homeric epics of the eighth century BC (Garlan 1988: 32; Harris 2012), where slavery is a fate that can befall those defeated in battle, their wives and their children (Homer *Il.* 3.301). While slaves appear in the literature that survives from the Archaic and Classical periods, the limited discussion of slavery as an institution suggests an “unquestioning acceptance” of slavery by the ancient Greeks (Westermann 1955: 1). The similarly limited discussion of the metic status was no doubt too “a reflection of the very fact that they were both a familiar and necessary part of the population of Athens” (Akrigg 2015: 155).

While in the wake of Solon’s reforms an Athenian could no longer enslave another Athenian if they failed to settle their debt (Harris 2002b; Lewis 2018: 10, 120), non-Athenians in Athens or elsewhere were still vulnerable to enslavement. Slaves at Athens came to be, ideologically at least, exclusively alien, individuals uprooted from their homelands who were ethnically different from their Athenian masters, though metics could own slaves too (Braund 2011: 112; Bush 1996: 2; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 24). By the fifth century BC at least, potentially as a result of the Pan-Hellenic sentiments fostered by the Persian Wars, all Greeks, as opposed to just Athenians, were deemed too worthy to be enslaved, and servile status was now deemed suitable only for those the Athenians regarded as barbarians (Garlan 1988: 50; Hunt 2011: 36-37; Vlassopoulos 2013: 8). Ethnic groups whose members found their way to Athens as slaves included Carians, Illyrians, Lydians, Paphlagonians, Phrygians, Scythians, Syrians and Thracians (Braund 2011: 115-130; Garlan 1988: 46; Klees 1998: 52; Lewis 2011: 92; Lewis 2018: 170; Westermann 1955: 7). While the importance of Thrace and the Black Sea in the slave trade have been stressed, other regions were just as important in supplying Athens with slaves, the presence of ethnic names derived from these regions or foreign names from these regions attested in Athenian comedy and in inscriptions, including, of course, epitaphs and dedicatory inscriptions (Lewis 2011: 92, 93-98, 110). In practice, however, Greeks were still enslaved by other Greeks, and the Athenians themselves enslaved the Melians after they refused to join the Delian League (Thucydides 3.91; Braund 2011: 116; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 173).

The circumstances by which an individual became enslaved varied. They could be captured in war or while travelling and sold into slavery at slave markets (DuBois 2010: 55; Klees 1998: 20; Rihl 1996: 90; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 30). If either or both of their parents were slaves, then an individual was born into slavery (Lewis 2018: 43-44; Vlassopoulos 2015: 108). Though their parents may have been brought from abroad, second-generation and later slaves would have been born and raised in Athens, never setting foot in their ancestral land (Vlassopoulos 2015: 108). To what extent second-generation slaves represented a deliberate breeding strategy on the part of masters is debatable (Vlassopoulos 2015: 108-110). While the figure of 400,000 given by Athenaeus (272c-d) as the size of the slave population at the end of the fourth-century BC is either an exaggeration or an incorrect transcription, a total of around 100,000 slaves has been deemed plausible during the mid-fifth century BC at the height of Athens' prosperity, though estimates vary (Akrigg 2007; Akrigg 2011; Kamen 2013: 9; Lewis 2015: 105; Lewis 2018: 95; Sargent 1925: 126). This is still a large servile population that was maintained by both bringing slaves into Attica and by the already resident slaves having children.

Whether brought to Attica or born there, a slave was defined as the property of a free person and was "hence subject to use, disposal and sale" (Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 24; see also Fisher 1995: 45; Garland 1988: 40-41; Harris 2002b: 416; Harris 2012: 352-354; Kyrtatas 2011: 106; Lewis 2018: 25). At least legally, slaves exercised no control over their own bodies, their labour being at the disposal of their master (Demand 1998: 83; DuBois 2010: 3-4; Lewis 2018: 43; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 22-23). As slaves received no protection under Athenian law, a master had the right to physical punish a slave as they saw fit, though excessive violence towards slaves was not necessarily in a master's interest, as if a master harmed a slave to the point of making them unfit for work or even killed them, they would lose the capital the slave represented to them as the owner (Fisher 1995: 60, 65-66; Rihl 2011: 51-52). The law on hubris has been thought to cautioned against excessive violence towards slaves but the law "was designed to engender respect and orderly conduct among citizens, not to protect slaves" (Lewis 2018: 42-43). The law was concerned with citizen morality rather than slave wellbeing. A rare example of slave testimony in the form of a lead letter discovered in the agora evidences the brutal treatment of slaves (Harris 2006). In the letter, Lesis asks his mother and Xenocles, possibly his

mother's owner if she is still a slave or her *prostates* (see below) or husband – though not Lesis' father – if she is free, to intercede with his masters owing to his brutal treatment at the hands of the foundry owner he has been leased or apprenticed to (Harris 2006: 271, 276). Female slaves additionally had to fear the sexual advances of their masters, for as their property they could not refuse them (Klees 1998: 161; Lewis 2018: 41). Xenophon describes the master's right in his *Oeconomicus* (10:12);

Besides, when a wife's looks outshine a maid's and she is fresher and more becomingly dressed, they're a ravishing sight, especially when the wife is also willing to oblige, whereas the girl's services are compulsory.

Even if a slave did not fear violence and sexual exploitation at the hands of their master, they might fear being tortured (*basanos*) as part of judicial proceedings (DuBois 2010: 3, 87; Lewis 2018: 45; Mirhady 2000; Vlassopoulos 2009: 348). Slaves were tortured, or threatened with tortured as Thür (1977) argues that threatening to torture slaves was done to embarrass the opponent and no longer practised, because it was believed that only then would they offer up true testimony (Lewis 2018: 45-46; Mirhady 2000: 72). As their slave was their property however, a master had to give permission for his slave to be tortured, which he may not have wanted to grant as his slave, working for him and likely living with him, might possess knowledge that could incriminate him (Lewis 2018: 45).

The situations of individual slaves and their relationships with their masters varied. Some slaves lived apart from their masters and enjoyed more personal freedom on a day-to-day basis even though they were not legally free (Fisher 2008; Lewis 2018: 43). Such slaves could have their own families and were permitted to keep a portion of what they earned (*apophora*) and in some cases even 'own' their own slaves, though of course any such property they had was not legally theirs but their masters and rather they were allowed the appearance of control over such property by their master (Lewis 2018: 43-44). This control of some of their earnings allowed them to participate in the commemorative landscape. Some of the fourth-century BC funerary monuments considered in **Chapter IV** appear to depict such independent

slave families, though they should not be regarded as the only slaves capable of participating in or represented in the commemorative landscape. Many slave women were used as nurses and the nature of their work presumably meant they lived in their masters' households or at least had an association with the master's household, yet nurses are found represented in the cemeteries of Attica (see **IV.2.1.3** and **IV.4.2.1** in particular) and among groups of worshippers in votive reliefs (see **V.2**; see Schulze 1998), much like seemingly more independent slaves participated in the commemorative landscape.

Figure 2.1 Map of Attica. After I. Gelbrich in Hurwit, J.M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Much of Attica's slave population was concentrated in the Lavreotiki region of south-east Attica (see **Figure 2.1**), where they laboured in the region's silver mines, one of the sources of Athens' wealth in the Archaic and Classical periods (Morris 2011: 179). At least some of the slaves resident in the Lavreotiki region, however, must have experienced some level of autonomy and controlled some of their earnings, attested by dedications found in the region (see **V.1**).

Despite having no legal protection and being unable to participate in politics, slaves did have access to the commemorative landscape. Whether living with their master or separately, however, slaves must always have enjoyed this access, as well as any other personal freedoms, in a context of vulnerability. As property, a slave could be sold in the event of their master's death, as part of the settling of a debt, or in the event of their master's property being confiscated (Harris 2002b: 416; Lewis 2018: 25). Though a slave may have built up a good relationship with their master that may have permitted them to have their own family, retain some of their earnings, and commemorate themselves and that family using those earnings, in the event of the transference of their ownership they were not guaranteed the same relationship with a new master. The right to retain part of their earnings and anything that enabled them to do was "a de facto arrangement at the discretion of the owner, and did not grant the slave any right to the remainder" (Lewis 2018: 43).

The development of defined citizen and slave statuses was well under way prior to the institution of democracy at Athens in 508/7 BC. Citizens were the legitimate sons of at least one Athenian parent, and from the early sixth century BC Athenians could not be enslaved, at least at home in peace time. Slaves in Attica came to be, ideologically, exclusively foreign. Despite such defined legal statuses developed over centuries, however, the variety of slave experience in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC varied significantly. The same can be said of Attica's large free foreign population that lacked an official designation until after 508/7 BC: metics.

II.2 Legal Statuses under the Democracy: Citizens and Metics

After the reforms of Solon, Athens became a tyranny under Pisistratus and his sons Hipparchus and Hippias, ending with Hipparchus' assassination in 514 BC and

Hippias being deposed and exiled in 510 BC (Martin 1996: 86-87). In the aftermath, Kleisthenes established democracy at Athens in 508/7 BC, extending the right of political participation to all adult male citizens (Lape 2010: 14-17; Martin 1996: 87-88). With the extension of full citizen rights and privileges to all Athenian men, citizenship became evermore worthy of guarding from outsiders in the bid to create a cohesive identity, the creation of the metic status being regarded as part of that defence (Patterson 2007: 163; Rihll 2011: 59). The metic status finally classified in law those residents who could not be designated either citizen or slave and ensured citizenship remained “the family privilege of those born into it” (Patterson 2007: 163).

The metic status, *metic* literally meaning home-changer (Whitehead 1977: 6), was a free status assigned to those foreigners who came to settle in Attica and to slaves who had been manumitted (Burford 1972: 47; Kamen 2013: 43; Whitehead 1977: 3, 16; Wijma 2014: 27-28; Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 4-5). While the exact date of the codification of the metic status is uncertain, it must have taken place by the 460s BC at the latest, when a decree of the deme *Skambonidai* on the stipulations of metic religious participation was published (*IG I² 188. 53 = IG I³ 244*; Baba 1984: 4; Whitehead 1977: 145; Wijma 2014: 33, 43). Those residents designated *metic* included not only freeborn and manumitted alike, but also Greek and non-Greek, men and women, rich and poor (Akrigg 2015: 162; Taylor and Vlassopoulos 2015: 26). While this thesis will show that despite their different legal statuses, citizens and non-citizens shared experiences that contributed to the creation of a shared iconography across the commemorative landscape, it must also be acknowledged that legal statuses masked differences as well, as “the polis ignored... the utter heterogeneity of these *metoikoi* in every possible respect” (Whitehead 1977: 18).

The size of the *metic* population at any one point in the fifth- or fourth-century BC can only be roughly estimated, as is the case with any other component of the Attic population. Recently, Ben Akrigg (2015: 158) has suggested that the *metic* population may have constituted one third to one half of the free population, the remainder of the free population of course being citizens. Mogens Hansen (1985) placed the total citizen population – men, women and children – prior to the Peloponnesian War at 60,000, a figure that Akrigg (2011: 57) suggests should be

regarded as a minimum estimate. Based on this citizen estimate, then, the metic population in the fifth century BC would have been at least 20,000. Edward Harris (2002a: 70) estimates that 19,000-20,000 metic men worked in crafts and if so the total metic population must have been even higher than 20,000. As has been mentioned, the metic population would have included freeborn and manumitted individuals alike, but most are regarded as “economic migrants” who, once settled in Athens, were subject to a series of obligations (Akrigg 2015: 158).

Metics were required by law to pay the *metoikon* tax, set at 12 drachmas a year for metic men and their dependents and half that sum for single metic women (Kennedy 2014: 2; Patterson 2000: 95; Whitehead 1977: 7, 11, 75). The exceptions were those metics granted *ateleia*, tax exemption, or the status of *isotelês*, a tax-exempt privileged metic status that made the bearer equal to citizens with regard to financial obligations (Whitehead 1977: 7, 11, 75). While no fifth- or fourth-century BC definition of the metic status survives, the later third to second century BC testimony of Aristophanes of Byzantium describes payment of the *metoikon* as a defining feature of the status,

A metic is anyone who comes from a foreign (city) and lives in the city, paying tax toward certain fixed needs of the city. For so many days he is called a *parepidemos* and is free from tax, but if he outstays the specified time he becomes a *metoikos* and liable to tax (Ar. Byz. fr.38, translation from Whitehead 1977: 7).

In addition to paying the *metoikon*, a metic was required to have a *prostates*, a citizen guarantor, whose main role seems to have been to represent their metic client in court should the occasion arise (Aristotle *Pol.* 1275a1-14; Patterson 2000: 95; Whitehead 1977: 90). Other details of the *metic-prostates* relationship are unclear, and evidence is lacking regarding how a particular *prostates* was assigned to a particular metic, except in the case of manumitted slaves who became metics, their former master becoming their *prostates* (Whitehead 1977: 90).

A metic could be brought to trial for crimes a citizen could commit, an obvious example being murder, but a metic could also be tried for crimes not applicable to

citizens, including non-payment of the *metoikon* and not having a *prostates* (Hunter 2000: 16; Pattson 2000: 97-98; Rihll 2011: 59-60). Metics were brought to trial in a separate court from citizens, though the jury may still have been composed of citizens (Kamen 2013). It is not known if metics were normally under threat of torture as part of legal proceedings as slaves were (Hunter 2000: 17 n.30), but Demosthenes (18.132-133) describes how Antiphon when apprehended was put on the rack before being executed for his crimes. If a metic was found guilty either of non-payment of the *metoikon* or not having a *prostates* the punishment was being sold into slavery (Hunter 2000: 16; Patterson 2000: 97-98; Rihll 2011: 59-60). The severity of the punishment for these crimes was no doubt directly related to the fact that the *metoikon* and a *prostates* served to identify metics as such (Hunter 2000: 16-17; Patterson 2000: 97-98; Whitehead 1977: 76). Failure to perform these duties could be construed as an attempt to falsely present oneself as a citizen (Hunter 2000: 16-17; Patterson 2000: 97-98; Whitehead 1977: 76).

Despite certain imperative performances of their status, however, the experience of some metics would have been more in line with that of rich citizens than other metics. The *eisphorai* and liturgies were obligations placed on wealthy citizens and metics alike, a shared expectation grounded not in their legal status but in their socio-economic status (Kamen 2013: 57; Niku 2004: 86; Whitehead 78-82; Wijma 2014: 74-75). The *eisphorai* was a tax on the property of Attica's free residents based on the total worth of their property, and while a metic's status usually prevented them from owning land they must have been able to amass enough property in other forms to qualify for the tax (Kamen 2013: 57; Whitehead 1977: 78). Liturgies were acts of public spending by the wealthy men of Athens, and could be divided into two types; *trierarchia* for the navy; *choregia* for staging one of Athens' many annual festivals (Whitehead 1977: 80-82). Surviving epigraphic and literary evidence show that, at least at the Lenaia, metics served as *choregoi* (Lysias 12.20; *SEG* 32.239.3; Wijma 2014: 70) but there is no evidence for metics ever serving as *trierarchoi* (Whitehead 1977: 81). Performing a liturgy conferred honour on the benefactor (Manville 1990: 22-23), and while metic performance of liturgies appears to have been restricted to *choregia*, and then only at certain festivals, the performance still constituted a shared experience between wealthy metic men and wealthy citizen men.

While certain metics shared in the privileges of certain citizens, most citizens and metics would have had to work for a living. Being prohibited from owning land, most metics would have found employment in non-agrarian sectors of the economy (E. Harris 2002a: 70). Many would have been craftsmen, some working as sculptors and no doubt responsible for many of the funerary, votive and decree reliefs that adorned the Attic landscape. While the ideal citizen male would either not have to work himself, giving him time to exercise his body and mind, or if he did have to work would own and work his own land, many citizens would have, like metics, not owned their own land and instead worked in crafts (E.E. Cohen 2002: 102; E. Harris 2002a: 70). The building accounts for the Erechtheion not only attest to citizens and metics – and slaves – working within the same sectors, but working alongside each other on the same projects (*IG I³ 474-476*; E. Harris 2002: 70; Randall 1953: 200).

Being barred from owning their own land, then, influenced metic employment opportunities and by association the distribution of the metic population across Attica. Most metics would live in the urban demes, working in crafts but also in trade and retail. Only with a grant of *enktesis* could a metic own land (Kamen 2013: 46, 55-57; Whitehead 1977: 12). That said, metics – and slaves – had access to burial plots in Attica's cemeteries, and while Ursula Knigge (1991:121) characterises many of the metics and foreigners buried in the Kerameikos as “privileged foreigners in Athens, not subject to the laws regulating the lives of metics,” it seems unlikely that every metic needed a grant of *enktesis* to secure proper burial. Only 173 non-citizens – or potential non-citizens – are represented by sculpted funerary monuments in **Chapter IV** of this thesis, but there are many others represented by surviving funerary inscriptions that were not part of a sculpted memorial (Meyer 1993). Equally there will have been many metics and slaves – and citizens – whose memorials are now lost or else never had such a permanent memorial. Based on metic and slave population estimates hundreds of thousands of non-citizens would have been in need of burial over the course of the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC.

Service in the Athenian army or navy was a duty shared by citizen and metic men regardless of their wealth, though their wealth determined their rank (Cohen 2000: 18-19; Kamen 2013: 53; Manville 1990: 11; Niku 2004: 86; Whitehead 1977: 82-86). While men were segregated according to their legal status and wealth, and

citizens and metics were arranged into separate orders of cavalry, hoplites and light-armed troops, army service still represented a shared citizen and non-citizen experience, and one that found representation in the commemorative landscape (see **Chapter IV.4.1.5**; Whitehead 1977: 82). The earliest evidence for metics serving in the army comes from Thucydides (2.13.7, 2.31.1-2), showing that metics fought in the battles of the Peloponnesian War, though Whitehead (1977: 82) argues that “there is no indication that this was anything other than the standard practice by then.” The Athenian state did not allow metics to be members of the political community yet still required them to perform military service. Metics of course had a vested interest in the defence of the city, for any metic had “a natural and common interest in repulsing a threat to his livelihood” (Whitehead 1977: 84).

Payment of the *eisphorai*, performance of liturgies and military service were all obligations expected of metic men and invite little discussion of metic women. That the *metoikon* had a separate tier of payment of six drachmas for single metic women demonstrates that some metic women lived independently and worked for a living themselves rather than being a dependent wife (Kennedy 2014: 2; Patterson 2000: 95). Through earning their own money, such women would have had access to the commemorative landscape in their own right rather than through their husbands or other male relatives, as may have more often been the case for citizen women. Of course, many metic women would have been the wives of metic men, and prior to Pericles’ Citizenship Law in 451/0 BC, even the wives of citizen men (Kennedy 2014: 12-22).

During the Archaic period, foreign wives had been desirable among the Athenian aristocracy, allowing them to forge links with families in other *poleis* (Patterson 1981: 3, 99). With the coming of democracy, this kind of personal foreign policy was regarded as a threat to the *demos*, the worry being that wealthy citizen men would honour foreign ties over their native Athenian ones (Humphreys 1993: 24; Kennedy 2014: 14). The practice, however, was not penalised until 451/0 BC, still giving metic women the opportunity to marry into the Athenian citizen body, as “the identity of the son’s mother would usually have been of less interest than that of his father” (Patterson 1981: 11; though again on the reliability of the evidence for the Citizenship Law see Haake 2013). With the passage of the Citizenship Law in 451/0

BC, however, metic women must have very quickly become undesirable marriage partners, as any children born of such a union would not qualify as citizens (Kennedy 2014: 14; Patterson 1981: 3). From this point on, a citizen was the child of both an Athenian father and an Athenian mother (Kennedy 2014: 14). Whether the Citizenship Law was a direct attack on aristocratic foreign marriages or had some other motivation, the effect was that metic women now had no chance of gaining entry into the citizen body, except when the law was temporarily relaxed during the Peloponnesian War to boost citizen numbers after the devastations of war and plague (Kennedy 2014: 17). In the fourth-century BC, not only was the law reinstated but now mixed marriages were not just undesirable because they would fail to produce citizen children, they were actually illegal (Kennedy 2014: 16). This is apparent in the trial of Neaira in the 340s BC (Dem. 59). While rare, metic men still had the opportunity to be granted citizenship for some service done for Athens, but this was not an option for metic women, unless her husband's grant extended to her and her children (Kennedy 2014: 2; Patterson 2007: 164). Even manumitted male slaves could, again rarely, be granted citizenship, as in the famous case of the slave-banker Pasion (Dem 36.43-44).

Lack of citizenship and limited opportunities to become citizens, however, did not prevent metic men and women, or male and female slaves, having access to the commemorative landscapes (Hochscheid 2015: 290). Neither lack of citizenship – though as will be seen some were granted citizenship – nor residence prevented other foreigners from gaining representation in the commemorative landscape through the honorific nature of foreign relations.

II.3 Athenian Foreign Relations

Just as legal statuses developed within Athens from the rise of the *polis* into the fourth-century BC and beyond, so too did the conduct of foreign relations. With the shift from aristocratic factions and tyranny to democracy, foreign relations, at least on the Athenian side, came to be about the whole state rather than individuals or families. Contracting foreign marriages to ensure advantageous personal connections abroad in the event of personal trouble at home in Athens was no longer an appropriate means of conducting foreign policy, favouring as it did wealthy

individuals and families and their interests over those of the whole Athenian community (Herman 1987: 3-4). Despite the shift from personal to state interests in Athenian foreign relations, the basis of relations was still reciprocity, with personal strategies developed to fit the needs of the state, and foreign individuals still relied upon to entreat on the behalf of Athens with their own state. These foreign individuals were rewarded for their efforts, their service and subsequent rewards earning them representation in the commemorative landscape in the form of decrees, some with reliefs and hence lending an iconographic dimension to their representation that will be the subject of **Chapter VI**.

While in the Classical period, and particularly the time of empire during the fifth century BC, Athens was one of the most powerful *poleis* in the Greek world, even this powerful *polis* had to operate within a system of shared conventions and honours when it came to foreign relations (Low 2007: 39). Diplomatic relations in the Greek world were often conducted or facilitated by individuals, hence the number of decree reliefs honouring individuals rather than all decrees relating to foreign relations being alliances (Adcock and Mosley 1975: 152). Individuals working in the service of another state were seeking *philotomia*. Hagemajer Allen (2003b: 203) argues that for non-Greeks in particular a favourable connection to Athens was a sure way to earn a “badge of Hellenism,” allies’ and benefactors’ pursuit of which Athens used to advantage, bestowing badges of honour for arguably more tangible benefits in return.

While there might be a perceived imbalance, then, diplomatic relations between Athens and foreign states or individuals was always based on reciprocity. An individual or state would perform some service for Athens, for example military assistance or establishing or maintaining trade links, and in return they could anticipate rewards. An individual might be made *proxenos* in return for their services, as is evidenced by a number of the collected decorated decree reliefs, a position recognised and bestowed across the Greek World (Mack 2015). The bestowal of the title of *proxenos* dates back the seventh century BC (Gerolymatos 1986: 7; Herman 1987: 132; Walbank 1978: 4). Though the title was awarded in recognition of services rendered, what came with it was the expectation of future service to the state that granted it (Gerolymatos 1986: 4-6, 8-12, 19; Herman 1987:

135). The role was unpaid and might place an individual's loyalty to their own *polis* in doubt (Adcock and Mosley 1975: 155-160; Gerolymatos 1986: 95, 102). The road to honour – *philotomia* – could be expensive and dangerous.

Athens' foreign benefactors could be granted other honours in place of or alongside the title of *proxenos*. Individuals were rewarded with crowns, protection (*asyllia*), tax exemption (*ateleia*), the right to own land (*enktesis*) and even Athenian citizenship (Engen 2010: 182-213; Walbank 1978: 5-7). Honorands often dedicated the crowns they were awarded to Athena, and grants of tax exemption, land ownership and citizenship, while tangible benefits, were only tangible if the honorand took up residence in Attica (Hagemajer Allen 2003b: 234). Such grants were given to men who were dignitaries or royalty in their own land. They would only relocate to Athens and make use of these grants if they were threatened or forced out of their own lands, as happened to Arybbas the Molossian king (**DR 44**; Lawton 1995: 134; M. Osborne 1982: 81-83). Though some foreign honorands were granted citizenship, then, it is not necessary to exclude them from this study of non-citizen commemoration. Excepting Arybbas (**DR 44**), the citizenship granted to foreigners was symbolic rather than an active, performed citizenship. Foreigners who gained representation in the commemorative landscape through decrees did so precisely because of their non-Athenian status, because of their positions of power and influence abroad, compared to metics and slaves who were arguably allowed to represent themselves in the sanctuaries and cemeteries of Attica in spite of their legal status.

With the defeat at the battle of Chaeronea in 338 BC, Athens came under Macedonian control and was no longer in control of its own foreign policy. As a result decrees commemorating alliances or honouring foreigners ceased to be erected around the end of the fourth-century BC. Not only did Macedonian hegemony affect Athens' conduct with the wider Greek world, it also affected affairs within Athens' own borders. With Macedonian control of taxation and the military, the metic status, defined as it was by, along with other obligations, the *metoikon* and military service, ceased to exist by the end of the third century BC (Niku 2004: 90). This thesis, then,

is considering the relationships between legal status and iconography both at the height of Athens' power and influence in the wider Greek world and at the time of most stringent distinction between its citizen and non-citizen population. Legal status, however, was not always instantly recognisable, owing to shared identities brought about and perpetuated by 'free spaces.'

III: ‘Free Spaces’: Framing Non-Citizen Commemoration

In the previous chapter the obligations, restrictions and inherent vulnerabilities of the metic and slave statuses that defined non-citizens resident within Attica have been explored, along with the system of agreements and honours that facilitated and maintained relationships between Athens and foreign communities. Also in the previous chapter, however, the similarities between citizen, metic and slave experience, or at least between the experience of some citizens, metics and slaves, have already begun to be explored. For while the Athenian state sought to define and therefore distinguish residents through legal statuses, residents of all three statuses lived and worked alongside each other, and consequently their day-to-day lives would have resembled each other. The capacity to earn, save and spend money in order to commemorate and dedicate represents one such similarity.

Epigraphic evidence demonstrates clearly that non-citizens had access to the commemorative landscape. This thesis explores non-citizen representation within the commemorative landscape. As will be shown, the iconography of non-citizen funerary monuments, votives and decree reliefs was not, in most instances, distinct from that of identifiable examples of citizen commemoration. Instead of explaining away such similarity as passive copying by metics and slaves of a dominant citizen iconography not intended for them, this thesis argues that such a shared iconography was the outcome of shared experience and shared space, shared iconography in turn begetting shared experience and characterising shared spaces. Shared iconography was the result of ‘free spaces’ in fifth- and fourth-century BC Attica.

This chapter will introduce and adapt the ‘free spaces’ paradigm as a framework for understanding non-citizen iconographic representation in the commemorative landscape. It will begin by giving Vlassopoulos’ (2007: 33-52) definition of ‘free spaces’ and his application of the paradigm to the agora. This will be followed by how the ‘free spaces’ paradigm is developed in this thesis, along with some criticism of the paradigm, and its application to the sanctuaries and cemeteries and the iconography present in these spaces.

III.1 Vlassopoulos' 'Free Spaces' Paradigm and the Agora

The 'free spaces' paradigm was adapted for the interpretation of Athenian society in the Classical period by Kostas Vlassopoulos (2007: 33-52) in an article of the same name from a volume by Sara Evans and Harry Boyte (1986) entitled *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America*. As the title suggests, the paradigm was originally constructed to study modern American political history, asking in what public spaces did citizens of different backgrounds or means come together to participate in democracy. In its application to Athens, Vlassopoulos (2007: 38) is using the 'free spaces' paradigm to consider interactions between citizens and non-citizens. Vlassopoulos (2007: 38) defines 'free spaces' as "spaces that brought together citizens, metics, slaves and women, created common experiences and interactions, and shaped new forms of identity." While only citizen men had the right to formally participate in politics in Classical Athens, Vlassopoulos (2007: 42) argues that interactions within 'free spaces' that led to shared identities created the opportunity for non-citizens to participate in and influence politics indirectly. The space Vlassopoulos (2007: 38) chooses to apply the 'free spaces' paradigm to within Athens is the agora.

III.1.1 The Agora

In the ancient Greek world, the agora was often a multifunctional space, and this was certainly true of the Athenian agora. The multifaceted nature of the Athenian agora is captured by Paul Millett (1998: 215) as;

...the setting for administration, publicity, justice, ostracism, imprisonment, religion, processions, dancing, athletics and equestrian displays. In addition to persons passing through, individuals might gather there to get information, gather a crowd, gamble, torture a slave, get hired as labourers, bid for contracts, accost a prostitute, seek asylum, have a haircut, beg for money or food, fetch water, watch a cock-fight and find out the time... All going on all around was the business of buying and selling... there was the unavoidable mingling of types of people.

Citizens, metics and slaves, both male and female, would all have been engaged in many of these activities, as Millett (1998: 215) states “there was the unavoidable mingling of types of people.” While in certain scenarios, for example the torturing of a slave, legal distinctions would have been made very apparent, in many of the situations arising in the agora similarities must have masked legal status. Trying to ascertain an individual’s legal status in an environment like the agora was no easy task, as the Old Oligarch (Ps. Xen. *Const. Pol.* 1.10) complained;

Now among the slaves and metics at Athens there is the greatest uncontrolled wantonness; you can't hit them there, and a slave will not stand aside for you. I shall point out why this is their native practice: if it were customary for a slave (or metic or freedman) to be struck by one who is free, you would often hit an Athenian citizen by mistake on the assumption that he was a slave. For the people there are no better dressed than the slaves and metics, nor are they any more handsome.

The agora’s designation as a ‘free space,’ then, lies not only in that it was a space frequented by citizens, metics, slaves and women, but that their legal statuses were so often indistinguishable. Everyone would have been able to participate freely in a great many of the activities going on simultaneously in this space, and it would have been difficult for anyone to single out and exclude others on the basis of their status. In terms of the commemorative landscape, it is generally difficult to distinguish between the funerary monuments and votives of citizens, metics and slaves, surviving epigraphic evidence being necessary to know the status of the deceased or dedicator definitively, as already set out in **Chapter I**. The differing status of individuals within the same individual relief, however, is communicated through certain iconographic markers that only serve to differentiate status when juxtaposed so closely. The main iconographic trope for achieving this, comparative size of individuals, has no basis in reality.

In his article, Vlassopoulos (2007: 39-47) focuses on the agora as a setting for political discussion and discourse. He argues that as “the political space of the agora

was not restricted to Athenian citizens... it is difficult to see how a political discussion that took place in the agora, involving poor citizen artisans, shopkeepers, labourers, would exclude all those other people present” (Vlassopoulos 2007: 42). Vlassopoulos (2007: 39) highlights the two approaches to the study of Athenian democracy, the top-down institutional approach and the discourse approach. In his application of the ‘free spaces’ paradigm, Vlassopoulos (2007: 42) is not only furthering the discourse approach, but he is assigning greater agency in political decision making to poor citizens and even to non-citizens. Furthermore, he argues that the opportunity for non-citizens to participate indirectly in politics, and perhaps even directly if they felt they could get away with it, was not only down to spaces like the agora that allowed for the mixing of activities and people, but also symptomatic of “the peculiar nature of Athenian democracy” (Vlassopoulos 2007: 47).

Athens was not unique in being a democracy in the Classical period, but it was unique in its extension of the franchise to all citizen men irrespective of their wealth and landholdings. For Vlassopoulos (2007: 47-50), it is the inclusion of artisans, traders and wage labourers in the citizen body that in particular facilitated ‘free spaces’ and within them the blurring of identities and the creation of new ones. If residents employed as such had been denied citizenship, or the full rights of citizenship, then distinguishing between citizens and non-citizens would not have presented the challenge described by the Old Oligarch (*Ps. Xen. Const. Pol.* 1.10). The inclusion of artisans, traders and wage labours within the citizen body meant that many of those within it and many of those excluded from it had a lot in common. For Vlassopoulos (2007: 42) this means that new shared social identities fostered through the ‘free space’ of the agora enabled indirect political participation.

In considering shared access to commemorative spaces, and a shared repertoire of representation within those spaces, this thesis takes an even broader look at shared citizen, metic and slave experience. In doing so, it is considering not just what might be described as a collective ‘working class’ of citizens, metics and slaves, but the experience and representation of any metics and slaves identifiable in the commemorative landscape and how their representation compared to that of citizens.

III.2 Critiquing and Developing ‘Free Spaces’

The idea of ‘free spaces’ as spaces that brought people of different legal statuses together is not taken issue with, in fact it is welcomed. The literary evidence, whether the fact of such mixing is regarded as for good or ill, speaks for itself in showing that the agora was a ‘free space’ based on this definition (Vlassopoulos 2007: 38; such mixing is also acknowledged by Millett 1998: 215 who is quoted above). This thesis seeks to categorise other spaces in Classical Athens as ‘free spaces’ on the basis of epigraphic and iconographic evidence. The term ‘free spaces,’ however, is somewhat of a misnomer, as while residents and visitors of various statuses could frequent the spaces of the agora, cemeteries and sanctuaries, those spaces did not exist outside of the framework of Athenian laws and customs, and as such no one, including citizens, was free to do exactly as they pleased without consequence, and as such no space was inherently free.

Numerous laws and officials governed activities in the agora and those laws might punish a wrongdoer differently depending on his status. For example, a law found in the agora excavations orders that silver coinage be tested daily by a tester who sits in the agora and that any seller who refuses to accept coinage verified by the tester will have his or her merchandise for that day confiscated but that if the denouncer is a slave they will receive 50 lashes, as well as presumably also having their merchandise confiscated (Stroud 1974: 159, 178, 181). Ronald Stroud (1974: 182-183) does not find the differing punish for free persons and slaves remarkable but does find the fact that there is no mention of the slaves’ masters in the law and that the slaves appear to be considered individually responsible noteworthy, for, as highlighted in the last chapter, slaves were the property of their masters and they were responsible for them. Stroud (1974: 182-183) concludes that a lack of reference to their masters in the law is “to be explained by the fact that the law prescribes no fines to be levied against those convicted.” A slave who had committed an offence could be beaten by those against who they had transgressed. While citizens, metics and slaves were involved in commerce in the agora, making it difficult to distinguish between them, in the event of such a dispute a person’s status as slave or free would be made apparent through the performance of their punishment.

‘Free spaces’ as a way of thinking about spaces in Classical Athens, or indeed elsewhere, are useful to archaeologists and historians alike and that usefulness should not be dismissed. Perhaps, however, the paradigm should be rebranded as ‘open spaces’ or ‘accessible spaces,’ therefore still acknowledging the use of such spaces by different people of different statuses whilst mitigating any misconceptions that these spaces existed outside a framework of law and order. It should be remembered, however, that Vlassopoulos adapted the ‘free spaces’ paradigm from the work of Evans and Boyte who were concerned with American democracy, participants in their spaces all being of the same legal status, American citizens, but of different socio-economic status. Like Classical Athens, however, spaces in 20th century America that facilitate political discourse and brought people together did not exist outside of a framework of laws. Therefore, if the name of the paradigm is misleading, then this criticism can be levelled at Evans and Boyte as readily as at Vlassopoulos (2007). As long as the researcher bears in mind that legal distinctions and their vulnerabilities could be thrown up at any time and that no space was inherently free, the ‘free spaces’ paradigm is useful for thinking about citizen and non-citizen relationships and this thesis shows that it can be used in conjunction with a variety of evidence. For the sake of continuity in this thesis, the cemeteries and sanctuaries as spaces that brought together citizens and non-citizens will continue to be referred to as ‘free spaces’ but for themselves the reader may wish to think of them as ‘open spaces’ or ‘accessible spaces.’

There is scope to apply the ‘free spaces’ paradigm to other spaces in fifth- and fourth-century BC Attica, as this thesis is, and Vlassopoulos (2007: 52) himself ends his article by suggesting other spaces that might be explored and interpreted as ‘free spaces’: “the workshop, the tavern, the ship, the neighbourhood, and the cemetery.” This thesis explores the last of these suggestions, the cemetery, but also a type of space Vlassopoulos does not consider, the sanctuary.

In applying ‘free spaces’ to the sanctuaries there needs to be some consideration as to why Vlassopoulos himself appears not to consider them as potential ‘free spaces.’ Although participation in the many festivals of the Athenian religious calendar was defined by the participant’s legal status, leaving little room for the blurring of identities, they were certainly occasions that brought residents of diverse status, and

sometimes even non-residents, together. By Vlassopoulos' (2007: 38) definition, to qualify as a 'free space' sanctuaries need to bring people together and create new forms of identity, which consequently blur their legal identities. Festivals may not have always blurred legal identities but they certainly brought people together and promoted a common identity as worshippers of the same pantheon, a pantheon that continually expanded to include the gods of foreign residents and allies.

Furthermore, like the agora sanctuaries were multifunctional spaces and, as has been demonstrated, even in the agora status distinctions could be thrown into sharp relief. Worship took many forms at the communal, family and individual level, and as well as being places of worship sanctuaries were also places for display. For the purposes of this thesis such display includes religious dedications and decree reliefs, but there were other monuments erected in sanctuaries, such as those to commemorate military victories or other events. Commemoration displayed at sanctuaries would have been made by, for and consumed by citizens, metics, slaves, foreigners, men and women. The ability to erect certain types of commemoration may have been limited by an individual's legal status or position, i.e. decree reliefs (see **Chapter VI**), but access to view these monuments, to consume all the iconography and epigraphy present in these spaces, discuss it with contemporaries, and draw from it for future commemoration, was available to anyone. Provided it was not a type of state-endorsed commemoration and provided they had funds available, anyone could add to the commemorative landscape of the sanctuaries. There is enough here to warrant the designation of sanctuaries as 'free spaces' but they will be returned to shortly.

The role of commemoration in the consideration of the sanctuaries as 'free spaces' brings this discussion back to the agora. Much of the activity in the agora as described by Millett (1998) and Vlassopoulos (2007) allows for the blurring of identities but the agora was also a venue for commemoration. No doubt the consumers of such commemoration were mixed just as they were for monuments erected in the sanctuaries. In the years after the Peloponnesian War, however, the commemoration erected in the agora came to be concerned exclusively with the democracy (Liddel 2003; Shear 2007). This meant decrees concerned with the affairs and decisions of the democracy. Those decrees commemorating alliances and honouring foreigners were erected on the acropolis. Non-citizens and foreigners

were not the recipients of commemoration in the agora. They could not add to the commemorative landscape as they could in the sanctuaries and, as will be discussed, the cemeteries, although they could still consume such commemoration, which they may have felt spoke to them even if this was not the intention of the Athenian state. Such decrees may well have aided the political discussions Vlassopoulos (2007: 42) envisioned metics, slaves and women contributing to.

Like the sanctuaries, then, there were aspects and uses of the agora that excluded non-citizens or defined them as non-citizens rather than allowing them to blend in. Many spaces in fifth- and fourth-century BC Attica can be defined as ‘free spaces’ but they were not necessarily ‘free spaces’ all the time. There is a time aspect as well as the physical space that arguably Vlassopoulos does not have room to explore in what is a relatively short article, and perhaps this is why he does not consider sanctuaries as potential ‘free spaces.’

Part of developing the ‘free spaces’ paradigm, then, has been to add to the list of spaces that can be considered ‘free spaces’ and suggest that a ‘free space’ need not, and probably cannot, be considered free all the time. In this way, this thesis adds to the paradigm conceptually. In its application of the paradigm, this thesis not only responds to Vlassopoulos’ (2007: 52) call to explore other spaces, but also expands the types of evidence that ‘free spaces’ is used in conjunction with. In his exploration of the agora Vlassopoulos draws on the law court speeches, plays and political treatises of the fifth- and fourth-century BC to illustrate its designation as a ‘free space.’ In considering funerary monuments, votives and decree reliefs, this thesis is using ‘free spaces’ in conjunction with iconographic and epigraphic evidence, demonstrating the paradigm’s versatility and capacity to convey direct experiences of spaces in a way that the textual record cannot.

III.3 Sanctuaries and Non-Citizen Religious Participation

Religion permeated all aspects of Athenian society and not all acts of worship took place within the sanctuaries (Kindt 2009: 12). The sanctuaries were, however, venues for erecting two of the types of commemoration considered in this thesis: dedications and decrees. Dedicating a votive was obviously a religious act, but the

alliance and honorary decrees erected primarily on the Acropolis were also imbued with religious significance. Analysis of the iconography of their reliefs in **Chapter VI** will demonstrate this. Though taking place away from the sanctuaries in the cemeteries, the commemoration of the dead, while important for other reasons, did hold religious significance too, with the dead maintaining a presence in the Athenian religious calendar long after the initial commemoration of their passing (Sourvinou-Inwood 1995b: 117).

As discussed above, while Vlassopoulos (2007: 38, 52) does not include sanctuaries in his list of spaces that might be considered ‘free spaces,’ there is a case for their interpretation as such. Citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners shared a common identity as mortal worshippers seeking divine favour. It was in the interests of the entire community to allow all residents and visitors to participate in religious life, to maintain both accord within the community but also accord with the gods. Legal status did dictate if and how worshippers participated in certain festivals, but legal status was not the only identity important in determining participation (Kindt 2012: 67; Pedley 2005: 10; Sourvinou-Inwood 2000a: 13; Sourvinou-Inwood 2000b: 48). Other identities, such as age or gender, determined participation in some rites and festivals, identities that citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners shared. Certain rites, like the Eleusinian Mysteries were only for the initiated, with severe punishment for those uninitiated who tried to partake in the rites, though Athenian citizenship was not a prerequisite for initiation (Livy 31.14.6-12). Making a dedication, like so many other acts of worship, could be a communal or individual undertaking, but either way it was a form of worship and commemoration open to citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners (Kindt 2015: 39).

In this section on the sanctuaries there will be some consideration of non-citizen participation in Athenian festivals before turning to consider dedications as examples of non-citizens participating in the commemorative landscape. This consideration of non-citizen participation in festivals serves to contextualise dedications within the broader framework of *polis* religion and show how access to and participation within religion differed according to the particular act of worship and the scale of worship. Juxtaposition of festivals and dedications provides a more balanced view of non-citizen inclusion within Athenian religion, for while this thesis seeks to demonstrate

more agency on the part of non-citizens and explore identities that transcended legal statuses, it is evident that legal statuses did define certain religious participation.

III.3.1 Non-Citizen Participation in Athenian Festivals

There is neither need nor room in this thesis to consider all the festivals celebrated at Athens. Taking just two festivals as examples, the Panathenaia and the Bendideia, serves to demonstrate how non-citizens were included in Athenian religious festivals but also how their presence and Athens' affairs in the wider Greek world influenced and added to the Athenian religious calendar.

Held every summer, with the Greater Panathenaia every fourth year, the Panathenaia brought together the residents of Attica, as well as foreign visitors, to worship Athena in her guise as Athens' patron deity, Athena Polias (Deacy 2010: 229-230; Evans 2010: 50; Pedley 2005: 202; Wijma 2014: 40). While the festivities included athletic and musical contests, the main event was a procession from the Dipylon Gate to the Acropolis, culminating in the sacrifice of many animals and the presentation of a new *peplos* to the wooden cult statue of the goddess (Deacy 2010: 229-230; Evans 2010: 51; Maurizio 1998: 297; Pedley 2005: 202; Wijma 2014: 40-42). The procession that escorted the gifts for the goddess included both citizen and metic men and women, and at the Greater Panathenaia these citizens and metics were joined by "representatives of Athenian allies and colonists, who were to bring a cow and a panoply" (Wijma 2014: 43-44), and "even manumitted slaves and barbarians carrying oak branches are said to have joined the march," (Hurwit 1999: 47). While the festival obviously included worshippers of diverse status, those included were given specific places and roles in the procession in order to articulate their particular membership (Maurizio 1998: 298; Wijma 2014: 37-38).

Though much of what is known about the Panathenaia of the Classical period is derived from later lexicographic sources, four roles that were specifically charged to metics can be identified (Maurizio 1998: 302-305; Sourvinou-Inwood 2000b: 49; Wijma 2014: 42-51). These can be found in **Table 3.1**.

<i>Skiadephoroi</i>	<i>Skiadephoroi</i> were the first metics to ascend the Acropolis as part of the procession. The role was performed by metic daughters who carried parasols to shade the <i>kanephoroi</i> , Athenian girls who lead the procession carrying baskets concealing sacrificial knives and other equipment.
<i>Diphrophoroi</i>	<i>Diphrophoroi</i> were metic girls who carried stools, the use of which in the procession is unknown.
<i>Skaphephoroi</i>	<i>Skaphephoroi</i> were metic men who carried silver and bronze trays bearing honeycombs and cakes to be offered to the goddess. <i>Skaphephoroi</i> wore crimson cloaks that marked their role and metic status.
<i>Hydriaphoroi</i>	<i>Hydriaphoroi</i> carried water-jars, the duty perhaps being performed by metic men and metic girls at different times.

Table 3.1 Metic roles in the Panathenaia.

While metics, and at the Greater Panathenaia foreigners, marched along with citizens in the Panathenaia, their participation has not always been interpreted as being in the spirit of inclusivity (Maurizio 1998: 305; Wijma 2014: 51). Metic participation in the procession has been interpreted at times as an honor and at others as an attempt to disgrace them (Maurizio 1998: 305; Wijma 2014: 51). On the one hand the roles they were assigned might have appeared less than flattering, as Lisa Maurizio (1998: 305) explains,

The items carried by metics also marked their bearers. Female metics carried stools and umbrellas for Athenian basket-bearers. Both of these items were associated with Eastern luxury, and in Classical Athens they were carried by slaves for wealthy Athenians. Thus, these items, normally used to mark a class difference, here mark the difference between citizen and metic and implicitly link metic with slave.

In this view, metics were forced to participate in the Panathenaia in order to be represented as inferior to citizens (Wijma 2014: 51). On the other hand, metic

inclusion in the procession at all would appear to mark them out as members of the Athenian community with the right to worship alongside citizens (Maurizio 1998: 305-306).

Though Vlassopoulos (2007: 38) does not name sanctuaries as a potential 'free space' he does acknowledge "a need of laxity and tolerance in order to be able to maintain social peace." Rather than interpreting metic roles in the Panathenaia as being bestowed to humiliate them, then, their inclusion in this and other festivals might better be interpreted as being within the gift of the Athenian state, but as a gift that had to be given for the good of the whole community. The Old Oligarch (Ps. Xen. *Const. Pol.* 1.11-12), though he complains about their "uncontrolled wantonness," recognized the importance of keeping the metic and slave population on side;

If anyone is also startled by the fact that they let the slaves live luxuriously there and some of them sumptuously, it would be clear that even this they do for a reason. For where there is a naval power, it is necessary from financial considerations to be slaves to the slaves in order to take a portion of their earnings, and it is then necessary to let them go free. And where there are rich slaves, it is no longer profitable in such a place for my slave to fear you. In Sparta my slave would fear you; but if your slave fears me, there will be the chance that he will give over his money so as not to have to worry anymore. For this reason we have set up equality between slaves and free men, and between metics and citizens. The city needs metics in view of the many different trades and the fleet. Accordingly, then, we have reasonably set up a similar equality also for the metics.

Even though they had no formal political power, metics and slaves had the Athenian state beholden to them owing to their numbers and, consequently, their economic and military contribution (as described at **II.2**).

The institution of new deities and their festivals further demonstrates the influence that the resident non-citizen population and Athenian allies had. The Thracian

goddess Bendis was one such addition to the Attic community's pantheon and the festival in her honour, the Bendideia, an addition to the festival calendar. While the exact date of the goddess and her festival's entry into official Athenian cult has been contested, the first Bendideia was held in the second half of the fifth century BC, in either 429 BC or 413 BC (Planeaux 2000: 165). This official worship of the goddess would have been prefaced by her worship by the large Thracian community present in Attica by the fifth century BC, living there as both metics and slaves, during which time the goddess had become familiar to and popular with Athenian citizens (Planeaux 2000: 173; Sears 2015: 316). While the institution of the Bendideia may have been at the behest of the goddess' Athenian citizen worshippers, her non-citizen worshippers had influenced them through their initial worship. The institution of the Bendideia has also been framed as political manoeuvring on the part of Athens to ingratiate themselves with their Thracian allies (Planeaux 2000: 180), but even viewed at the level of inter-state relations the Athenians were still acting because of the Thracians.

Whether citizens and Thracians had sought to keep their unofficial worship of Bendis separate, with the inauguration of the Bendideia they received prescribed roles that marked them out as citizen and non-citizen worshippers. Plato (*Rep.* 1.327a) has Socrates describe the Bendideia as follows,

I went down yesterday to the Peiraeus with Glaucon, the son of Ariston, to pay my devotions to the Goddess, and also because I wished to see how they would conduct the festival since this was its inauguration. I thought the procession of the citizens very fine, but it was no better than the show, made by the marching of the Thracian contingent.

Even though the festival was foreign in origin, once it became part of official Athenian cult worshippers' legal statuses were marked by their requirement to march separately, just as distinctions were made in the Panathenaic procession through the assigning of different roles.

In considering the Panathenaia and Bendideia together, it is apparent that the origins of a deity and their cult were inconsequential once they had received authorisation as official cult. If citizens and non-citizens participated together at the communal level then their particular membership of the community had to be articulated. The Athenian state had to allow non-citizens to participate in order to “maintain social peace” (Vlassopoulos 2007: 38), but that did not mean that their legal status could not be marked and order thus maintained. This understanding of the relationship between the Athenian state and their large non-citizen population, and between the Athenian state and their allies, also serves to explain why non-citizens were allowed to participate in the commemorative landscape. Unlike at festivals, however, there was no obligation to make one’s legal status known when making a dedication or erecting a funerary monument, such freedom being essential to designating sanctuaries and cemeteries ‘free spaces,’ yet at the same time posing a methodological problem in identifying non-citizen commemoration when citizens and non-citizens made use of the same iconography.

III.3.2 Dedications

While both festivals and dedications were both forms of worship prescribed under official *polis* religion, and like all acts of worship were designed to foster, maintain and strengthen relationships between mortals and deities, their focus was often different. A festival was about maintaining the entire community’s relationship with a particular deity, hence the desire to articulate the legal statuses of all those involved. A dedication could come from the entire community, as did the *peplos* dedicated to Athena at the Panathenaia, but more often than not dedications came from individuals, families or other smaller collectives. Below the level of the entire community there was no obligation, perhaps even any need, to articulate individual legal status (Hochscheid 2015: 270; Taylor 2015: 43).

Though in this thesis the kind of dedications that will be considered are those that survive with iconography or else epigraphic attestations to dedications by non-citizens, there was a great variety of items or produce that could be dedicated or sacrificed to the gods, much of which will have perished since the time of dedication. Rather than having anything to do with the legal status of the dedicator,

choice in dedications would have been determined by the deity in question, the reasoning for or timing of the dedication, and, no doubt, the funds available to the dedicator or dedicators. Through a dedication, not only was the dedicator articulating his or her identity as a worshipper of a particular deity, but they were also articulating their own social identities that would have been common to citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners alike. This might have been their role within their own family, their occupation, or their health. As examples in **Chapter V** will demonstrate, not only did citizens, metics and slaves through dedication articulate identities that transcended legal statuses, they also made dedications together on the basis of such shared identities.

III.4 The Cemeteries

While most funerary monuments lack a specific provenance (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 84), enough survive in situ to demonstrate that citizens and non-citizens made use of the same cemeteries. As already addressed, the aim is not to prove non-citizen access to cemeteries but explain why they were allowed access when their statuses were designed to exclude them from so much else. As with non-citizen participation in Athenian religion, non-citizen access to proper burial and the option to erect commemorative tombstones should be seen as being within the gift of the Athenian state, but owing to social pressure and consideration of the whole community, it was not a gift they could afford not to give.

“Slave or free, all Greeks died sooner or later” (Pomeroy *et al* 2008: 263), and proper treatment and reverence for the dead were the responsibility of the whole community, with consequences for the whole community should the duty fail to be discharged (Felton 2010: 87; Hitch 2015: 521; von Hesberg *et al* 2015: 236). While the particulars performed and the expense incurred on the behalf of the deceased would have been at the discretion of the individual family, or in the absence of any family the demarch, certain practices were common in the treatment of the dead. The body was washed, dressed, anointed and laid on a bier ready to receive night-time procession, *ekphora*, to its resting place (Felton 2010: 87; Garland 1985: 21; Hitch 2015: 526; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 144; von Hesberg *et al* 2015: 236). Cemeteries were located away from settlements, and in the case of the Kerameikos

that served the city of Athens itself, as the city developed it came to be outside the city walls (Felton 2010: 88; Knigge 1991: 10, 35; von Hesberg *et al* 2015: 236). Once arrived at the cemetery the body was either buried or cremated, both practiced across Attica in the Classical period (Felton 2010: 87; Garland 1985: 21; Hitch 2015: 526; Houby-Nielsen 1995: 137; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 96; von Hesberg 2015: 238). The funerary rites were concluded with a series of feasts held in the deceased's honour, the first on the day of burial and subsequent ones on the third, ninth and thirtieth days after burial, the final feast bringing the mourning period to a close (Isae. 2.37, 8.39; Hitch 2015: 526). At some point soon after burial or cremation the grave would be marked with some sort of marker. The marker could be made of wood, ceramic, or stone. Stone markers may have simply borne the inscribed name of the deceased or boasted iconographic representation of the deceased of various size and quality as will be covered in **Chapter IV**. The feasts and markers were no doubt dependent on the deceased's surviving family and their income or what money they had set-aside for the inevitable, if perhaps untimely, occasion.

Though the epigraphic evidence speaks for itself that citizens, metics, slaves and even foreigners made use of the same cemeteries, the apparent importance of family tombs in proving citizenship in the Classical period has created a myth of "citizen cemeteries" (Patterson 2006: 48). Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 55.3) records the importance of family tombs, among other criteria, in proving citizenship to be eligible to be selected for the office of *archon*;

The questions put in examining qualifications are, first, 'Who is your father and to what deme does he belong, and who is your father's father, and who your mother, and who her father and what his deme?' then whether he has a Family Apollo and Homestead Zeus, and where these shrines are; then whether he has family tombs and where they are; then whether he treats his parents well, and whether he pays his taxes, and whether he has done his military service. And after putting these questions the officer says, 'Call your witnesses to these statements.

While family tombs may have been essential to proving one's citizenship it does not follow that only citizens could have such tombs or that such tombs would have been placed into separate citizen and non-citizen cemeteries (Patterson 2006: 50). The burials and cremations of citizens and non-citizens alike took place in the same spaces, the locations of cemeteries determined by shared fears of spiritual and actual pollution rather than the legal statuses of the deceased interred there.

While cemeteries were emphasized as liminal spaces by their location, at the same time their location enhanced their role as commemorative spaces. "Grave monuments and cemeteries did have a religious significance, but they did not belong exclusively to the religious sphere; they also had an important social dimension" (Sourvinou-Inwood 1995b: 117). A location at the limits of the settlement allowed a cemetery to fulfil both the religious and social needs of the local community that it served (Burton 2003: 20; Felton 2010: 88). In separating the dead from the settlements of the living the cemetery safeguarded against both spiritual and actual pollution, but at the same time provided a prominent location for the commemoration of the dead. Though the marking of a grave with a sculpted tombstone was optional rather than a compulsory part of the rites owed to the dead, the location of cemeteries at the gateways to settlements ensured that should the decision be taken to commemorate the deceased in such a way, then the public consumption of such commemoration was guaranteed (Burton 2003: 20). That a number of epitaphs addressed the passer-by serves to demonstrate that tombstones were not for the benefit of the family alone, but to proclaim the merits and social identities of the deceased to both the wider community and to visitors (Arrington 2015; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 262). The Kerameikos, like the other cemeteries that served the city of Athens itself, was cut through by the roads that led to the city gates, which would have been traversed not only by resident citizens, metics and slaves, but also by the many foreigners visiting Athens (Burton 2003: 20).

III.5 Iconography and 'Free Spaces'

There needs to be some initial consideration of non-citizen iconographic representation within the 'free spaces' before moving on to in-depth analysis of each type of commemoration over the next three chapters. As will be seen in the next

chapter, there were only a relatively small number of different motifs on identifiably metic and slave funerary monuments and most motifs are also attested on identifiably citizen monuments. In reverse, most motifs known from identifiably citizen memorials are attested on metic and slave memorials. In the case of votive reliefs, so few lack surviving dedicatory inscriptions that citizens and non-citizen dedicators cannot be distinguished. Citizens and non-citizens were represented in similar ways, which as has already been stated should not be interpreted simply as non-citizens copying a citizen prescribed iconography that is not intended for them, but as a reflection of the triumph of shared social identities over their different legal statuses in the commemorative landscape. The limited number of motifs used in the sanctuaries and cemeteries does suggest that worshippers and mourners, and the sculptors of their votives and funerary monuments, were copying existing iconography. An iconographic feedback loop certainly existed within and between the sanctuaries and cemeteries as the next three chapters will show (see also **VII.1** and **VII.2**), but this was not necessarily non-citizens copying citizens. Conceivably a citizen could be inspired by the monument of a metic or a slave. In fact, metics were some of the first to commission stone memorials when they once again became acceptable in the second half of the fifth century BC (see **IV.1.2**; Stears 2000: 31, 51).

Understanding of the sanctuaries and cemeteries as ‘free spaces’ is more than just recognizing that citizens and non-citizens both made use of the same spaces, but that they had certain freedoms of choice in how they participated in these spaces, though as highlighted above no one, including citizens, was free to do whatever they wanted or above the law. The range of motifs available to citizens and non-citizens to represent themselves atop their final resting place or in their devotion to the gods was limited, but all of them could make choices as to what best represented them from the limited repertoire, and some did choose to be different (see **IV.4.2.1** and **IV.4.2.3**). As the social identities made salient on funerary and votive reliefs were common to citizens and non-citizens alike, there was a definite blurring of legal statuses across the commemorative landscape. The consumer of iconography in the sanctuaries and cemeteries would only be made aware of the deceased’s or dedicator’s legal status through the epitaph or dedicatory inscription, and only then if they had chosen to make their legal status known and if the consumers of their

memorials took the time and were able to read the inscription as well as reading the iconography.

IV: The Funerary Monuments

In the previous chapter expectations regarding the iconography of non-citizen funerary monuments, votives and decree reliefs have already begun to be established. While non-citizen commissions, or in the case of decrees commissions for non-citizens, made use of iconography shared by citizens, they should not be regarded as non-citizens using citizen iconography but as an iconography that was just that – shared. This shared iconography was a product of ‘free spaces’ and in turn serves to characterise such spaces as ‘free spaces.’ A detailed investigation of the way this iconography was employed by non-citizens informs understanding of the way their identities – and by extension broader Athenian identities – were crafted in commemorative contexts.

Over the next three chapters the collected non-citizen funerary monuments, votives and decree reliefs will be considered in turn, beginning in this chapter with the largest collection of commemoration – the funerary monuments. 173 decorated funerary monuments that can be assigned to metics, slaves or else to potential non-citizens whose legal status is undefined are presented in this chapter. The chapter begins with an overview of funerary commemoration from the Archaic to the Classical period, demonstrating how through developments in the availability of memorials and their iconographic repertoire cemeteries transitioned from being primarily male and citizen spaces to, by the end of the fifth century BC at least, ‘free spaces.’ After this overview there is consideration of the importance of epigraphy in identifying non-citizen memorials when citizens and non-citizens make use of a shared iconography, followed in turn by a short section on the practicalities of selecting and organising the collected non-citizen memorials and chronicling some of the most useful catalogues and studies of Attic funerary monuments. Then follows the main section of the chapter, the collection of non-citizen funerary monuments, their descriptions ordered chronologically into the following sub-sections: 450-420 BC (**F 1**); 420-400 BC (**F 2-5**); 400-375 BC (**F 6-26**); 375-350 BC (**F 27-95**); 350-300 BC (**F 96-150**); and finally undated memorials (**F 151-173**). Following the catalogue are discussions of imagery that does not conform to the broader corpus of Attic funerary iconography, being instead peculiar to non-citizens. Such imagery

serves to demonstrate that while for the most part citizens and non-citizens alike made use of a shared iconography, there was freedom enough to choose something different. Conversely, the limited number of examples of use of different iconography amongst non-citizens suggests that the use of a relatively small set of shared iconography by most citizens, metics and slaves was in itself a choice.

IV.1 An Overview of Attic Funerary Commemoration

IV.1.1 The Archaic Period

Sculpted funerary commemoration was not an invention of the Classical period but has its roots in the Archaic period and earlier. While the monuments that survive from the Archaic period are far fewer than the thousands that are known from the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, these earlier examples are often far more monumental in nature. By the sixth century BC, two monument types prevailed: the tall stone stelai on which the deceased was carved, the shaft topped with palmettes or other decoration, including mythical sirens and sphinxes; the larger than life-size *kouroi*, the naked youths carved in the ridged Archaic style (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 84, 88; Neer 2012: 156, 160; Richter 1961: 2, 6; Small 1995: 147; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 221-227).

While of course not exclusively male spaces, sculpted memorials of the period certainly characterise Archaic cemeteries as spaces for primarily male display. The *kouros*-type was known across Greece in the Archaic period, described by Richard Neer (2012: 160) as “removed from the everyday world, and part of a panhellenic class of statuary,” (see also Ridgway 1977: 50). Neer (2012: 160-161) describes contemporary stelai as monuments that “belong to the society of the city state... part of a larger whole, enmeshed in a block of stone and in a civic community.” Both *kouroi* and stelai were monumental in size and few in number compared to smaller stelai and other types of memorial during the Classical period, attesting to the exclusively elite nature of funerary commemoration during the Archaic period (Day 1989: 16-17; Stears 2000: 27). These elite males, however, were usually depicted as either warriors or athletes, idealised types that would be revived and used in the

Classical period by greater numbers of deceased (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 86; Neer 2012: 160; Oakley 2004: 219; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: 264). Women only rarely received representation in the cemeteries in the Archaic period, and when they did they were usually depicted with a male relative rather than in their own right as men were (Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 84; Oakley 2004: 219; Shepherd 2013: 549). While elite men must have had mothers, wives and daughters who propagated their lineage, they did not regularly receive monumental commemoration upon their deaths. Female counterparts of the *kouroi*, *korai*, did adorn the commemorative landscape at the same time, but these female figures were almost always votive rather than funerary in nature (Hochscheid 2015: 247-248; Neer 2012: 157; Ridgway 1977: 86). Who these *korai* represented when placed in a sanctuary context has been debated, ranging from dedicator to deity (Keesling 2003: 99-101; Neer 2012: 157).

The gender bias across funerary commemoration in the Archaic period means the cemeteries cannot yet be considered ‘free spaces,’ defined as they are as bringing together not just citizens, metics and slaves but also women (Vlassopoulos 2007: 38). Cemeteries in the Archaic period, however, were not exclusively citizen spaces, and while Archaic memorials were limited, remnants survive that attest to the commemoration of foreigners alongside Athenian men. At least seven Archaic funerary monuments are identifiable as the memorials of foreigners (Hochscheid 2015: 271-272). Three of these are now housed in the Kerameikos Museum in Athens; two inscribed bases possibly having supported *kouroi*; and a base that likely supported a seated figure. All three are dated to the last two decades of the sixth century BC and commemorate men of foreign origin or descent who died in Athens. The two *kouros* bases were found near the Piraeus gateway and honour Tyr[-] from Caria (*IG I³ 1344*) and Aischros from Samos (*IG I³ 1366*). The base for the seated figure names Anaxilas from Naxos (*IG I³ 1357*), who is actually referred to as an immigrant, *μετάοικον*, the earliest instance of the word and its only appearance in an epitaph in Attica (Baba 1984: 1). In addition to the three Kerameikos bases are the bases for Alexos from Delos (*IG I³ 1349*), Leanax from Samos (*IG I³ 1365*), [-]xenos son of Kaletor from Teos (*IG I³ 1373*) and Lampito (*IG I³ 1380*). Lampito’s birthplace is not given in her epitaph but she is referred to as being far from her forefathers (Hochscheid 2015: 271-272). Lampito was one of few women in the Archaic period to receive a memorial, and so the base is doubly

exceptional in commemorating not just a foreigner but a foreign woman. In the context of Archaic funerary monuments, these men and woman might be assumed to be of elite status, even if not of citizen status. Sadly, as only the bases survive, these monuments cannot be subject to iconographic analysis.

Whether or not there was a formal metic status, foreigners participated in the commemorative landscape prior to the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, both in cemeteries and, as will be seen in the next chapter, in the sanctuaries. While changes to the cemetery landscape are witnessed during the Classical period, the coming of democracy – and with it the strengthening of legal status distinctions – did not exclude foreigners from the commemorative landscape of the cemetery, despite the increased importance given to family burial in proving one’s citizen status (see **Chapter III.3**). In fact non-citizens received greater representation in the cemeteries from the fifth century BC, or were at least more visible.

IV.1.2 The Classical Period

The transition from the Archaic to the Classical period brought with it a hiatus in sculpted funerary monument production that lasted at least fifty years, c.500/480 BC – c.450/430 BC. When funerary sculpture was revived, it looked very different from what had gone before. While the funerary commemoration of the Archaic period had been decidedly male dominated, the funerary landscape from the second half of the fifth century BC saw the representation of women in equal if not greater numbers (Burton 2003: 24). While still not attested as often as adults, children too now received greater representation on Attic funerary monuments, either by themselves or with one or more adults, most often their mother. These shifts in funerary commemoration have been attributed to the socio-political changes brought about by the Kleisthenic reforms of the late Archaic period and the later clarifications of Perikles’ Citizenship Law in the middle of the fifth century BC (Burton 2003: 24; Osborne 1997: 11-18; Osborne 2011: 121-122).

Though no contemporary literary evidence survives, the cessation of sculpted funerary monuments in the early fifth century BC is seen as symptomatic of the coming of democracy (Stears 2000: 42-47). The traditions of the Archaic period

were elite traditions in which many newly enfranchised citizens would have been unable to share, and so such monumental commemoration was no longer appropriate (Neer 2012: 300; Stears 2000: 47). Instead graves were marked with decorated white lekythoi (Neer 2012: 301; Oakley 2004: 8, 215). While these lekythoi were still a “cut above” and not necessarily something everyone could afford, they no doubt represented a more affordable memorial than the monumental *kouroi* and stelai of the Archaic period (Oakley 2004: 10). Karen Stears (2000: 47) suggests that funerary lekythoi may have been a reflection of aristocratic frustrations, being denied the kind of monumental memorials that had gone before. The iconography on funerary lekythoi, however, did not simply mimic the iconography of the Archaic period, but rather served as a bridge between that male dominated period and the more inclusive Classical funerary landscape (Oakley 2004: 219). A range of scenes was painted on the lekythoi, many of which transitioned to sculpture when it was introduced in the second half of the fifth century BC. This included depictions of warriors, which while indeed echoing many Archaic memorials now often focused on the warrior arming and taking leave of his family (Oakley 2004: 29, 57). Mistresses with their maids was another favourite scene on funerary lekythoi, as were depictions of a visit to the grave and the lying out of the deceased as part of the funerary rites, though these latter two scenes do not transition to sculpted monuments in subsequent decades (Oakley 2004: 32, 73, 86, 145).

With the reintroduction of stone funerary monuments in the second half of the fifth century BC the production of white lekythoi began to dwindle, being superseded by, among other types, huge stone versions of these vessels (Oakley 2004: 216). The timing of the reintroduction of stone funerary monuments is attributed to a number of factors, both practical and political. The Periklean building programme saw an influx of foreign sculptors into Athens in the middle of the fifth century BC who would have been available to take private commissions, particularly as work on the Acropolis drew to an end or was halted by the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (Lawton 2009: 66; Stears 1995: 113; Stears 2000: 50). Building on this practical consideration, Karen Stears (2000: 50) argues that the presence of many foreign craftsmen not only facilitated the mass production of sculpted funerary monuments, but also represented a change in mind-set amongst Attica’s residents. The work on the Acropolis demonstrated rebuilding and renewal, the spirit of which inspired the

commission of other types of commemoration (Stears 2000: 50). Though the production of votives had not previously ceased as that of funerary monuments had it had dwindled, and with the reintroduction and growth of sculpted funerary monuments came growth in the production of votives. At the same time, decorated decrees began to be erected for the first time (Lawton 2009: 66, 68). The reintroduction of sculpted funerary monuments, then, should be viewed as part of a larger revival, a revival of which metics, slaves and foreigners were a part.

Many of the foreigners who flocked to Athens to work on the Acropolis undoubtedly became metics resident in the city or its environs, and would have contributed to the reintroduction of funerary sculpture by being among the sculptors who produced it (Erechtheion accounts *IG I³ 474-476*). Metics, however, also contributed to the funerary sculptural revival as some of the earliest patrons of these sculptors (Keesling 2005: 408; Stears 2000: 31, 51). While these early stelai lack figural decoration – and so are not included in the collection of non-citizen funerary monuments below – they were still important in the transition from lekythoi to more imposing, permanent markers. The earliest of these plain stelai may have been erected as early as the 470's BC, long before the reintroduction of decorated monuments (Stears 2000: 31). They commemorate [Mene(?)k?]rates from Aegina (*IG I³ 1341*), Sko[?]eas from Messenia (*IG I³ 1355*) and Damaineto from Pallene (*IG I³ 1358*). This series of plain or non-figural decorated stelai continued between 450 and 420 BC, with metics commemorated by these stelai hailing from Andros (*IG I³ 1342*), the Chersonese (*IG I³ 1301*), Chios (*IG I³ 1345*), Corinth (*IG I³ 1348*), Knidos (*IG I³ 1346*), Lampsakos (*IG I³ 1351*), Lesbos (*IG I³ 1353*), Miletus (*IG I³ 1356*), Pallene (*IG I³ 1359*), Phaselis (*IG I³ 1360*), Stagira (*IG I³ 1370*), Syracuse (*IG I³ 1371*), and, most numerous, Torone (*IG I³ 1377, 1378, 1379*). To these can be added a further two stelai, the names on which suggest they were the memorials of foreigners (*IG I³ 1237bis, IG I³ 1282*; Stears 2000: 31). While Athenian citizens were also commemorated with stelai during this timeframe, non-citizens appear to have been over-represented, with only around 40 stelai dated between the 470's and 420's BC and around half of them commemorating non-citizens (Keesling 2005: 408; Stears 2000: 31). Four of these non-citizen memorials were decorated; one with an anthemion (*IG I³ 1371*); one with fillets (*IG I³ 1378*); one has some surviving evidence of painted decoration (*IG I³ 1377*); one with a figural relief of a bearded

man (*IG I³ 1282*). These four stelai are not included in the collection proper below, three because they lack figural decoration and the fourth because the deceased's status is tenuous. These stelai still deserve mention here, however, owing to their demonstrating the active role of metics in the funerary sculpture revival, both as producers and consumers.

The presence of a great many sculptors in Attica in the wake of the Periclean building programme explains practically why funerary sculpture could begin to be commissioned from perhaps as early as 450 BC and certainly by 430 BC. The reintroduction of privately commissioned memorials, however, has also been regarded as ideologically motivated and not merely down to the availability of sculptors. The boom in sculpted memorials from the 430s BC has been closely associated with the losses of the Peloponnesian War and the plague it brought (Lawton 2009: 66; Stears 2000: 51). Greater honouring of the dead is seen as a response to the number of untimely deaths the whole community was enduring. Men were falling in defence of the *polis* and men, women and children were dying of the plague that spread easily on account of the inhabitants of Attica being brought within the city walls for safety (Lawton 2009: 66; Stears 2000: 51). Though the war dead would have received commemoration within the *demosion sema*, erecting individual memorials for fallen warriors, as well as other members of the family, privatised grief and claimed them for the *oikos* rather than just the *polis* (Arrington 2015: 221). The public burial of the war dead throughout the fifth century BC honoured citizen and metic men, but with the erection of private memorials the unsung residents of Attica began to receive commemoration, notably women, children, and slaves.

The representation of women on Classical funerary monuments, compared with their virtual absence on Archaic memorials, has long since been associated with the passage of Perikles' Citizenship Law in 451/0 BC (see **II.2**; Arrington 2015: 217; Osborne 1997: 11-18; Osborne 2011: 121-122; Stears 2000: 52). From the middle of the fifth century BC, Athenian citizenship required descent from not just an Athenian father but now an Athenian mother as well. These memorials, that represented women either alone or as part of a family group, sought to proclaim the virtue of Athenian wives and mothers and by that virtue the legitimacy of their marriages and the children of their marriages (Stears 1995: 111). Idealised female scenes were

centred on the domestic and were chiefly child-raising, wool-working and interacting with family members and slaves. This restricted iconographic repertoire suggests that the reliefs were not depicting the variety of real-life experience but were reflecting culturally ingrained notions as to the ideal and proper concerns of women within the *oikos* and *polis* (Stears 1995: 123).

While such iconography was certainly driven by citizen ideology regarding the proper place of women, this does not mean that these scenes did not actually reflect the lives of certain of the women represented on surviving funerary monuments, citizen or otherwise. That said, the idealising nature of funerary iconography is problematic when interpreting funerary monuments, particularly non-citizen ones. In the last chapter the possibility for disparity between legal status and socio-economic status was highlighted as in part responsible for creating shared citizen and non-citizen experiences that were played out in ‘free spaces.’ Many women, both citizen and non-citizen, would have had to work outside the home to support their families. Therefore, when looking at funerary iconography, it is necessary to consider not just what is shown, but what is not shown. Depictions of women at home in the company of their families may not necessarily be unfair or untrue representations of many women, but they are certainly selective about what aspects of women’s experience are represented for posterity.

The idealising nature of Attic funerary iconography and questions about how representative these scenes were, whether of citizens, non-citizens, men or women, should be considered alongside the increasing number of funerary monuments and the greater variety in the shapes and sizes of funerary monuments available for purchase that seems to reflect the ability for wider participation in the cemetery as a commemorative landscape. Though the *kouros*-type was no longer a feature of the cemetery landscape, freestanding sculpture was still commissioned, either standing alone or as part of a family group framed by a *naiskos*, a house- or temple-like structure with three walls and a roof (Grossman 2001: 5). *Naiskoi* with freestanding sculpture “reflect chronology as well as cost,” being a development of the later fourth-century BC when the Classical Attic funerary series was well established. *Naiskoi* are often the largest and most detailed of the available funerary monuments, and therefore likely one of the more costly choices for a memorial (Grossman 2001:

6). Freestanding sculpture was not always human, but included animals and mythical beasts that served to mark the boundaries of family *periboloi* (Garland 1982: 129).

Stelai were once again erected for the deceased, but they were no longer of the same imposing height of many Archaic examples and a range of decorative techniques was now made use of on the new Classical stelai. Probably representing the most costly stelai-type were those that foreshadowed the later freestanding naiskoi, with figures in relief framed by pillars and pediment. Within this type, however, there was variation in the height of the relief of figures and architectural elements, placing some monuments closer to freestanding naiskoi than others. Other stelai had figures in relief but lacked the architectural features of the naiskoi-style stelai, instead having flat tops or an acanthus (Grossman 2001: 5). Alternatively, decoration on stelai could be incised or painted, with no relief features at all, except perhaps rosettes, or figures in relief could be confined to a sunken panel or an incised or sculpted loutrophouros, generally scaling down their size and level of detail (Grossman 2001: 5).

Stone vessels and bases with relief decoration represent another choice within the landscape of funerary commemoration. These are predominantly lekythoi and loutrophouroi, but hydria and hydria-loutrophoroi are also known. While lekythoi served as the memorials of deceased of various ages, loutrophouroi were used to mark the passing of unmarried youths and maidens (Neer 2012: 306). Denied its use in wedding ritual, the loutrophoros was instead used to anoint the deceased, and this poignant reversal was immortalized in stone in the cemeteries of Attica. No other monument type was strongly associated with any particular age, gender, status or iconography.

It is unwise to draw a direct correlation between the grandeur of monuments and the wealth of those commemorated by them. A very simple stele may have stood within a *peribolos*, unimpressive in itself but indicative of wealth and position when viewed in context, though sadly provenances are so often lacking (Closterman 2007; Nielsen *et al* 1989: 415-416; Oliver 2000b: 67). It can be said, however, that individual monuments of certain types must have cost more or less than others by virtue of the number of man hours invested in them (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 414-415). Furthermore,

though only monuments with figural decoration are being dealt with here, there are many stelai with no decoration, bearing just an epitaph, in the Classical period (Oliver 2000b: 71). These simple stelai probably cost between 10 and 20 drachmas, opening up funerary commemoration to most Attic residents if they so wished to have it and no longer a preserve of the elite as in the Archaic period (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 414-415; Oliver 2000b: 59, 71). At the other end of the scale, freestanding naiskoi and the more elaborate stelai and vessels, while there is no surviving evidence of their exact cost, may have run up a bill of several hundred drachmas. The Erechtheion accounts attest to the potential costliness of sculpture (*IG I³ 476*). One sculptor was paid 120 drachmas for producing a man striking a horse (*IG I³ 476 161-162*), demonstrating the likely steep rise in price from simple inscribed stelai to freestanding sculpture. Such information on wages also attests that a sculpted memorial was within the means of at least skilled working men and women, some choosing to make their occupational identity salient on said memorials as will be seen below (Burford 1972: 164-165).

Though it seems not all memorials were necessarily expensive, they were certainly luxury items in that they were not essential to the discharging of the proper dues for the deceased. As such all decorated memorials, regardless of type or quality, were prohibited by the luxury decree of Demetrius of Phaleron in 317 BC (Humphreys 1993: 118; Small 1995: 147; Stears 1995: 127-128). “The increase in scale and finery of the later 4th century monuments leads one yet again to consider their relationship to the ideology of democracy,” for although funerary commemoration in the Classical period was more accessible, it was far from equal (Stears 1995: 127). Though no contemporary evidence survives, the gap in production of decorated stone memorials in the early fifth century BC is regarded as a result of democratic sentiment, and after a revival of no more than 130 years, the same sentiment curtails funerary commemoration. In the Hellenistic period, naiskoi, stelai and vessels were replaced by simple, inscribed kioniskoi and trapeza (Small 1995: 147).

While this assessment of funerary commemoration shows that it was very accessible, with all but the very poor likely able to afford at least the simplistic memorials if they wanted one (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 412, 414-415; Oliver 2000b: 78), it bears reiterating that the idealized rendering of the deceased and their families should be

viewed with caution. The scenes listed above are repeated again and again in varying quality on various types of monument (Stears 1995: 123, 127-128). Though the simple, less expensive nature of a monument is not enough to say it was the memorial of a less well off individual, it is enough to say it was more accessible, despite the iconography being the same. Funerary monuments represented the elite and non-elite, citizens and non-citizens, but how representative their memorials were of their lives is another matter.

Although the iconography erected there may not always be truly representative of the deceased commemorated, in the Classical period the cemeteries should certainly be considered ‘free spaces.’ In the last chapter it was shown that legal limitations, i.e. the inability to own land, were not in themselves sufficient to bar metics and slaves from being commemorated in Attic cemeteries. Here this has been taken further, showing that while a certain level of wealth was necessary to erect any memorial, should an Attic resident wish to be commemorated as such, there was a range of monuments to suit all but the poorest pockets (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 412, 414-415; Oliver 2000b: 59-60).

IV.2.1 Identifying Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments

The funerary inscriptions of Classical Attica number several thousand, yet they are “probably the most understudied and unloved area of ancient epigraphy,” despite the fact that this corpus “embodies a social attitude; epitaphs thus constitute a matter of historical importance that can be studied for the very reason that so many... survive,” (Meyer 1993: 99). It is true that Attic funerary commemoration has attracted more attention as art than as epigraphy, but it is only by considering iconography and epigraphy together that the relationship between legal and social status and representation in the cemeteries can be understood. Since Elizabeth Meyer’s (1993: 99) lament over 20 years ago that funerary inscriptions are “unloved,” there have been a number of studies that focus on funerary commemoration, though a divide between iconography and epigraphy has often remained. Interest in non-citizen funerary inscriptions and the distinctions between citizen and non-citizen epitaphs has burgeoned during the intervening decades,

including articles by Peter Fraser (1994), Mogens Herman Hansen (1996), Balbina Bäbler's (1998) *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und Wehrhafte Skythen* and Anna Ginestí-Rosell's (2012) *Epigrafia funerària d'estrangers a Atenes* to name a few. While these works include inscriptions with accompanying iconography, however, they make little to no reference to the relationship between them. Johannes Bergemann (1997: 131-150) devoted a chapter of his *Demos und Thanatos* – a volume dealing with funerary iconography - to 'Sozialgeschichtliche Fragen,' requiring consideration of the epigraphy alongside the iconography in order to compare the representation of citizens, metics and slaves. Here Bergemann (1997: 131-150) draws a distinction between rich and poor citizen and metic families, arguing that differences in iconography, or the rendering of that iconography, are more heavily dependent on wealth than legal status. While not untrue – the above discussion of the accessibility and representativeness of funerary commemoration reflects Bergemann's own conclusions – Janet Grossman (2015: 5) has recently criticised Bergemann for the selective use of monuments when answering his 'Sozialgeschichtliche Fragen.' There is a definite need, then, for further interpretation of the iconography in the cemeteries with regards to status. This requires full treatment of status indicators in epitaphs inscribed on decorated monuments.

IV.2.1.1 Ruling out citizens: Demotics

While the identification of Athenian citizens is not of primary concern here, the use of the demotic in private epitaphs serves to eliminate them from the present collection and at the same time establish a comparative dataset of funerary monuments. Unlike on the casualty lists of the *demosion sema*, citizens often referred to themselves on private monuments by the more local affiliation of deme rather than as members of one of the ten tribes. As well as affirming legal status as a citizen, the deme was an important social unit, particularly so with regard to funerary arrangements and the providing of burial plots (Faraguna 2012: 176-177).

Not all citizens, however, and by extension not all metics and slaves, chose to highlight their status in their epitaph at all. Readings of *Ath. Pol.* 21.4 have suggested that after Kleisthenes' reforms citizens were required to identify

themselves by their deme, rather than just their patronymic, in order to more clearly assert their membership of the newly expanded citizen body (Hansen 1996: 176; Winters 1993: 162). In the years following the reforms, however, demotics did not become a universal handle in citizen epitaphs (Winters 1993: 163-164), or dedications (see **Chapter VI**). The simplest epitaphs bear only a name, some name and patronymic, and others the full formula of name, patronymic and demotic (Meyer 1993: 100; Winters 1993: 163-164). Rarely, an epitaph might contain name and demotic without a patronymic (Winters 1993: 163-164). While the use of demotics increased in the years after Perikles' citizenship law of 451/0 BC, "there is simply no evidence to support the notion that demotics were 'mandatory and universal,' replacing patronymics in Attic society" (Winters 1993: 165). Context, however, may have made the addition of the demotic unnecessary. Those monuments on which only a name or name and patronymic were inscribed may have stood within a *peribolos*, and so the status of the deceased would be apparent through association (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 415-416; Oliver 2000b: 67).

A famous example of this is the stele for Hegeso (Clairmont 1993: vol II, 2.150; *IG* I² 1079; NAM 3624). The stele on which Hegeso is shown attended by her maid, probably the most famous depiction of a mistress and her maid on an Attic stele, bears the inscription Ἥγησῶ Προξένο, Hegeso daughter of Proxenos (*IG* I² 1079). The lack of a demotic on the actual stele led Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway (1981: 147) to suggest Hegeso could have been the daughter of *proxenos*. The stele, however, is one of few with an exact provenance and comes from a *peribolos* in the Kerameikos in which there is a stele with the *deme* Melite inscribed (Clairmont 1993: vol II, 2.150). Hegeso was, therefore, a citizen woman.

Hegeso's stele, however, found in situ in the Kerameikos, is the exception rather than the rule. Most monuments lack such a specific provenance, or any provenance at all, returning to the issue raised in the previous section of a simple stele not necessarily being indicative of a lack of wealth when it may well have belonged within a *peribolos* (Nielsen *et al* 1989: 415-416; Oliver 2000b: 67). The same is true of determining status, with the lack of a demotic in no way indicative of the status of the deceased as a non-citizen (Fraser 1994: 66-67). Some other indicator is needed to determine the status of the deceased as a metic or slave.

IV.2.1.2 Remaining Outsiders? Metics and Ethnics

Like citizens, there was often a distinction between how metics were distinguished in public state inscriptions and how they distinguished themselves in private inscriptions such as epitaphs. The Erechtheion building accounts are an example of metics being mentioned in a public inscription (*IG I³ 474-476*). Metic workers are identified as ‘living in’ a particular deme (Faraguna 2012: 172; Hansen 1996: 178). So, for example, the sculptor paid 120 drachmas to carve a man striking a horse mentioned earlier was a metic called Prax[is] and lived in the deme of Melite (*IG I³ 476 161-162*). The formula shows metics belonging to a deme, and, therefore, belonging to a tribe, a membership affirmed by their inclusion in the Athenian casualty lists (Whitehead 1977: 73).

In epitaphs, however, metics are most often identified not by where they were living but where they were from, expressed as an ethnic that stood in place of an Athenian demotic, if this was used (Vestergaard 2000: 82-84; Whitehead 1977: 33). Where in Attica the metics commemorated by these epitaphs had resided is not stated and, as already mentioned, provenance is often lacking, so it is not usually possible to identify a metic’s deme of residence based on their resting place. The consistent use of ethnics supposes that there was a desire to maintain a foreign identity even amongst second and later generation metics who may never even have set foot in the homeland of their ancestors. The only deviation from the use of an ethnic in metic epitaphs was by those men who had achieved the status of *isotelês* and who “wanted to be remembered not as citizens of wherever it might be but as men honoured by their city of residence” (**F 86, F 87, F 138, F 139, F 172**; Whitehead 1977: 33; see **Chapter II**). Only one metic represented among the decorated monuments collected here refers to his deme of residence, though the ‘living in’ formula used in public inscriptions like the Erechtheion accounts is not used and an ethnic is still included in his epitaph. He is Nichomachos from Lesbos now of the Piraeus (**F 48**).

IV.2.1.3 The Worthy Ones: Slaves, Adjectives and Names

Despite formal markers of status, identifying citizen and metic funerary monuments based on inscriptions is not without its problems. Identifying slave memorials is rendered even harder by the lack of such formal indicators. Instead assigning servile status to the deceased relies on sentiment and onomastics. The adjective *chrestos* (χρηστός), *chreste* (χρηστή) in the feminine, translated as ‘worthy’ or ‘useful,’ is regarded as indicative of slave memorials within Attica, particularly if paired with a non-Greek name (Bäbler 1998: 65-66; Braun 1994: 41; Fraser 1994: 71; Nielsen *et al* 1989: 419; Vlassopoulos 2010: 114). This epithet is, however, seldom used, with only 25 occurrences amongst decorated memorials with surviving inscriptions. The feminine form of the adjective is far more common, with 19 attestations versus only six in the masculine form. Some of these female slaves were nurses, *tithe*, and there are other women referred to as nurse, though not as *chreste*, included in this collection of non-citizen funerary monuments, as the role was so often one performed by if not slaves then at least foreign women (Fildes 1988: 14; Stears 1995: 124).

The rarity of the adjective *chrestos* on decorated monuments could be regarded as a reflection of the rarity of slaves receiving such commemoration. The accessibility of funerary commemoration has been explored above, with all but the most poor able to afford the simplest memorials if they wanted. As the following collection only includes monuments with figural decoration, the simplest memorials are not covered and slaves more so than citizens or metics were likely to have fallen into the category of the most poor, being themselves property and able to acquire wealth only with the approval of their masters. There remain, however, a number of monuments inscribed with names that are either distinctly foreign or servile, but lack further qualification by an adjective or ethnic. That much of the slave population of Attica was drawn from Asia Minor, Scythia and Thrace quickly accounts for the presence of foreign names associated with these regions (Kamen 2013: 8). Either such names were the ones the slaves were born with or, in an act of identity transformation, were assigned to them by their masters upon purchasing them as a reflection of their origin (Braund 2011: 126). Some of the most common of these ethnic and foreign names include Thratta / Thraitta (Thracian female), Thraix / Thrax (Thracian male),

Syros (Syria), Lydos (Lydia), and Karion (Karia) (Braund 2011: 126; Vlassopoulos 2010: 116-117). As well as foreign and ethnic names, slaves might receive other names that marked them out from the free citizen population, such as petnames and nicknames (Braund 2011: 126; Vlassopoulos 2010: 115-116).

The name of the deceased, then, might suggest that a slave was commemorated by a given monument, however, in a recent article, Kostas Vlassopoulos (2010: 113) has demonstrated that there are few names that are only attested amongst slaves in Athens. In his comprehensive study, Vlassopoulos (2010: 118) collects all names attested for real, fictional, possible and freed slaves from the sixth- to fourth-centuries BC, a total of 464 names. Cross-referencing these with the names of identifiable citizens and metics, Vlassopoulos (2010: 124) shows that all too often traditional slave names reoccur among the free population. It is only in drama that “the Athenians were in a position to use names which would clearly demarcate slaves from citizens,” (Vlassopoulos 2010: 124). Drama could be used to reflect citizen ideology and did not necessarily have to reflect the ambiguity of social realities.

Amongst other explanations, Vlassopoulos (2010: 130) suggests that less distinction between citizen and slave names than previously acknowledged could reflect strategies for social mobility amongst masters and slaves. Certain names might mask status and afford a slave better opportunities, benefiting the slave and potentially their master or, if freed, their *prostates* (Vlassopoulos 2010: 130). This complication of the onomastic picture is excellent evidence when trying to recast slaves as social actors rather than merely passive objects. Conversely, if having a citizen-attested name did facilitate social mobility and allowed slaves to blend in, it is harder to identify slaves in the commemorative landscape, and doubtless there are slave memorials amongst the many monuments of which nothing about the status of the deceased can be said with certainty.

Names unaccompanied by any other indicator of status, then, are questionable as a criterion for the inclusion of monuments in the following collection, but in trying to be as comprehensive as possible those decorated monuments with slave names have been included.

IV.2.1.4 Other Indicators of Non-Citizen Status

While ethnics represent the most secure marker of non-citizen status and names and epithets can be telling, there are a few monuments with epitaphs that are indicative of the potential non-citizen status of the deceased. Rather than having the deceased's birthplace named explicitly in the form of an ethnic, foreign script, dialect or reference to personal circumstances in an epitaph points to foreign origins and, therefore, non-citizen status. Only one example of each of these ways of indicating status is included in this collection of decorated non-citizen memorials, though this is not to suggest there are not more such examples among undecorated memorials. A worn stele now in the Epigraphic Museum in Athens tells of the deceased woman dying away from her homeland, though where she is from is not mentioned (**F 19**). This echoes the Archaic period epitaph for Lampito (*IG I³ 1380*), perhaps suggesting that reference to dying away from one's homeland was part of a broader epitaphic tradition. The epitaph on a fragmentary stele now in the Getty Museum is rendered in either Boeotian or Megarian dialect (**F 73**; on dialect and script see Ginestí-Rosell 2012). Finally, the epitaph of a fragmentary stele now in the Piraeus Museum is written in Phoenician script, tying the deceased to a specific region more so than the other two epitaphs, but still not directly labelling this man as a Phoenician (**F 74**). Although these rare epitaphs demonstrate ethnic identity, they leave the legal status of the deceased undetermined, just as foreign names do. Whether metic or slave, however, the hints to their foreign origins mean these men and woman were more likely to have been non-citizens than citizens.

In closing this discussion on identifying non-citizen memorials, three monuments still need to have their inclusion in the following collection justified (**F 1, F 5, F 26**). This is because they either lack an epitaph that can be used to deduce the status of the deceased, or the epitaph only gives a name and it is not indicative of foreign origins or servile status. Instead they have been included on the grounds that their iconography is suggestive of their non-citizen status. This is a somewhat circular argument, that the deceased is a non-citizen because they look like one, which is why the inclusion of the majority of monuments is based on epigraphic rather than iconographic indicators. Though the status of these individuals will never be known with any certainty, when viewed alongside non-citizen memorials and against citizen

ones, it is not unjustified to think of them as non-citizens. In order to avoid repetition, no description of these three monuments will be provided here, instead they are described along with their contemporary monuments in the collection below.

Epitaphs, then, have been instrumental in assembling the following collection of non-citizen funerary monuments. It has also been demonstrated, however, that using epitaphs to determine status is not always straightforward and that certain markers of status, particularly names, cannot necessarily be taken at face value. For this reason, the assembled monuments are classified under one of three statuses. First, and most numerous, are those monuments convincingly honouring **metics**, giving either an ethnic or the title *isotelês* in their epitaph. Second, come those monuments assigned to **slaves** based on the adjective *chrestos* in the epitaph, limiting the number of such attestations to just 25 as already mentioned. The remaining monuments are grouped together on the grounds that they likely commemorate non-citizens, but it is not possible to pass judgment on their legal status with any certainty. Hence this third category of monuments is labeled **non-citizens of undefined status** and includes; monuments with foreign or ethnic names but lacking an ethnic or adjective; those with foreign script, regional dialect or reference to dying away from one's homeland; nurses without the adjective *chreste*; those included on iconographic grounds.

IV.2.2 Collecting and Organising Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments

IV.2.2.1 Existing Catalogues of Funerary Monuments

No catalogue of the funerary monuments of Classical Attica can ever be truly complete. On the one hand, what survives for study is only a fraction of the total number of funerary monuments produced, many having been lost or destroyed in the intervening centuries. On the other hand, excavations continue and the new finds they unearth mean no hardcopy catalogue can ever remain up to date. That said,

catalogues are still invaluable tools with which to begin searching for non-citizen funerary monuments.

Christopher Clairmont's (1993) 8-volume *Classical Attic Tombstones (CAT)* remains the most comprehensive English-language catalogue of Classical funerary monuments, including some 2662 monuments of varying type and condition (not including the epistyles and roof simae Clairmont includes in his supplementary volume, which lack preserved iconography). Of these 2662, 137 are of non-Attic provenance, included by Clairmont because they are Attic exports or atticizing in style, but these were excluded in the earliest stages of inquiry as they fall outside the limits of this study, non-citizen commemoration within Attica. While of course there will be other omissions either through oversight or discovery in the last 20 years, Clairmont (1993: introductory volume, v-vi) lists those monuments he has deliberately omitted, including; monuments too fragmentary to comment on; individual heads; statues without heads; painted gravestones where the painted decoration is entirely lost; funerary animals - though he includes some; and funerary banquet reliefs - though again he includes some. The fragmentary nature of most of the monuments Clairmont excludes makes it unlikely that there would be surviving inscriptions from which to deduce the status of the deceased, and freestanding sculpture and funerary animals are not themselves inscribed and so if their context is missing it not possible to associate them with other monuments where status might be given. Clairmont's omission of funerary banquet reliefs, though they are a small group, is regrettable owing to most of them being attestable as the memorials of non-citizens (Closterman 2015). The peculiar appeal of banquet scenes to non-citizens will receive attention later in this chapter (**IV.4.2.4**).

The monuments in *CAT* are organized across four volumes according to the number of adult and child figures and the date of the monument. For Clairmont, the status of the deceased plays no role in the organization of the catalogue, though the inclusion of inscriptions where one is preserved, along with the prosopography and index volumes, make the catalogue workable for present purposes. Clairmont (1993: prosopography vol, 9) admits "I cannot pretend that I have done more than scratch the surface with respect to the social status of the inscribed figures on Classical Attic tombstones." It was left to Johannes Bergemann (1997) in *Demos und Thanatos* four

years later to compare status and iconography, though as already remarked his inquiries are not without criticism.

Based on initial consultation of *CAT*, 160 monuments with surviving iconography commemorating metics, slaves and otherwise undefined non-citizens were identified. Through cross-referencing *CAT* with more recent catalogues of funerary monuments, including *Demos und Thanatos*, Andreas Scholl's (1996) *Die Attischen Bildfeldstelen*, Janet Grossman's (2013) funerary sculpture volume of the Agora results, and, in particular, Anna Ginestí-Rosell's (2012) *Epigrafia funerària d'estrangers a Atenes*, a further 13 non-citizen monuments with preserved iconography came to light, bringing the total to 173.

IV.2.2.2 Dating and Further Organization of the Collected Monuments

Following the example of *CAT* and other volumes, dating provides a logical structure for any catalogue and so the 173 monuments collected below are initially organised by date. Dating largely follows *CAT*, where monuments fall into one of the following ranges; 430-420 BC; 420-400 BC; 400-375 BC; 375-350 BC; 350-300 BC. The earliest potentially non-citizen memorial collected, however, is not included in *CAT* and pre-dates 430 BC. As a result, the earliest date has been extended back to 450-420 BC to accommodate this monument, though it is the only one that falls within this earliest date.

At the other end the funerary monument series, the final date range of the collection follows *CAT* in giving 300 BC, rather than 317 BC, the year of Demetrius of Phaleron's decree, as the end of decorated monument production. Clairmont extends the series to the end of the century on the grounds that the decree may have taken time to impact the fringes of Attica, such as Rhamnous on the northwest coast, from where some of the most grandiose citizen memorials are known. Many monuments lack an exact provenance, and only one non-citizen monument in the present catalogue comes from Rhamnous (**F 92**). Of those non-citizen memorials with an attested provenance most come from Athens, the Piraeus or their immediate environs, where the decree will have come into effect more quickly. Clairmont's reasoning, however, stands for those non-citizen memorials of the later fourth-

century BC from other outlying areas of Attica, and, of course, those memorials of unknown or general Attic provenance that may well have been erected in these more distant areas which the decree took longer to reach. Finally, there are those monuments that cannot be securely dated at all that are assigned loosely to the fourth-century BC. These undated monuments are included at the end of the collection.

The funerary monuments, then, are primarily organised by date as follows; 450-420 BC; 420-400 BC; 400-375 BC; 375-350 BC; 350-300 BC; undated monuments. Within each date range, the monuments are organised based on epigraphic indicators as follows; those with ethnics ($\alpha\text{-}\omega$); those with foreign script or language; those with foreign, ethnic or slave names; those with the title *isotelês*; those with the adjective *chrestos* or *chreste*; nurses; those with 'non-citizen' iconography (see section **IV.2.1.4**). If a monument's epitaph has more than one of these indicators, it is organized based on whichever comes first in this list. So for example, the combination of foreign name, *tithe* and *chreste* appears in some epitaphs, but the monument will be organised on the basis of the name. This strict ordering is not adhered to in the following descriptions, where monuments are discussed together with regard to similarities in iconography in relation to status. Instead, this ordering based on elements of the epitaphs justifies the number (**F 1 – F 173**) a given monument was assigned.

IV.3 Collected Non-Citizen Funerary Monuments: A Chronological Overview

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non-Citizen	TOTAL
450-420 BC (No.1)	0	0	1 (No.1)	1
420-400 BC (No.2-5)	1 (No.2)	0	3 (No. 3-5)	4
400-375 BC (No.6-26)	13 (No.6-18)	2 (No. 24-25)	6 (No. 19-23, 26)	21
375-350 BC (No.27-95)	48 (No.27-72, 86-87)	5 (No.88-92)	16 (No.73-85, 93- 95)	69
350-300 BC (No.96-150)	31 (No.96-124, 138-139)	16 (No.126-129, 132-135, 140-147)	8 (No.125, 130- 131, 136-137, 148-150)	55
Undated (No.151-173)	14 (No.151-163, 172)	2 (No. 167, 173)	7 (No.164-166, 168-171)	23
TOTAL	107	25	41	173

Table 4.1 Numbers of metic, slave and undefined non-citizen funerary monuments, organised by date.

IV.3.1 450-420 BC (F 1)

Only one monument, and that only possibly, commemorating a non-citizen survives from these early years of the revival of decorated funerary monuments (**F 1; figure 4.1**). The stele, found in the Piraeus and now in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, depicts a seated woman wearing two chitons, one slightly longer than the other, with a himation draped over her head and arms whilst holding a bird in one hand and a phiale in the other. This depiction is in no way unusual; single seated women with similar attributes are depicted later in the Attic series. What makes the present stele different is the style; K. Friis Johansen (1951: 137) describes the stele as “humble and rudely executed... the figure of the enthroned heroine... looks totally un-Attic.” The stele lacks an inscription, leaving the woman’s status undetermined, but it has been suggested that the deceased may originally have been from Thessaly and adhering to the artistic style of her homeland (NAM 711). Without an inscription this interpretation cannot be confirmed. The stele could

honour a citizen, metic or slave not hailing from Thessaly. Instead it could be seen as the work of a Thessalian craftsman who had relocated to the Piraeus and did not work in the Attic style. Equally possibly is that this is the work of a Thessalian craftsman for a Thessalian patron living and dying in the Piraeus. While none of these interpretations can be assured, the stele represents the influence of non-Attic styles in the re-emergence of private sepulchral art in Attic.

Figure 4.1 Funerary stele of a woman from Thessaly (?) (F 1). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 711. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

IV.3.2 420-400 BC (F 2-5)

As the fifth century BC draws to a close there is a steady increase in the number of monuments honouring non-citizens. All four monuments are types of stele, two with scenes in reliefs (**F 2**, **F 5**), one with painted decoration and no features in relief at all (**F 3**), and one where the relief scene sits in a sunken panel (**F 4**). All four stelai honour men, one a metic from Tegea (**F 2**), the other three of undefined status, and so either potential metics or potential slaves.

Only Lisas from Tegea (**F 2**) is depicted alone, wearing a pilos helmet, belted exomis and carrying a shield; he is striding into battle, no doubt a reflection of how he died. This stele commemorating a metic is one of the earliest depictions of warriors on private Classical funerary monuments, though the warrior motif, while exhibiting variation, is a regular one. Getas (**F 3**; **figure 4.2**) is not depicted on his stele at all, but instead clearly wishes to be remembered as an archer, a quiver painted on to the surface of the stele. Both his occupation as an archer and his name suggest he may have been of Scythian origin, though no ethnic is inscribed. Perhaps Getas (**F 3**) also died in battle as Lisas (**F 2**) likely did.

Euempolos (**F 4**; **figure 4.3**) and Xanthippos (**F 5**) are both identified by name alone, though the former's name, meaning well bought, is suggestive of servile status. The uncertainty of Xanthippos' (**F 5**) status has already been mentioned above. Both men, however, are depicted in a similar fashion; both are bearded, older men seated on chairs, each accompanied by two small children. While Euempolos (**F 4**) holds out a bird, often associated with children and youths in sepulchral art, Xanthippos (**F 5**) holds an object unique in Attic funerary reliefs – a cobbler's last – and so indicates his profession as a cobbler. As will be seen, such depictions of occupation are rare, but, as mentioned above, most depictions are qualified by an ethnic, foreign name or presumed servile status on the basis of the adjective *chrestos* or *chreste* being inscribed. The depiction of occupations is not unknown amongst attestable citizen monuments, and there is overlap in the depiction of citizen and non-citizen women at work, however, the occupations of men represented in sepulchral art differ between citizens and non-citizens, as we be discussed below (see **IV.4.2.1**).

Figure 4.2 Funerary stele of Getas, a Scythian archer (F 3). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 2611. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.3 Funerary stele of Euempolos, a slave (?) (F 4). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 778. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

IV.3.3 400-375 BC (F 6-26)

It is in the fourth-century BC that the production of funerary monuments really boomed and with it came increased representation of non-citizens. In the first quarter of the fourth-century BC, 13 metics (F 6-18), two slaves (F 24, F 25) and six other non-citizens or potential non-citizens (F 19-23, F 26) have been identified. These years preserve the first attestations of *chreste* in epitaphs, at least those with preserved iconography anyway (F 24, F 25). The beginning of the fourth-century BC also sees growing variation of monument types employed amongst non-citizens. The stelai with a sunken panel become more common, with seven examples in this quarter century (F 13, F 15, F 16, F 22-25). Unframed reliefs (F 8, F 9, F 21, F 26) and painted stelai (F 17, F 19) also persist, but are now joined by vessels – one loutrophoros (F 11) one lekythoi (F 18) – and the naiskos-type stelai on which figures are framed by pillars (F 6, F 7 – figure 4.4 – F 10, F 12, F 14, F 20), but not yet by full naiskos. Of these six naiskos-type stelai, five commemorate metics, as do both vessels.

During the first quarter of the fourth-century BC, there are more men, and women, characterised by their occupation or talent, like Xanthippos (F 5) in a preceding decade. The men are metics, Sosinous of Gortyn (F 6) and Olympichos and Potamon of Thebes (F 8; figure 4.5). Sosinous (F 6), like Xanthippos (F 5), is an older, bearded man seated by himself, not particularly unusual in Attic funerary repertoire. What distinguishes his memorial, however, is the addition of a round object leaning against his chair upon which he rests his hand. This has been identified as a bellows that would have been employed in metalworking. Olympichos and his son Potamon (F 8) are represented as engaged in less strenuous activity. Father and son are both depicted holding flutes (*auloi*), their talent for playing extolled in their epitaph, just as Sosinous' (F 6) occupation is attested in his epitaph. The memorials of these metics represent a development from the earlier depiction of Xanthippos (F 5), as a relationship is established between epitaph and relief. While it is evident that Attic funerary sculpture and painting relied on the stock scenes that form a shared iconography, the stelai of Sosinous (F 6) and Olympichos and Potamon (F 8) are very much idiosyncratic, in terms of both epitaph and iconography.

Figure 4.4 Funerary stele of Ktesileos of Erythrea and his wife Theano (F 7). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 3472.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.5 Funerary stele of Olympichos and Potamon of Thebes (F 8). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1962. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by E. Galanopoulos); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Continuing the representation of musical instruments in funerary scenes, another monument, while lacking any preserved inscription, shows a young woman holding what Clairmont (1993: vol I, 1.721) describes as a *krotala*, a type of percussion instrument (F 26; figure 4.12). Clairmont suggests that the woman, who is depicted with a child, may well have been a *hetaira* based on her possession of the *krotala*. If Clairmont is correct about her situation then it is likely she was of non-citizen status or had forfeited her citizen status.

The unnamed '*hetaira*' is not the only woman to have reference to her work made on her memorial, and is joined in this first quarter of the fourth-century BC by Kypria (F 22) and a nurse called Paideusis (F 25). Kypria (F 22) is depicted seated and bent over a *kalathos* while "passing woollen yarn through her hands" (Kosmopoulou 2001: 302). Like the potential *hetaira*, Kypria's (F 22) status is difficult to discern, her epitaph giving only her name. Angeliki Kosmopoulou (2001: 302) suggests her name indicates a Cypriot origin and that this likely makes her a metic. An ethnic name such as Kypria, however, is just as suggestive of servile status, such names assigned on the basis of origin or place of purchase (Braund 2011: 126). Kypria's status, then, remains undefined and, furthermore, her representation as woolworker does little to influence assigning her a status, as such domestic production befitted women of all statuses, including citizens (Kosmopoulos 2001: 301-302). Paideusis' (F 25) memorial is the earliest decorated stelai honouring a nurse to survive, as well as being one of the earliest identifiable commemorations for a slave on the basis of the adjective *chreste*. Even without the adjective, her servile status is implied by her name, which is formed with the Greek word for child / servant, *paidion*, possibly assigned to her by the family she served. While her epitaph is informative, the depiction of Paideusis on the sunken panel stele does nothing to indicate either her status as a slave or her role as nurse. Dressed in chiton and himation, Paideusis is seated, her feet on a footstool, a motif familiar in both single- and multi-figure scenes and here comparable with the contemporary stelai for Tito from Samos (F 15), a metic woman depicted alone, and Choregis (F 23), also depicted seated alone but of undefined status, her name suggesting that she was another potential *hetaira* (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.264). While later depictions of nurses are more indicative of their position when paired with their epitaph, without the title nurse being

inscribed the deceased's occupation would go unrecognised, unlike the visible occupations of Xanthippos (F 5) and Sosinous (F 6).

The nurse Paideusis (F 25) is one of two identifiable female slaves having died between 400 and 375 BC whose stelai survive. While Paideusis is depicted alone, Plangon (F 24; figure 4.11) is depicted at the centre of a sunken panel relief along with two other figures. Plangon herself is dressed and seated similarly to Paideusis, but is depicted bidding farewell to her husband, the pair united in the gesture of *dexiosis*, whilst attended by a female figure. This second female figure carries a box and wears a sakkos over her head, and either a sleeveless chiton or both a sleeveless and long-sleeved chiton – it is difficult to tell. The combination of box, sakkos and possible long-sleeved chiton mark this woman as slave, and so the slave Plangon, if *chreste* as an indicator is to be believed, is herself attended by a slave. Depictions of mistress and maid, either alone or with other relatives, is a common theme in Attic funerary iconography that will be attested again and again in the present collection of monuments, with slaves attending metic and non-citizen mistresses of undefined status, as well as amongst monuments honouring citizen women and the large number of monuments of which the status of the deceased is undetermined. The memorial of Plangon (F 24) and the later memorial of Soteris (F 89) – another slave identified on the basis of the adjective *chreste* – who is herself attended by a slave, will receive further attention later.

Single figure scenes, or at least single adult scenes, remain the most common amongst non-citizens monuments of this date. Sosinous (F 6), Tito (F 15), Kypria (F 22), Choregis (F 23), and Paideusis (F 25) are all depicted alone, and the unnamed *hetaira* only with a child (F 26). To these can be added; Hagestor of Megara (F 12; figure 4.7), depicted as an athlete on the basis that he holds a strigil and aryballos; Menekles of Megara (F 13), a bearded older man seated and holding a stick; [Ask]epiades of Miletus (F 14; figure 4.8), whose stele is broken but who seems to have stood alone or was perhaps accompanied by a dog; and Tibeios of Tieion (F 17) and Herseis (F 19), both figures painted onto their memorials seemingly alone. Antiochos from Knidos (F 9), Kallimandros from Siphnos (F 16), and Asia (F 20; figure 4.9) are all depicted with a child, Asia presumably the mother of the child

who reaches for her, but Antiochos is potentially the child's grandfather based on his age, and Kallimandros an older brother.

Depictions of multiple adults have already been encountered in this first quarter of the fourth-century BC; flute playing father and son Olympichos and Potamon from Thebes (**F 8**) and Plangon with her husband and slave (**F 24**). Also depicted together are husband and wife Ktesileos and Theano from Erythrae (**F 7**; **figure 4.4**), both names being inscribed throwing into question who was the primary deceased, but the husband's name being accompanied by the ethnic suggests it is Ktesileos. Like Plangon (**F 24**), wife Theano (**F 7**) is seated, but the couple do not engage in *dexiosis* and are sheltered in a naiskos. Demokrita and Arnion from Corinth (**F 10**; **figure 4.6**) are similarly framed in a naiskos, the woman once again seated, though the relative ages of the figures suggest they are mother and son rather than husband and wife, the mother being the principal deceased. Father and son Kydrokles and Stephanos from Kos (**F 11**) are depicted on the only loutrophoros of the first quarter the fourth-century BC to definitely commemorate a non-citizen. Form and scene combine to inform the viewer that it is son Stephanos who is the deceased, taking leave of his father to head to war accompanied by a squire, whose stature relative to Stephanos suggests his servile status. The only non-citizen lekythos of the quarter century shows a family from Phokis (**F 18**), only the father, Eukleidas, being named suggesting he is the deceased. This is the first identifiable non-citizen representation of a nuclear family, father, mother and two small children. This composition is uncommon not only across known non-citizen memorials, but across the corpus of Attic funerary monuments.

The final monument of this date to mention is the earliest example a banquet scene on a funerary monument, a motif in Attica almost unique to non-citizens. Gelon (**F 21**; **figure 4.10**), his status unknown, is depicted reclining on couch whilst holding out a cup. Behind him on the right-hand side of the stele is, according to the inscription, Kallistratos, an older man, who stands with his head in his hand as if in a fit of despair. The relationship between Gelon and Kallistratos can only be guessed at, perhaps brothers, but it is evident that Kallistratos is depicted here as deeply affected by Gelon's passing. While there is no ethnic or adjective to indicate Gelon's actual legal status, his name is attested as an ethnic slave name in other inscriptions

(Vlassopoulos 2010: 134, appendix). It is possible, then, that the earliest example of a banquet scene in Attica in a funerary context commemorated a slave, though it looks as though the stele was older and reused by Gelon, as the scene is cut through by the neck of a loutrophoros (Clairmont 1993: vol II, 2.278). Banquet scenes as distinctly non-citizen will receive further attention in a section following this chronological catalogue.

Figure 4.6 Funerary stele of Demokrita of Korinth and Arnion (F 10). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 5253. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.7 Funerary stele of Hagestor, son of Apollodoros, of Megara (F 12). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 13.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.8 Funerary stele of [Ask]epiades, son of Lukophrone, of Miletus (F 14). Piraeus, Archaeological

Museum 206. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.9 Funerary stele of Asia (F 20). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 767.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.10 Funerary stele of Gelon (F 21). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 971.

Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.11 Funerary stele of worthy Plangon, a slave (?) (F 24). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 5242.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.12 Funerary stele of a possible hetaira (F 26). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1896.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

IV.3.4 375-350 BC (F 27-95)

The second quarter of the fourth-century BC sees the zenith of funerary monument production across Attica, and in line with this is the peak of monuments identifiably commemorating non-citizens: 46 metics (F 27-72), as well as the first two appearances of the status *isotelês* on decorated monuments (F 86-87), five slaves (F 88-92), and a further 16 monuments commemorating possible non-citizens of unknown status (F 73-85, F 93-95). The sunken panel type stele remains the most popular form of memorial (see table 4.2), with at least 36 attested examples out of the total 69 monuments of this date. F 59, commemorating one or more Plataeans, may be a sunken panel or naiskos-type stele, however it is too damaged to be sure, with only the siren that topped the stele and part of the inscription preserved. By comparison, there is little growth amongst other monument types for non-citizens in this period, despite the growth in the total number of monuments overall.

Monument Type	375-350 BC (F 27-95)
Painted Stele	3 (F 29, F 52, F 71)
Incised Stele	4 (F 39, F 42, F 84, F 92)
Sunken Panel Stele	36 (F 27, F 28, F 30, F 34, F 36-38, F 40, F 41, F 43-47, F 51, F 53, F 55, F 56, F 58, F 63, F 66, F 67, F 70, F 72, F 75, F 77-81, F 85, F 86, F 88, F 91, F 93, F 95)
Stele with Relief	7 (F 54, F 61, F 65, F 83, F 87, F 90, F 94)
Stele with scene on loutrophoros	2 (F 48, F 69)
Naiskos-type Stele	9 (F 31-33, F 35, F 57, F 60, F 73, F 74, F 89)
Lekythos	7 (F 49, F 50, F 62, F 64, F 68, F 76, F 82)
Unknown	1 (F 59)

Table 4.2 Monument types amongst non-citizens between 375 BC and 350 BC.

With growth in the numbers of funerary monuments also comes a shift in figural representation. Prior to the second quarter of the fourth-century BC, single-figure depictions have dominated, at least amongst the memorials of non-citizens. By 375-350 BC, two-figure scenes, most often husband and wife (F 27, F 39, F 51-53, F 57, F 58, F 60, F 68, F 72, F 76, F 78, F 79, F 84, F 85, F 92, F 94) far outnumber

single-figure depictions. Of these husbands and wives, the sunken panel stele of Pyrrhias and Thettale (**F 78; figure 4.20**) stands out, as the couple is depicted on a couch in a banquet scene, only the second example of the motif after the earlier memorial of Gelon (**F 21**). Other relationships depicted based on the relative ages of figures, if not attested in the epitaph itself, include father and adult son (**F 38, F 49, F 50, F 62, F 66, F 69**), father and adult daughter (**F 37, F 40, F 42; figure 4.16**), mother and adult daughter (**F 65, F 87**), mother and child (**F 55, F 75**), mistress and maid (**F 32, F 43**), and athlete and slave (**F 35; figure 4.15**). There is also a pair of men from Olynthus (**F 56; figure 4.18**), and a pair of women (one of whose names – Malicha – suggests a Phoenician origin) whose relationships are unclear (**F 81**), as well as the possible depiction of two children, presumably siblings, from Salamis (**F 63**). There is a total of 37 monuments depicting two figures, then, be they two adults, adult and child, or, in the one case, two children.

While the number of single figure depictions relative to the total number of monuments has dwindled by this date – 16 single figure depictions out of a total of 69 (**F 28-31, F 36, F 46, F 47, F 48, F 54, F 61, F 74, F 82, F 83, F 90, F 91, F 95**) – they still exhibit the most variation and room for personalisation. It is in this quarter of the fourth-century BC that surviving memorials commemorating non-citizen children alone are first seen (**F 28, F 31, F 54 – figure 4.17 – F 61, F 83**). All five children, one girl, Moschine from Aspendos (**F 28**), and four boys, Onatoridas from Boeotia (**F 31**), Pamphilos from Miletus (**F 54**), Aristophon from Rhegium (**F 61**), and Sannion (**F 83**) – whose name suggests a servile origin – are depicted holding birds and accompanied by dogs, attributes observed for most children in the broader Attic corpus.

Depictions of working men and women as seen in the previous 50 years continue, still mostly single figure depictions, though while the total number of monuments rise, this kind of representation by comparison is still rare. Pithane (**F 90; figure 4.24**), a slave, is shown seated whilst holding up a spindle, indicative of wool working, though whether this was a task she performed for the family she served or as wife and mother in an independent household cannot be known. Six stelai commemorate nurses or midwives, though the depictions of these women do little to reflect this occupation (**F 46, F 91-95**). Two nurses, Pyraichme (**F 91**) and one

unnamed (F 92), are identified as slaves, whilst the legal status of Phanostrate (F 93; figure 4.25) is disputed (Carroll 2018: 36; Kennedy 2014: 141-143; Laes 2011: 156) and that of a further two unnamed nurses (F 94, F 95) is not specified, though the role of nurse makes a servile status likely. On the basis of the ethnic Kythera, Malicha (F 46) is one of only three nurses in this collection who can be identified as a metic. The only earlier memorial for a nurse, Paideusis (F 25), shows her seated alone. Of these six later memorials, three are like that of Paideusis, depicting each nurse alone, Pyraichme (F 91) and an unnamed nurse (F 95) seated, the stele of metic Malicha (F 46) is damaged but her forward-facing stance suggests she was depicted standing. Unlike Paideusis (F 25), Phanostrate (F 93) and the other two unnamed nurses (F 92, F 94) are not alone. The unnamed nurses are shown seated but they engage in *dexiosis* with men whose relative ages suggest they are the nurses' husbands, meaning these two stelai account for two of the 19 depictions of husband and wife in this quarter of the fourth-century BC. Phanostrate (F 93) is also seated but engages in *dexiosis* with a woman, Antiphile, the two accompanied by four children. Clairmont (1970: 131) suggests "a wealthy Attic family is responsible for the erection of the lady doctor's tombstone," Antiphile being a woman Phanostrate aided in childbirth and the four children the happy result. While the iconography of none of these three memorials alone clearly demonstrates the deceased's occupation as a nurse, in conjunction with the epitaphs their occupational identities are made apparent.

The only other two monuments of this date that hint at the deceased's occupation are those for Pantaleon (F 82; figure 4.22) and Seukes from Bithynia (F 30; figure 4.13). Pantaleon's (F 82) status cannot be known as he is referred to only by name, though his name is distinctly foreign, being rare in Attica and better known in the western Peloponnese and, conversely, the Greek East (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.377). Being depicted in short-sleeved, full-length chiton and carrying a kantharos suggests that Pantaleon had served as a priest, and in particular as a priest of Dionysos (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.377). If his name is truly indicative of foreign origins and, therefore, his likely status as a metic, Pantaleon's memorial, one of the few lekythoi of this date, is real evidence of non-citizen religious participation. Seukes from Bithynia (F 30), whose status as a metic is more assured on the basis of an ethnic, may also have been a priest, depicted as he is carrying a knife that may have been

used for sacrifice (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.380). His dress, however, counts against such an interpretation - a short chiton as opposed to the long robes associated with priesthood worn by Pantaleon (F 82). Clairmont (1993: vol I, 1.380) suggests the occupation of butcher for Seukes, reconciling working with the knife and un-priestly garments. Unlike in the epitaphs of Sosinous (F 6) and Olympichos and Potamon (F 8), there is no reference to Seukes' (F 30) occupation in his epitaph.

The remaining single figure depictions of this quarter century (F 29, F 36, F 47, F 48, F 74) make no reference in either epitaph or iconography to the occupation of the deceased. Of these five monuments, one metic woman is commemorated, Demetria from Kyzikos (F 47) depicted stood in a sunken panel, though the stele is damaged, and the remaining four commemorate men, at least three of who were metics. Eurachos from Elis (F 36) is depicted stood alone in a sunken panel, as is Demetria (F 47), while Tokkes from Aphyte (F 29) is rendered in paint only, seated on what appears to be a rock. Nikomachos from Lemnos now living in the Piraeus (F 48) was presumably painted onto the body of the loutrophoros carved on to his stele, the vessel suggesting he died fairly young, unmarried, and perhaps as a soldier, as the earlier loutrophoros for Stephanos from Kos (F 11) and the near contemporary stele with carved loutrophoros in which father and son Pamphilos and Kallias from Sikyon (F 69) are depicted suggest. The final presumed single figure monument - it is damaged, leaving only the upper right quarter of this naiskos-type stele – commemorates a Phoenician man (F 74; figure 4.19) on the basis of Phoenician script being used for his epitaph, a unique example amongst memorials with preserved iconography in the Classical period. A memorial using Phoenician script survives from the third century BC (Clairmont 1993: vol III, 3.410, Stager 2005; Tribulato 2013). Only the Phoenician's left hand is preserved, in which he holds an unidentified object. Interpretations include a writing tablet or bottle, either object being unique in the Classical Attic funerary repertoire (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.333).

The rest of the monuments of the second quarter of the fourth-century BC depict three figures (F 33, F 34, F 41, F 44, F 45, F 64, F 67, F 70, F 71, F 73, F 77, F 80, F 86, F 88, F 89). Five of these depict three adults amongst whom the relationships are uncertain. A family from Salamis (F 64) remembered on a lekythos may

comprise of father, son and a third male relative. A sunken panel relief stele for metics from Skaphlikos (F 70) may depict daughter, mother and father, but the proliferation of names in the epitaph makes assigning relationships difficult. A damaged memorial for a family from Boeotia (F 73), at least this is what the dialect of the epitaph suggests, has the heads of a male and female figure preserved, though the direction of their gaze suggests a former third figure. The last two memorials depicting three figures of uncertain relation are for a woman of possible Phrygian origin (F 80) and a slave woman (F 88). Kosmia (F 80; figure 4.21), whose name suggests Phrygian origins, is depicted seated in the middle of a panel, accompanied by an older male, bearded and leaning on a stick, and a younger male. They could represent father, mother and son but this is not certain and the inscription simply naming Kosmia gives no clues. Artemisia (F 88), a slave, is depicted seated shaking hands with a male figure in the presence of another female figure. They could be Artemisia's husband and daughter, but as with Kosmia's relatives their relationships are uncertain, only Artemisia being named and described as *chreste*. While the relationship depicted on these five memorials are unclear, the depictions themselves point to the wider familial networks of some metics and slaves.

The relationships depicted in other three-figure scenes are more straightforward owing to the supporting epigraphic evidence and the relative ages of the figures. Father and sons from Kythera (F 45) are rendered in relief within a sunken panel, the elderly father sat at the centre of the composition shaking hands with one son, the other, a warrior, stood behind his chair. In another sunken panel stele, a mother, seated, father and maiden daughter from Sestos (F 67) are shown together, though the stele is broken and the figures of father and daughter are preserved only to the waist and only the mother's head survives. Three other sunken panel reliefs depict father, mother and child (F 41, F 77, F 86), though in these instances the child is an infant clinging to one of its parents rather than a maiden or youth. The status of each family varies, though the scenes have much in common. Eutyichis, wife of Philippos and mother Dionysios is the most likely deceased honoured by this monument, at least originally (F 86). Her husband, Philippos, is designated *isotelês* in the epitaph, and consequently no ethnic is given. The next family are metics originally or historically from Kalamyde on Crete (F 41). While both husband and wife are named, Brithon and Agatheia respectively, Brithon may be the primary deceased

commemorated, his dress and sword suggesting he was a soldier. Here he takes leave of his wife, seated with their child, the pair engaging in *dexiosis*. The status of the final couple with a young child is not certain like the families of Eutyphis (F 86) and Brithon (F 41). Mother Hiero, child Aegyptia, and seated father Agathokles (F 77) are remembered by their names alone, though the ethnic name Aegyptia may indicate the foreign origins of the whole family and perhaps even servile status. Which of the family is the primary deceased is unclear.

Two further monuments, one another sunken panel relief stele (34), the other a naiskos-type stele (33), depict two adults and a child, though the relationships between the adults are more difficult to identify. Klea from Delphi (F 34) is seated on a chair, a small boy reaching for her whilst she shakes hands with a young man. This man seems too young to be Klea's husband and father to the boy; perhaps both are Klea's sons. Erene from Byzantium (F 33; figure 4.14), seated on a chair, is accompanied by another woman who holds a baby in her arms. The faces of both Erene and her companion are severely damaged, and so their relationship based on their relative ages cannot be established. The woman could be Erene's sister, daughter, or even mother. Alternatively, the woman could be Erene's maid, carrying as she does Erene's child, though her dress and stature compared to Erene do not make this relationship obvious.

A contemporary example of metic mistress and maid is the memorial of a mother and daughter, one of whom is named Herpillis, from Kresa on Crete (F 44). The daughter is seated on a chair attended by her mother. Behind them stands another woman of short stature who carries a box, almost definitely a slave. Husband Pamphilos from Torone (F 71) is followed by a servant-boy as he bids farewell to his seated wife Protho. A final memorial that includes an attending slave is of most interest, as the deceased herself is designated as a slave (F 89). Soteris (F 89; figure 4.23), framed within a naiskos, seated, is dressed in a chiton with a himation draped over her head and arms. She shakes hands with a woman, not named, who could be her daughter or sister. Behind Soteris stands a woman of shorter stature, wearing a long-sleeved chiton. Such attributes make her a likely slave, despite the fact that Soteris herself is labelled *chreste*, just as in an earlier memorial Plangon (F 24;

figure 4.11) is named a slave yet has an attendant of similar appearance. Both memorials will be returned to below.

Figure 4.13 Funerary stele of Seukes of Bithynia (F 30). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 1483.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.14 Funerary stele of Erene of Byzantium (F 33). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 3582.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.15 Funerary stele of Ariston, son of Ariston, of Ephesus (F 35). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 4487. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.16 Funerary stele of Kosmia of Kelainai, Phrygia (F 42). Athens, Epigraphic Museum 6176. Courtesy of the Epigraphic Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.17 Funerary stele of Pamphilos, son of Lampitos, of Miletus (F 54). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1980. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.18 Funerary stele of two men from Olynthus (F 56). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 1236. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.19 Funerary stele of a Phoenician (F 74). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 3580. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.20 Funerary stele of Thettale, wife of Pyrrhias (F 78). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 997. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.21 Funerary stele of Kosmia (F 80). Athens, Kerameikos Museum P 286 I 140.
Courtesy of the Kerameikos Museum, Athens (Photograph by E. Bardani); © Hellenic
Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.22 Funerary lekythos of Pantaleon, a possible priest of foreign origin (F 82). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 4495. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.23 Funerary stele of worthy and just Soteris, a slave (?) (F 89). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 1547. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.24 Funerary stele of worthy Pithane, a slave (?) (F 90). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 263. Courtesy of the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.25 Funerary stele of the midwife Phanostrate (F 93). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 993. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by Eir. Miari); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

IV.3.5 350-300 BC (F 96-150)

Despite the fact that the monuments of the second half of the fourth-century BC are not divided into quarter centuries, covering instead at least the 33 years down to 317 BC if not to the end of the century, the identified number of non-citizen monuments is now fewer, totalling only 55 examples compared with the 69 of the preceding quarter century. This decline is in line with a more general decline in the number of surviving decorated funerary monuments in the second half of the fourth-century BC. Of the 55 identified monuments, 29 commemorate metics (F 96-124), two *isoteleis* (F 138, F 139), 16 slaves (F 126-129, F 132-135, F 140-147), and a further eight commemorate possible non-citizens of unknown status (F 125, F 130, F 131, F 136, F 137, F 148-150). In terms of represented monument types, sunken panel stelai remain by far the most significant, with limited examples of painted and incised stelai, stelai with relief, naiskos-type stelai, lekythoi, trapeza and statues (table 4.3). Here also is the first and only non-citizen example of what for comparative purposes can be termed a naiskos, differing from contemporary and earlier naiskos-type stelai in that the figures are completely freestanding rather than being carved from the supporting frame. This is the famous Kallithea Monument now housed in the Piraeus museum (F 105; figure 4.31).

Monument Type	350-300 BC (No.96-150)
Painted Stele	1 (No.115)
Incised Stele	5 (No.101, 132, 135, 141, 146)
Sunken Panel Stele	32 (No.97-99, 102, 106, 109, 110, 113, 114, 117, 118, 121-129, 131, 133, 134, 136, 139, 140, 142-145, 147, 148)
Stele with Relief	5 (No.96, 104, 116, 120, 130)
Naiskos-type Stele	5 (No.100, 111, 112, 119, 138)
Naiskos	1 (No.105)
Lekythos	4 (No.103, 108, 137, 149)
Trapeza / Base	1 (No.107)
Freestanding Statues	1 (No.150)

Table 4.3 Monument types amongst non-citizens between 350 BC and 300 BC.

With regard to the number of figures depicted, two-figure scenes remain most common, with 26 instances of this date, of which 11 seemingly show husband and wife (F 98, F 101, F 103, F 111, F 118, F 126, F 128, F 129, F 135, F 144, F 147). Other pairings include father and daughter (F 106), father and son (F 138), father

and child (F 114), mother and daughter (F 131, F 136), mother and son (F 123), possible sisters (F 137), possible brothers (F 113, F 140), master / athlete and slave (F 109, F 124), nurse and child (F 139, F 146), nurse and patient (F 133), and a pair of statues of Scythian archers (F 150). Of the 11 couples, two are depicted reclining in banquet scenes, one a metic couple from Gerenia (F 98; figure 4.27), the other a slave nurse and her husband (F 147; figure 4.37). There are two other banquet scenes of this date but they do not depict couples. Instead a single male from Cyprus is depicted reclining, being waited on by a servant-girl (F 109; figure 4.32), and two men from Kios are depicted similarly reclined whilst waited on by a servant-boy (F 102; figure 4.29).

Single-figure depictions continue in the second half of the fourth-century BC, but now number only eight, if that, as certain of these monuments are damaged. Of these, five commemorate metics (F 96, F 97, F 110, F 116, F 117), all of whom are male, two of whom are warriors (F 97, F 110). Menes from Argos (F 97; figure 4.26) is depicted on horseback carrying a lance, whilst a man from Cyrene (F 110), though the stele is damaged, is shown with helmet and shield. Perhaps both died in battle as Lisas from Tegea (F 2), Brithon from Kalamyde (F 41), and Sosidemos from Salamis (F 66) may have done earlier. The remaining three single-figure depictions commemorate slaves, two men (F 132, F 141) and one woman (F 145). While earlier, and contemporary, memorials for slaves show them as cherished relatives, in rare instances even having slaves of their own, the inscribed depictions of Karion (F 132) and Kallias (F 141) seem to reflect a lowlier status. Karion's stele is damaged (F 132; figure 4.36), but he appears to be carrying a sack, perhaps meant to represent how he had toiled in life. Kallias' stele is even more damaged (F 141), but a similar representation to Karion is possible, and Clairmont (1993, vol I, 1.463) states "there can be little doubt that these very simple memorials for slaves are the work of one and the same hand."

The memorial for slave woman (Ch)rysis (F 145), a sunken panel stele, shows her stood alone, draped in a mantle, a slight alteration on earlier monuments for single non-citizen women, as those well enough preserved to be sure of the depiction depict these women seated (F 1, F 15, F 22, F 23, F 25, F 90, F 91, F 95). Furthermore, (Ch)rysis is not only referred to as *chreste*, suggesting servile status, but as the

daughter of Archestrate, as her mother's daughter rather than her father's, who is not named. Use of the metronymic rather than the patronymic is indicative of a father not recognising a daughter and, therefore, of her illegitimate and non-citizen status (Foley 2003: 119, 136; Golden 1990: 190). Going further, the metronymic might suggest that the deceased was a *hetaira*, as the profession could pass from mother to daughter (E.E. Cohen 2015: 145; McClure 2003: 76; Ogden 1996: 95-96). The metronymic "shows just how far outside normative Athenian social hierarchies the hetaerae and her brothel counterparts lived" (McClure 2003: 77). While not depicted alone, Hegeso (F 131), Nikarete from Thespieae (F 151) and Aspasia (F 170) – for Nikarete and Aspasia see **undated monuments** below – are referred to as the daughters of their mothers, Persis, Telexene, and Mania respectively, Persis and Mania being foreign names. On these memorials mother and daughter are depicted together. These two potential *hetaira*, however, are not referred to as *chreste*, as slaves, as (Ch)rysis is. Earlier memorials potentially commemorating *hetairai*, Choregis (F 23) and an unnamed mother (F 26), also declined to indicate the legal status of the deceased. While these five women may have been of similar social status, they were not necessarily of the same legal status, though owing to their occupation they were all presumably non-citizens.

In mentioning *hetairai*, single-figure depictions and the depiction of couples at banquets, four slave memorials have already been specifically highlighted (F 132, F 141, F 145, F 147). The second half of the fourth-century BC sees the zenith of identifiable slave memorials on the basis of the adjective *chreste*, with the first instances of the masculine form, *chrestos*, on decorated monuments. With 16 instances of the adjective, slaves account for 29 per cent of the identified non-citizen memorials of this period, compared to only 5 instances – seven per cent of 69 – in the preceding quarter century (375-350 BC). Of these 16, five commemorate male slaves (F 126, F 132, F 135, F 141, F 142), Karion (F 132; **figure 4.36**) and Kallias (F 141) already mentioned, and there is one example, unique in Attica, of the adjective in the masculine plural, *chrestoi*, suggesting that slaves Dexippos and Diaulos were both honoured by this sunken panel stele at the same time (F 140). Both are elderly men, bearded and dressed in himatia, Dexippos seated and Diaulos standing as they shake hands. Their relationship is unknown; perhaps they were

brothers, or perhaps they were slaves who lived and worked together under the same master.

The other three male slaves commemorated, unlike Karion (F 132) and Kallias (F 141), are not depicted alone. Artimas (F 127), though his stele is damaged, is depicted together with an unnamed woman, who on the basis of other memorials is his wife. The same is true for Getas (F 135), depicted with his presumed wife Mania, both of whose names suggest foreign origins of Scythia and Phrygia respectively. Mikias (F 142) is depicted along with two women whose relative ages suggest they are his wife and daughter. While he is the only figure named, the composition of the scene suggests the memorial did not initially or just honour him; from left to right are depicted his wife, seated, who shakes hands with his daughter, followed by Mikias, suggesting one of the two women was primarily honoured by this now damaged sunken panel stele. Either way, if the adjective *chrestos* can be trusted as indicating a slave, all three memorials seemingly depict slave ‘marriages’ and slave families, as do the earlier memorials for Plangon (F 24), Artemisia (F 88), and two nurses (F 92, F 147).

The remaining 10 slave memorials of the second half of the fourth-century BC all primarily honour women, possible *hetaira* (Ch)rysis (F 145) already mentioned. Four memorials, all sunken panel stelai, depict slave women with their husbands, one being a nurse and her husband reclining in a banquet scene (F 147; figure 4.38). Gnome (F 128), Doris (F 129; figure 4.35), and Phengos (F 144) are all depicted seated, shaking hands with their husbands who stand before them. All three women wear long chitons, but Gnome (F 128) and Phengos (F 144) are additionally covered by a himation draped over their heads and arms.

Two more commemorated slave women are nurses, one named so, the other’s occupational status implied by the way she is depicted. An unnamed nurse is depicted seated with a child standing in front of her (F 146). Based on her role as nurse the child is presumably a child of her master rather than her own, though without the epithet in the inscription it would be assumed this scene simply represented mother and child. Two contemporary memorials honour nurses and depict them with their charges, however, these women are a metic from Corinth

(F 107) and the daughter of an *isotelês* (F 139) respectively. Malthake (F 133) is not named as a nurse in her epitaph but if Clairmont (1993: vol 2, 2.457) is right in his interpretation of the accompanying scene, she is a nurse or midwife. A woman attends a reclining woman either stricken by illness or in childbirth. Clairmont (1993: vol 2, 2.457) suggests Malthake is the attending nurse rather than the dying woman. In addition, Malthake (F 133) is referred to as the daughter of Magadis, her mother, whose name suggests she is of Eastern origin and further supports the notion that she is of servile status and perhaps the nurse.

In the final three memorials for slave women of this period, the deceased are depicted in three-figure scenes and, for the first time, a four-figure scene. Aphrodisia (F 127) is depicted seated bidding farewell to her husband and child. Malthake (F 134) is also seated, shown with Nikippe, possibly her mother, and another female figure. The name Nikippe follows Malthake perhaps as a metronymic, so like Hegeso (F 131), (Ch)rysis (F 145), and Aspasia (F 170), Malthake, her mother and the third women depicted may have been *hetairai*.

The four-figure scene in which the epitaph includes the word *chreste* is difficult to interpret (F 143). An elderly man is depicted seated shaking hands with his daughter. They are accompanied by another elderly man and a slave girl characterised by her long-sleeved chiton and a box she carries. The two elderly men are named Moschos and Herakleides, their names followed by two more names or possibly ethnics (Clairmont 1993: vol IV, 4.446). Below these is the name Biounis, qualified by *chreste*, which Clairmont (1993: vol 4, 4.446) notes was inscribed later. This name could refer to the daughter and suggest the whole family was of servile status, yet attended by a slave like Plangon (F 24) and Soteris (F 89), or it could refer to the slave depicted or another slave dying later – the family could be metics or even citizens. Slaves could be commemorated and buried with the family they served (Closterman 2007: 639), and so neither interpretation can be ruled out.

This memorial for a possible slave family or a family and their slave is not the only monument with a multi-figure scene whose interpretation is not straightforward. Seven monuments commemorating metics depict three figures (F 99, F 105, F 107, F 108, F 119, F 121, F 122), whether adult, child or slave, and a further three depict

four figures (**F 100, F 112, F 120**). To these can be added four other non-citizen memorials, three with three-figures (**F 125, F 148, F 149**) and one with four figures (**F 130**). Most of these scenes represent father, mother and son or daughter, or father and children. Timagora from Delphi (**F 99**) is shown seated shaking hands with her mother, the exchange watched by her father Demokritos. Sotairos, son of Soklees, from Kyzikos (**F 108**), an elderly man seated on a chair, shakes hands with his wife, the couple accompanied by a young woman, presumably their daughter. Plangon from Plataea (**F 120**) is depicted reclining in childbirth, no doubt a reflection of how she died, attended by her father Tolmides, her unnamed mother and a slave girl, whose status is marked by her wearing of a sakkos. Alexandros from Samos (**F 121**), characterized as a young athlete by his nakedness, is also accompanied by his parents. Artimas and Manyka (**F 125**) were husband and wife, accompanied by their young daughter, Artimas probably the deceased or at least the initial deceased. Onesimos from Lesbos (**F 112; figure 4.33**) is depicted with his wife Protonoe and daughter Eukoline, along with Nikostate, perhaps a sister of Protonoe (Clairmont 1993: vol IV, 4.420). Father Epicharides and daughter Erato from Plataea (**F 119; figure 4.34**) are depicted with a female relative who is not named. Clairmont (1993: vol 3, 3.427a) suggests this woman who stands behind the seated Erato is another daughter of Epicharides and, therefore, Erato's sister. Apollodoros from Sidon (**F 122**) is shown seated watching his two children, a son and daughter, play with a dog.

Slaves are often part of multi-figure scenes, depicted alongside the family they served, as in the monument remembering Plangon of Plataea and her parents (**F 120**). To this can be added a family from Herakleia (**F 100**), father and son Nikeratos and Polyxenos from Istros (**F 105**), nurse Phanion from Corinth and her charge (**F 107**), Thous and his wife (**F 130**), and Moschion and his nurse (**F 149**).

Husband and wife Agathon and Korallion from Herakleia (**F 100; figure 4.28**) are depicted together with Agathon's brother Sosikrates. The monument is a naiskos-type stelai, Korallion, seated, and Agathon carved in the round, while Sosikrates and a slave girl are carved out of the wall of the naiskos. The composition of the figures means the slave girl is largely obscured by Korallion, but her cropped hair and the way she holds her head in one hand as if mourning her mistress are indicative of her status.

Nikeratos and Polyxenos' (**F 105; figure 4.31**) monument is unlike any other non-citizen memorial, and indeed unlike most other funerary monuments from across Attica, on account of its sheer size. Standing 8.3 m tall, the monument comprises life-size figures of father Nikeratos, draped in a himation, and son Polyxenos, a naked youth, accompanied by a slave boy who carries Polyxenos' cloak. These freestanding figures are sheltered by an Ionic naiskos that sits atop a podium decorated with an amazonomachy frieze (Hagemajer Allen 2003: 210-211). This memorial, known as the Kallithea Monument, commemorates a father and son from Istros on the coast of the Black Sea, and has been characterized as non-Attic and even non-Greek in style (Hagemajer Allen 2003: 211). In character, size and cost, the Kallithea monument stands out in the corpus of Attic funerary commemoration, demonstrating room to choose to be different within the commemorative landscape. It will be returned to at the close of this chapter (**IV.2.4.4**).

Thous and his wife (**F 130**), whose name suggests that like Nikeratos and Polyxenos he too was from the fringes of the Greek world, perhaps Paphlagonia, are depicted with a slave each, male and female respectively. While Thous is not designated slave by the adjective *chrestos*, the origin suggested by his name makes servile or formerly servile status a possibility. This couple may be slaves with their own slaves like Plangon (**F 24**) and Soteris (**F 89**).

Warrior Moschion (**F 149**), in knee-length chiton with Attic helmet, cuirass and chlamys, is accompanied by a slave boy squire and a woman who otherwise might be called Moschion's mother but who the inscription tells us was his nurse. This lekythos presumably honours Moschion, whose status is unknown, but as the woman is inscribed nurse it seems it honoured her too, and as has been seen, nurses were often slaves or metics. At least two figures on this memorial were non-citizens and probably both slaves – the squire and the nurse – even if it did not principally commemorate them. Another nurse, Choirine (**F 148**), is commemorated in a contemporary three-figure scene. She is depicted seated facing a couple that Clairmont (1993: vol 3, 3.429a) suggests may have erected the memorial for the nurse. The relationship of nurse and patron is similar to that depicted on the earlier monument for midwife Phanostrate (**F 93**). Neither woman is called *chreste* but their profession makes servile status a possibility. The status of another nurse, Phanion

(F 107), is secure as metic, the ethnic Corinth given after her name. She too is depicted seated, accompanied by a girl and a slave girl who carries a box. Like *hetairai*, then, nurses could hold different legal statuses despite being of similar social status. Nothing in the shared iconography alone characterizes them exclusively as nurses or *hetairai*. It is only through their epitaphs that their occupations can be known or inferred, as otherwise they resemble other non-citizen and citizen women depicted in the cemeteries.

Two memorials do not feature figural decoration at all. The stele for Simon from Miletus and Aphrodisia from Samos (F 115) has the outline of a house preserved. The couple were probably depicted within, rendered in paint which is now lost. On the stele for Dionysios of Icaria (F 104; figure 4.30) there was no figural decoration and instead two rams are depicted butting heads over a cup. The depiction of animals in place of human figures is rare on funerary monuments but is seen occasionally on decree reliefs (see Chapter V).

The final memorial of the second half of the fourth-century BC is a pair of statues of Scythian archers (F 150; figure 4.38). Both figures are damaged, but it is possible to see that both wore Scythian caps, long trousers and carried *gorytoi*, the only instance amongst the collected memorials of dress demonstrating ethnicity rather than status. From the Kerameikos, the pair is associated with a *peribolos* there, serving as boundary markers rather than as actual grave markers in their own right (Garland 1982: 129, 138). While the statues themselves probably did not commemorate actual non-citizens who had lived and died in Attica, they are still examples of the representation of non-citizens in the commemorative landscape, ironically better characterization as non-citizens than of any of the identifiable non-citizens on their memorials, most of whom blend in through their use of a shared iconography.

Figure 4.26 Funerary stele of Menes, son of Kallias, of Argos (F 97). Athens, Kerameikos Museum P 671 I 271. Courtesy of the Kerameikos Museum, Athens (Photograph by E. Bardani); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.27 Funerary stele of Hermogenes, Rode and Epigenes of Gerenaïos (F 98). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1025.
Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.28 Funerary stele of Korallion, wife of Agathon (of Herakleia) (F 100). Athens, Kerameikos Museum P 688 I 246. Courtesy of the Kerameikos Museum, Athens (Photograph by S. Mavrommatis); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.29 Funerary stele of Eutychides of Kios (F 102). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 3785. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.30 Funerary stele of Dionysus of Ikaria (F 104). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 806. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.31 Funerary monument of Nikeratos of Istros and his son Polyxenos, also known as the Kallithea Monument (F 105). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 2413-2529. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.32 Funerary stele of [Di]okles, son of Diokles, of Cyprus (F 109). Piraeus, Archaeological Museum 16. Courtesy of the Archaeological Museum, Piraeus (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.33 Funerary stele of Onesimos son of Onetor of Lesbos, Protonoe, Nikostrate and Eukoline (F 112). Athens, Kerameikos Museum P 694 I 281. Courtesy of the Kerameikos Museum, Athens (Photograph by E. Bardani); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.34 Funerary stele of Epicharides and Erato of Plataea (F 119). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 2559. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.35 Funerary stele of worthy Doris, a slave (?) (F 129). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1704. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by J. Petas); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.36 Funerary stele of worthy Karion, a slave (?) (F 132). Athens, Epigraphic Museum 6068. Courtesy of the Epigraphic Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.37 Funerary stele of a worthy nurse (F 147). Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1020.

Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 4.38 One of a pair of Scythian archer funerary statues (F 150). Athens, National Archaeological Museum, 823-824. Photograph taken by C. Sawtell and appears here with permission from the National Archaeological Museum, Athens; © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

IV.3.6 Undated Monuments (F 151-173)

The final 23 non-citizen funerary monuments cannot be assigned more precise dates than the fourth-century BC, or at best the first half of the fourth-century BC.

Imprecision in the dating of these monuments is in certain cases no doubt the result of the poor condition in which they survive. 13 commemorate metics (F 151-163), one an *isotelês* (F 172), two slaves (F 167, 173), and seven non-citizens of unknown status (F 164-166, F 168-171).

The stelai honouring Nikarete, daughter of Telexene, from Thespieae (F 151), Leon from Sinope (F 152), and Panphile from Sinope (F 153) are all dated to the first half of the fourth-century BC. Nikarete and her mother (F 151), possible *hetairai* as mentioned above, were painted on to the stele, the paint now faded. Leon from Sinope (F 152) was not depicted on his stele at all. Instead a lion in profile is framed in a sunken panel. While lions were a part of the Attic funerary landscape, this was usually in the form of freestanding *periboloi* boundary markers, like the Scythian archers (Garland 1982: 129), rather than on grave stelai themselves. A third century BC stele for a Phoenician shows the deceased being mauled by a lion but this is the only other instance of a lion featuring on a grave stele (Clairmont 1993: vol III, 3.410; Stager 2005; Tribulato 2013). Panphile (F 153), also from Sinope, is shown seated, a himation covering her head and arms, reaching to remove some item from a box held by an accompanying slave girl who wears a sakkos and long-sleeved chiton.

The remaining 20 monuments are simply assigned to the fourth-century BC. Most of these are two-figure scenes: four couples (F 155, F 157, F 160, F 172), one of which is a banquet scene (F 172), two fathers and daughters (F 156, F 159), two mothers and daughters (F 162, F 170), the memorial of Aspasia (F 170) already mentioned above, a mistress and maid (F 165), a pair of opposing warriors (F 171), and five pairs whose relationships are uncertain (F 158, F 161, F 163, F 166, F 167).

Philostratos and a woman from Kalchedonia (F 158) may be husband and wife, as may slave nurse Theoxene and the male figure she is depicted with (F 167). Another Theoxene (F 166) is depicted with another woman, perhaps her mother or daughter. While this Theoxene is neither named as a slave or a nurse, her name suggests

Thracian origins and, therefore, non-citizen status. A woman from Macedon (**F 161**) and a man from Megara (**F 163**) seem to initially have been depicted with a second figure, but both stelai are so fragmentary the sex of these figures is uncertain. The same is true of a stele commemorating a family from Herakleia (**F 154**). Two figures, one male and one female, are depicted standing but a third seated figure probably occupied the left half of the scene now broken away. As such the relationship between these figures is unknown. The stele for Skiapos (**F 171**), whom Bähler (1998: 213) classifies as Ethiopian, shows him as a warrior battling his opponent, a unique scene amongst recognisably non-citizen memorials. Another unique occurrence is that of the title *proxenos* on a decorated funerary monument (**F 162**), though the Megaraian himself is not depicted, just his wife and their daughter.

Two non-citizen women, one of unknown status (**F 168**) and one a slave (**F 173**), are depicted by themselves. Thraitta (**F 168**), while not designated slave, has a name indicative of Thracian origin and, therefore, of servile status. She is depicted seated holding a spindle, not unlike the earlier memorial for slave woman Pithane (**F 90**). Melita (**F 173**) is designated *chreste* and, if the designation of the adjective is to be believed, a slave. Exactly how Melita was depicted is unclear; her image was painted on to her stele and has since faded.

Based on onomastics, a surviving naiskos-type stele commemorates a family of Thracians, perhaps depicted with a slave girl of their own (**F 169**). Timon and Herpyllis, perhaps husband and wife, shake hands, Thraitta stood between them, though her relationship to the possible couple is unknown. Behind Herpyllis, who is seated, is a slave girl, identified by the box she carries and her subordinate position behind Herpyllis, similar to the slave girl accompanying Korallion and her husband and brother-in-law from Herakleia (**F 100**).

A final undated stele may depict a metic couple together with a named slave (**F 164**). A man from Rhodes is named, though his name is damaged, followed by the names Eutyichis and Tibeios, the latter qualified by *chrestos*. Eutyichis may have been the wife of the now nameless man from Rhodes, who is depicted seated, Tibeios stood behind him. Clairmont (1993: vol I, no.111) suggests they may be father, mother and

son, but this does not account for the use of *chrestos*, unless the family is originally from Rhodes but are now slaves in Attica. Alternatively the monument may remember husband and wife and their slave Tibeios, as is potentially the case for Biounis (F 143) in the second half of the fourth-century BC.

VI.4.1 A Shared Iconography: Familial Relationships and Dress

The 173 identified non-citizen funerary monuments recorded above represent only a small number of the total Attic funerary corpus. At every date, non-citizen monuments are matched or outnumbered by citizen examples, identified by an inscribed demotic. All monuments on which the status of the deceased is known or can be inferred, as is the case amongst certain of the collected non-citizen memorials, are overshadowed by the mass of commemoration for individuals of unknown status. This includes those memorials on which only names, or names and patronymics, were inscribed or survived, and those where no inscription survives at all (table 4.4).

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non-Citizens	Citizens	Unknown -Name/s Only	Unknown – No Inscription	TOTAL
450-420 BC	0	0	1	1	7	7	16
420-400 BC	1	0	3	4	42	69	119
400-375 BC	13	2	6	48	210	163	442
375-350 BC	48	5	16	164	413	472	1118
350-300 BC	31	16	8	93	151	227	526
Undated	14	2	7	56	141	97	317
TOTAL	107	25	41	366	964	1035	2538

Table 4.4 Total number of funerary monuments with surviving iconography, organised by date, based on the total in *CAT* (plus 13 extra non-citizen examples [F 1, F 3, F 59, F 96, F 98, F 102, F 104, F 105, F 109, F 115, F 147, F 154, F 172], minus those monuments in *CAT* with non-Attic provenances and the epistyles and roof simae of *CAT*'s Supplementary Volume, which lack preserved iconographic features).

Despite differences in status or known status being lacking, the same scenes appear time and again across the Attic funerary landscape. In his recent volume *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body*, Robin Osborne (2011: 24) observes that,

There is no disputing that status distinctions mattered in Athens. Slaves, resident aliens (metics), and citizens all had different positions in law at Athens. But the significance of those differences in daily life must come into question if the differences could not be put into operation at the moment at which they would be of consequence.

The existence of ‘free spaces’ and the shared identities that played out within them account for the masking of legal differences. While the law made distinctions between citizens and non-citizens, in social, economic and religious terms these groups had much in common. This accounts for the shared repertoire of funerary imagery amongst citizens, metics, slaves which in the main centres around familial relationships.

IV.4.1.1 Husbands and Wives

The depiction of husband and wife, identified through their epitaphs and the relative ages and intimacy of the couple depicted, is one of the most common scenes on monuments across all statuses and of all types at any given point during the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC that sculpted funerary monuments were being produced (**table 4.5**). Husband and wife only scenes account for nine per cent of the Attic corpus based on Clairmont’s *CAT* and the additional non-citizen monuments collected. Looked at by status, however, despite identifiable metics and slaves being so sparsely represented, scenes with just a couple account for a greater proportion of the memorials for non-citizens. 17 per cent of metic and *isotelês* monuments depict couples, as do 24 per cent of those for slaves, granted only 24 per cent of a total of 25 slave memorials. By comparison, only 13 per cent of known citizen funerary monuments depict just couples, though the total is of course greater. Of all the memorials of unknown status, a total of 1999, only eight per cent, 164 monuments, shown just couples.

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non- Citizens	Citizens	Unknown -Name/s Only	Unknown – No Inscription	TOTAL
450-420 BC	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/7	0/7	0/16
420-400 BC	0/1	0/0	0/3	1/4	2/42	1/69	4/119
400-375 BC	1/13	0/2	0/6	2/48	10/210	8/163	21/442
375-350 BC	10/48	1/5	5/16	21/164	42/413	58/472	137/1118
350-300 BC	4/31	5/16	0/8	10/93	14/151	17/227	50/526
Undated	3/14	0/2	0/7	13/56	11/141	1/97	28/317
TOTAL	18/107	6/25	5/41	47/366	79/964	85/1035	240/2538

Table 4.5 Total of depictions of husband and wife only across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments, not including the four banquet scenes depicting couples (F 78, F 98, F 147, F 172), which are classified specifically as banquet scenes rather than just as depictions of husband and wife.

While the percentage of depictions of couples may seem small, they represent the single most common scene in the Attic funerary corpus with the exception of what for ease can be termed small family groups (**table 4.6**). These scenes consist of three or four figures depicted together whose relationships are unknown or attested too infrequently to classify. Often, but not always, two of these figures are, or appear to be, a couple, accompanied by a third and sometimes fourth figure of unknown relation. Possibilities include father, mother, brother or sister of either the husband or wife, but not the son or daughter of the couple, whether adult or infant, slaves, or the combination of father, mother, son / daughter and slave, all of which occur often enough to classify separately, though not necessarily amongst non-citizens. The representation of married couples, whether alone or with other relatives or slaves, shows the desire to promote marriage in the context of funerary commemoration, and not just amongst citizens, for whom legitimate marriage was integral to the continuation of that status for future generations. Marriage was also important for metics and slaves in social terms even if not in political ones. Unlike citizens, however, identified non-citizens were less likely to be depicted with their spouse along with other family members, perhaps a reflection of many metics' and slaves' limited familial networks, or less concern to promote them. Depictions of larger family groups, five or more figures, are known from the Classical period (**table 4.7**), but they are rarer, numbering only 29 compared to 435 depictions of three to four

family members together - not including depictions of what today would be termed a nuclear family of husband, wife, child, or depictions of husband, wife and slave. Only one identified non-citizen memorial depicts five figures but it does not show family members together, rather it shows midwife Phanostrate and patron Antiphile and her three children (**F 93**). Funerary monuments depicting husband, wife and slave total 54, though only four commemorate non-citizens (**F 24, F 71, F 130, F 148**). This includes the stele for nurse Choirine (**F 148**), a possible slave, or at least a woman whose services the couple had employed, and a couple of unknown status. There are 10 instances of citizen couples with a slave, and a further 40 of unknown status.

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non-Citizens	Citizens	Unknown -Name/s Only	Unknown – No Inscription	TOTAL
450-420 BC	0/0	0/0	0/1	1/1	0/7	0/7	1/16
420-400 BC	0/1	0/0	0/3	0/4	3/42	16/69	19/119
400-375 BC	0/13	0/2	0/6	8/48	30/210	27/163	65/442
375-350 BC	4/48	1/5	2/16	40/164	95/413	76/472	218/1118
350-300 BC	4/31	2/16	0/8	21/93	30/151	40/227	97/526
Undated	0/14	0/2	2/7	5/56	15/141	31/97	35/317
TOTAL	8/107	3/25	4/41	75/366	173/964	172/1035	435/2538

Table 4.6 (above) Total of depictions of small family groups (three or four figures) across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments.

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non-Citizens	Citizens	Unknown -Name/s Only	Unknown – No Inscription	TOTAL
450-420 BC	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	0/7	0/7	0/16
420-400 BC	0/1	0/0	0/3	0/4	2/42	1/69	3/119
400-375 BC	0/13	0/2	0/6	1/48	5/210	1/163	7/442
375-350 BC	0/48	0/5	1/16	0/164	4/413	2/472	7/1118
350-300 BC	0/31	0/16	0/8	3/93	3/151	3/227	9/526
Undated	0/14	0/2	0/7	1/56	1/141	1/97	3/317
TOTAL	0/107	0/25	1/41	5/366	15/964	8/1035	29/2538

Table 4.7 (above) Total of depictions of large family groups (five or more figures) across status and time as a fraction of the total monuments.

IV.4.1.2 Parents with Grown or Infant Children and Child Memorials

After husband and wife, the most common familial relationship between adults depicted on all funerary monuments is that of mother and daughter, with 78 monuments depicting this pairing. Seven commemorate non-citizens (**F 65, F 87, F 131, F 136, F 151, F 162, F 170**), a further eight commemorate citizens and the remaining 63 are of unknown status. An additional 26 scenes show mother, daughter and slave, though only two honour non-citizens (**F 89, F 44**), four citizens, and the rest deceased of unknown status. Fathers and daughters are slightly less common, with 66 examples. Of these, six are metic fathers and daughters (**F 37, F 40, F 42, F 106, F 156, F 159**), eight are citizen fathers and daughters, and 52 are of unknown status. There are no attestable examples of slave fathers and adult daughters. There are 12 scenes showing father, daughter and slave, though only three are known to be citizens and the rest are of unknown status.

Depictions of father and son or mother and son at first appear fewer than those of one parent and daughter, however, many sons are depicted as warriors departing for war and so are classified differently. Father and civilian son depictions number 59, of which seven are metic. 14 citizen fathers and civilian sons are depicted and there are another 38 fathers and sons of unknown status. Depictions of father, civilian son and slave number 18, but only one honours non-citizens, metics Nikeratos and Polyxenos from Istros (**F 105; figure 4.31**) commemorated by the Kallithea monument. The pairing of mother and son is far rarer, with just two scenes showing metics (**F 10, F 123**), a further two showing citizens, and the remaining 14 of unknown status. There are 11 scenes showing mother, son and slave, but none of these are known to commemorate non-citizens, though only two definitely commemorate citizens.

Scenes with father, mother and adult daughter are as common as those with just father and daughter, with a total of 66 such scenes. Of these families, however, only two are metic and one is slave, yet 14 are known to be citizen, the remaining 49 of unknown status. A further 12 scenes feature a slave as well, though none can be identified as commemorating non-citizens, yet only three are definitely citizen families. Father, mother and adult son depictions are again fewer as depictions of

warriors are discounted, totalling only 36 – one metic (**F 121**), seven citizen, and 28 of unknown status. Only eight scenes show father, mother, son and slave, none of which represent metics or slaves, though only two definitely representing citizens.

Monuments exclusively commemorating children number 114 depictions of one child and a further eight of two or more children. 4 stelai commemorate single metic children (**F 28, F 31, F 54, F 61**), one commemorates two or more metic children (**F 63**), and a further stele commemorates a boy named Sannion (**F 83**), whose name suggests foreign if not servile origins. All five stelai are dated between 375 and 350 BC, the quarter century in which child memorials peak, 74 depicting single children and 4 depicting two or more children. From the reintroduction of sculpted funerary monuments in the second half of the fifth century BC until the end of the first quarter of the fourth-century BC, the total of child memorials is only 23, and from the middle of the fourth-century BC until 317 BC or the end of the century there are only 20.

Children also feature on monuments with adults, the production of which is more evenly distributed across the chronological span of the Classical Attic funerary series. Depictions of mother and child or children are most common, more so than depiction of either parent and adult son or daughter, with 81 attestations of which two are metic, and another three are possible non-citizens of unknown status. Only three mothers and children are definitely citizens based on a surviving epitaph. Representations of fathers with young children, with or without a wife and mother present, are far less common. Scenes of father, mother and child total 44, two metic, one slave, and a further two non-citizens. Only four such scenes are definitely citizen families. Father and child scenes are even fewer with just 13 attestations, two metic, one other non-citizen, and three definitely citizen. Finally, children are depicted with men and women whose ages rule them out as a parent, but instead suggest they are a grandparent or older sibling. An epitaph may attest to the relationship between adult and child, as in the case of nurses and children (**F 107, F 139, F 146**), all such women likely non-citizen if not servile depicted with free if not citizen children. 17 children are depicted with women who are not deemed to be their mothers, the three nurses and a further 14 women and children of unknown status. 11 children are

depicted with men other than their fathers, including Antiochos from Knidos (**F 9**) and his likely grandson. The remaining 10 men and children are of unknown status.

IV.4.1.3 Brothers and Sisters?

While the relationships of most of the men and women represented in two- or more figure scenes can be inferred or are given in the epitaph, there are depictions of two women whose similar ages mean they cannot be mother and daughter, men who cannot be father and son, and men and women who cannot be father and daughter or mother and son and are unlikely to be husband and wife. The similar ages of these figures, ranging from youths and maidens to elderly men and women, make it likely that they represent siblings, though only in those instances where the two figures have the same patronymic or cognate names can this interpretation be definite. Scenes with possible sisters are more common than those with possible brothers and possible brother and sister, numbering 105, 80 and 78 respectively, of which 8, 10 and 11 respectively are citizens. Three pairs of likely non-citizen women are possible sisters (**F 81, F 137, F 166**), along with three pairs of metic men (**F 56, F 113, F 163**) and a pair of slaves who may be brothers (**F 140**). The relationship between Philostratos and a woman from Kalchedonia (**F 158**) and that between an unnamed man and nurse Theoxene (**F 167**) is speculated as husband and wife, but this is uncertain, leaving brother and sister as a possibility, or in the case of Theoxene, who is designated slave, master and slave, the scene therefore comparable to that commemorating fellow nurse Choirine (**F 147**).

IV.4.1.4 Dress

With the exception of the Scythian archer statues (**F 150**), dress fails to distinguish metics and slaves from the citizens they were commemorated alongside in the cemeteries of Attica, no doubt a reflection of the social reality of being unable to tell citizens, metics and slaves apart in the street as the Old Oligarch (Ps. Xen. *Const. Pol.* 1.10) complained. Only when slaves are depicted with their mistresses and masters, when they are not themselves the focus of the memorial, is status made apparent through dress. Dress depends on the age of the deceased, particularly if male, and has nothing to do with the legal status of the deceased. Young men are

often depicted naked, often in athletic pose with strigil and aryballos or else with a slave who carries these attributes. Non-citizen examples including Hagestor from Megara (**F 12; figure 4.7**), Ariston from Ephesus (**F 35; figure 4.15**), and Stephanos from Phokis (**F 124**). Youthful sons depicted with one or both parents are sometimes seen naked, such as Alexandros from Samos (**F 121**) and Polyxenos from Istros (**F 105**), though they were also depicted clothed, such as Potamon from Thebes (**F 8; figure 4.5**), Arnion from Corinth (**F 10; figure 4.6**), Herakleidas from Delphi depicted with likely mother Klea and little brother (**F 34**), Charinos from Thasos (**F 38**), and Minakos from Kythera (**F 45**). Husbands and fathers partially cover their nakedness, their arms and lower body draped in a himation. Elderly men too wear himatia but are shown supporting themselves with sticks to convey their advanced age. Amongst non-citizens such elderly figures include Antichos from Knidos (**F 9**), Kydrokles from Kos (**F 11**), Menekles from Megara (**F 13**), Xanthippos from Thasos (**F 38**), Pamphilos from Sikyon (**F 69**), an unknown relative of Kosmia (**F 80**), and the father of Alexandros from Samos (**F 121**).

Like men, the attire of women is somewhat reliant on their age, though the basis of all female dress in funerary monuments was some sort of chiton or peplos. Girls and young women might wear a sleeveless chiton, as do the unnamed *hetaira* with *krotala* (**F 26; figure 4.12**), Silenis from Boeotia (**F 32**), and a slave girl attending Diokles from Cyprus (**F 109**), but most women wear a sleeved chiton or a combination of sleeved and sleeveless chiton. Older women, often those depicted as wives, are further covered by a himation draped over their heads and arms. Such modest non-citizen women include the unnamed woman possibly from Thessaly (**F 1; figure 1**), Demokrita from Corinth (**F 10; figure 4.6**), Tito from Samos (**F 15**), Nikaso from Aegina (**F 27**), Erene from Byzantium (**F 33; figure 4.14**), Agatheia from Kalamyde (**F 41**), Nikeso from Olynthus (**F 55**), Athenais from Sestos (**F 67**), Siga (**F 84**), slave Soteris (**F 89; figure 4.23**), Antiphile who thanks midwife Phanostrate, though not Phanostrate herself (**F 93; figure 4.25**), Rhode (**F 98**), the unnamed mother of Timagora from Delphi (**F 99**), Korallion from Herakleia (**F 100; figure 4.28**), Phylako from Cyrene (**F 111**), Nikostrate from Lesbos (**F 112; figure 4.33**), Erato from Plataea (**F 119**), slave Gnome (**F 128**), slave Phengos (**F 144**), Panphile from Sinope depicted with her maid (**F 153**), Polykratis daughter of the *proxenos* from Megara (**F 162**), Thraita and Herpyllis (**F 169; figure 4.40**), and the

unnamed wife of *isotelês* Sparton (F 172). Women, regardless of status, with the exception of priestesses, always appear to be depicted in a domestic setting, meaning there is little variety in their dress, unlike men who can be depicted as warriors, athletes and, in the case of non-citizens, skilled workers.

IV.4.1.5 Dying for the *Polis*: Warriors and Warfare

Dominating in the Archaic period, warrior imagery transitioned to the white lekythoi of the early fifth century BC and back on to sculpted monuments during the Peloponnesian War. Warrior imagery does not seem to have dominated at any one moment in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, rather it appears to have increased with the general increase in funerary monument production until its peak in the second quarter of the fourth-century BC and declined in the second half of that century (table 4.8). Scenes with warrior imagery include; single warriors; warrior and squire; two or more warriors depicted together as comrades; two or more warriors with one or more squires; a warrior leading a horse; a warrior on horseback; warriors engaged in battle on foot; warriors engaged in battle on horseback; a warrior departing one or more relatives for battle, presumably from which he did not return. At least 195 memorials survive in which a warrior is depicted, but of these 139 are warrior departing scenes, so while the garb of the warrior alerts the viewer to the man’s completion of his civic duty, which took him away from the home, he is also shown as a member of an *oikos* who grieve his passing (Arrington 2015: 217-218).

DATE	Metic / Isotelês	Slave	Undefined Non-Citizens	Citizens	Unknown -Name/s Only	Unknown – No Inscription	TOTAL
450-420 BC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
420-400 BC	1	0	0	0	8	10	19
400-375 BC	1	0	0	12	21	18	52
375-350 BC	2	0	0	15	15	33	65
350-300 BC	2	0	2	9	14	16	43
Undated	0	0	1	6	5	4	16
TOTAL	6	0	3	42	63	81	195

Table 4.8 Total of all warrior and warfare scenes across status and time.

Only six identifiably metic memorials and three possible non-citizen ones, including the Scythian archers (F 150; figure 4.39) who represent non-citizens but may not

commemorate them, depict warriors in the course of the entire Classical Attic series. Of the only six memorials that can be said to commemorate male slaves on the basis of the adjective *chrestos*, none are warriors, though squires depicted either just with warriors or as part of departure scenes may represent slaves, though they themselves are not the recipients of these memorials. As a percentage of the total 173 non-citizen monuments, these nine warrior depictions count for only 5 per cent, compared with identifiably citizen memorials, of which warrior scenes constitute 11 per cent. Though there are a further 144 memorials depicting warriors of unknown status across the period, the bias towards citizens amongst those monuments for a deceased of known status could indicate that many of these undefined warriors were more likely to be citizens than metics, and it is unlikely any of them were slaves. The limited presence of warrior imagery amongst metics may not necessarily represent a limited number of metic men performing military service but a choice not to have themselves represented as warriors. Perhaps not all metic men who died in battle chose to advertise this fact, as Lisas of Tegea (**F 2**), Stephanos of Kos (**F 11**), Brithon of Kalamyde (**F 41**), Sosidemos of Salamis (**F 66**), Menes of Argos (**F 97**; **figure 4.26**), a man from Cyrene (**F 110**), Moschion (**F 149**), and Skiapos (**F 171**) did. Instead metic men kept mostly to the iconography of private life, most choosing domestic family scenes used by citizens, but others choosing to depict themselves at their work, scenes not seen on citizen memorials and so not part of shared iconography.

Overall, then, metic and slave funerary monuments were for the most part inconspicuous amongst those of citizen men and women. Like citizen memorials, those of metics and slaves stressed the importance of family, and in particular marriage, and dress helped determine these social relationships by reflecting the ages of the figures depicted. The iconography, while idealised, reflected their values and the realities of their lives in Attica, just as it did for citizens. Despite the general continuity of iconography across legal statuses, however, there are depictions that are unique amongst non-citizens and so require further interrogation.

IV.4.2 Peculiarly Non-Citizen Iconography

IV.4.2.1 Occupational Pride

The only occupation to be attested multiple times in the collection of non-citizen memorials is nurse - *tithe*. 13 women are identified as nurses (**F 25, F 46, F 91, F 92, F 94, F 95, F 107, F 139, F 146, F 147, F 148, F 149, F 167**), 4 of them referred to only as nurse with no personal name, unless *tithe* had become their personal name (**F 94, F 95, F 146, F 147**). If the adjective *chreste* consistently refers to slaves then at least six of these women are of servile status (**F 25, F 91, F 92, F 146, F 147, F 167**). Nurses Malicha (**F 46**) and Phanion (**F 107**) appear to have been metics from Kythera and Corinth respectively, neither of whom are referred to as *chreste*, but Melitta (**F 139**), the daughter of an *isotelês* and therefore not a slave, is still referred to as the worthy nurse, τὴν χρηστὴν τίτθην (*IG II² 7873*). The use of the adjective with a free status throws into question whether or not all other epitaphs with the adjective do actually commemorate slaves. With the exceptions of Malicha (**F 46**), Phanion (**F 107**), and Melitta (**F 139**), it is not unreasonable to take the other nurses for slaves, whether they are referred to as *chreste* or not, as the nurses of Athenian literature are usually servile, or at least foreign (Beaumont 2012: 56-57; Dansen 2011: 307; Fildes 1988: 14; Golden 1988: 455, 457-458; Golden 2011: 266). As such these memorials are often taken to be an expression of grateful thanks on the part of owners or patrons for the delivery and care of their children (Fildes 1988: 10; Stears 1995: 124). Nothing about how these nurses were depicted, however, sets metics apart from slaves (Beaumont 2012: 57), and for most of these women nothing sets them apart from other women depicted in the cemetery.

Of the 13 nurses honoured it is only the title of *tithe* in their epitaphs that alerts the viewer to their occupation in life. Paideusis (**F 25**), Pyraichme (**F 91**) and an unnamed nurse (**F 95**) are shown seated alone, with nothing to distinguish them as nurses. Phanion (**F 107**), Melitta (**F 139**) and another unnamed nurse (**F 146**) are shown with children, alluding to their positions as nurses, though without the designation in their epitaphs they would be assumed to be mothers with their own children (Stears 1995: 124). Malicha's (**F 46**) stele is damaged, only her head

surviving, but the way she inclines her head suggests she too may have been depicted with a child she cared for. The nurse depicted with warrior Moschion and his squire (F 149) may well have been his nurse in his youth and now sees him go off to war as a man. Synete (F 92), Theoxene (F 167) and the other two unnamed nurses (F 94, F 147) are depicted with men who can be taken to be their husbands, in no way setting them apart from other citizen, metic or slave couples, with the exception of one unnamed nurse and her husband (F 147; figure 4.38) who are depicted in a banquet scene. Choirine (F 148) is shown with a couple taken to be her master and mistress or patrons depending on her status, but without the title of *tithe* in her epitaph such an inference would not be made. The same is true of midwife Phanostrate (F 93; figure 4.25), who is depicted with a patron, Antiphile, and her children, but without the epitaph the viewer would take these women for relatives with their children. Phanostrate (F 93) is the only midwife named as such, as a *maia*, known from fourth-century BC Attic inscriptions (Laes 2011: 156).

Though identification as nurses in their epitaphs shows pride in their work and the gratitude of the families they served, it is not possible to identify women as nurses on the basis of iconography. Their role to deliver and care for children does not set them apart from mothers in Attic funerary iconography, and so the combination of epitaph and iconography is essential for defining their occupational identity. Only one memorial possibly portrays a slave woman as a midwife or nurse without the need of the title *maia* or *tithe* in the epitaph as a caption for the passer-by. According to Clairmont (1993: vol II, 2.457) Malthake (F 133) is the woman aiding the woman reclining on a bed either in childbirth or illness rather than being the stricken woman herself, as Plangon of Plataea is (F 120; figure 4.34). If Clairmont is right, Malthake's (F 133) memorial is unique in the corpus of Attic funerary monuments. Clairmont's interpretation has, however, been criticised. In her recent book *Earliest Childhood in the Roman World*, Maureen Carroll (2018: 36) juxtaposes the memorials of Malthake (F 133) and Phanostrate (F 93) and draws on others' criticism of Clairmont, concluding that a midwife would not "want to be commemorated in the process of unsuccessfully delivering a baby," and that while Phanostrate's memorial "does not show anyone in the throes of childbirth," through the representation of all Antiphile's children it conveys Phanostrate's successful career (Carroll 2018: 36). Of course not every birth had a happy outcome, as

funerary monuments depicting death in childbirth, whether Malthake's memorial is taken to be an example of such a scene or not, show. A Hellenistic well excavated in the Athenian agora contained a minimum of 449 infants and children who had been stillborn or who had died or been exposed due to illness or defects soon after birth (Liston and Rotroff 2013: 69-76). It is suggested that the unfortunate task of disposing of or exposing these infants may have fallen to midwives (Laes 2011: 154; Liston and Rotroff 2013: 76-77). Most midwives in fifth- and fourth-century BC Attica must have experienced failures owing to the society's high infant mortality rate and presumably they would not want those failures commemorated. Whether or not Malthake (**F 133**) was a midwife or just a woman who died in childbirth, the use of *chreste* in their epitaph suggests she was a slave and therefore her memorial belongs with the collected funerary monuments in this thesis. Phanostrate (**F 93**), explicitly named as a midwife and doctor, has been variously identified as a citizen woman (e.g. Carroll 2018: 36; Laes 2011: 156) and as a metic or even slave (e.g. Kennedy 2014: 141-143; Kosmopoulou 2001: 300), and so the inclusion of her memorial among the collected funerary monuments is contestable.

Though the occupation of nurse, or midwife, is not easily rendered in the scenes on the funerary monuments of these women, the occupations of a handful of metic men, or likely metic, are recognisable on their memorials, both with and without supporting testimony in their epitaphs. Unlike nursing each profession is only attested once amongst the decorated memorials, and these are; archer (**F 3**; **figure 4.2**); cobbler (**F 5**); copper-smelter (**F 6**); flute-players (**F 8**; **figure 4.5**); a possible butcher (**F 30**; **figure 4.13**); a priest (**F 82**; **figure 4.22**). Each man is shown with a tool of his trade - a quiver, a cobbler's last, bellows, flutes, a knife, and a *kalathos* respectively – identifying them in an explicit way not possible iconographically for nurses. Such depictions of occupation are clearly only a small number of the collected non-citizen memorials, with most metics and slaves still choosing more conventional domestic scenes of family members together, most commonly husband and wife. Though only a small number of occupations are depicted there is a divide between more manual, archer, cobbler, smelter and butcher, and less manual roles, flute-player and priest. No other such manual occupations are known from the broader corpus of decorated Attic memorials, not even amongst the many memorials for the deceased of unknown status. This is not the case with the occupations of

priest and musician – and actor – of which other examples are known. Including the lekythos for Pantaleon (**F 82**), there are 13 memorials where the deceased or an accompanying family member is depicted as a priest, recognisable by their dress – long chiton – and their carrying of vessels, knives or temple keys. Of the 12 priests besides Pantaleon, only three are definitely citizens (*CAT* 1.250, 2.270b, 2.341b), the rest being of unknown status (*CAT* 11, 157, 1.186, 1.469, 2.370e, 2.412a, 3.390b, 4.781 and 4.782). Two stelai commemorate men characterised as actors, both holding up masks, one with a second mask hung up (*CAT* 1.075, 1.400). A lekythos commemorating another man shows him as a lyre-player (*CAT* 2.161). Nothing can be said about the status of these performers, as their monument was either not inscribed or the inscription does not survive.

While the status of a number of priests, as well as the two actors and the lyre-player, are unknown, there is an apparent difference between how citizen men were willing to be represented and how some metic men were willing to be represented. If Pantaleon (**F 82**) truly was a non-citizen as his name suggests, then his memorial is testament to non-citizens serving as priests alongside citizens and both citizens and non-citizens being represented as such on their memorials. Conversely, the memorial of Theban father and son Olympichos and Potamon (**F 8**) is evidence of metics as musicians wishing to be remembered as such, with no definitively citizen memorials showing performers, though the actors and lyre-player could well be citizens. Copper-smelter Sosinous (**F 6**) and butcher Seukes (**F 30**) are both metics, and while the status of cobbler Xanthippos (**F 5**) is not given in his epitaph, his willingness to have his manual profession remembered gives him something in common with these two metics rather than with any citizen, as far as surviving evidence shows. This is why Xanthippos is often taken to have been a metic (Clairmont 1993: vol I, 1.630; Hochscheid 2015: 296).

That only metics are depicted in their employment is not a reflection of any social reality, but a choice some metics made, and that no citizens did, to commit this particular identity to posterity. Occupational identities were shared identities that contributed to the blurring of legal identities and the creation of ‘free spaces.’ Such shared identities, however, were not ones citizens wished to project in the ‘free space’ of the cemetery, yet there was clearly freedom enough to do so if they had

wanted. This disparity between citizen and non-citizen monuments might be rooted in citizen ideology. Ideally a citizen man would not have had to stoop to manual labour and would instead have been free to exercise his body and mind, though in reality most citizen men would have had to work in occupations alongside metics and slaves (Plato *Resp.* 371c; E.E. Cohen 2002: 101-102).

Returning to depictions of working women, nurse and midwife were not the only occupations attested for women on Classical funerary monuments. A handful of women were characterised as priestesses and wool workers (Kosmopoulou 2001: 292-302). None of the nine priestesses, like priests being recognisable on account of their dress and attributes such as temple keys and *tympana*, are identifiable as non-citizens, but only one is a definite citizen, Chairestrate daughter of Menekrates from the *deme* of Ikaria (*CAT* 1.934). The status of the other eight is unknown (*CAT* 13, 14, 1.316, 1.334, 1.350a, 2.362, 4.358, 5.150). Seven women are depicted wool-working, two possibly non-citizens based on their ethnic names, Kypria (**F 22**) and Thraitta (**F 168**), and a third a slave, Pithane (**F 90**), on the basis of the adjective *chreste* in her epitaph. Of the remaining four wool-workers, one is a citizen, Kleonike daughter of Diagoras from the *deme* of Prospalta (*CAT* 1.381), while the status of the remaining three is unknown (*CAT* 1.309, 1.691, 1.894). Like the role of priest, and perhaps performer, wool working while only attested rarely on funerary monuments appears to have been appropriate for women of all statuses (Kosmopoulou 2001: 300). The occupation of nurse, however, is never attested alongside a demotic on any decorated monument, only with ethnics, *chreste*, or else nothing at all. Karen Stears (1995: 124) suggests that widows, presumably citizens amongst them, with no family may have had to turn to nursing for financial security, but these women are not identifiable in the corpus of funerary monuments. Perhaps nursing like manual occupations was performed by citizens but such a role for citizen women was inappropriate to be commemorated, placing them outside their own homes and instead serving in someone else's. Wool working was an occupation women could engage in at home, either by themselves or, if the family could afford them, alongside their slaves in a larger operation (Kosmopoulou 2001: 300-301).

IV.4.2.2 Mistresses and Maids: Slaves with Slaves

While the depiction of mistress and maid is in no way unique to non-citizen memorials, the stelai of Plangon (F 24) and Soteris (F 89) deserve additional attention, as their epitaphs in conjunction with how they are depicted imply they are slaves with slaves. Both women are referred to as *chreste*, worthy or useful, the use of the adjective in epitaphs, as repeatedly mentioned, apparently reserved for remembering slaves. Both women are depicted with a relative, Plangon her husband and Soteris her daughter, and a female figure characterised as a slave by her short hair or sakkos, the wearing of a long-sleeved chiton and the holding of a box recognisable from the memorials of citizen and metic women shown attended by a slave.

The memorials of Plangon (F 24) and Soteris (F 89), then, either bring into question the usefulness of the adjective *chreste* in recognising slaves in the cemeteries or demonstrate the variety of slave experience in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC. Plangon and Soteris were not necessarily slaves if the adjective *chreste* had broader use in women's epitaphs. Nurse Melitta (F 139) was the daughter of an *isotelês* but is still referred to as *chreste* in her epitaph and so supports a broader use of adjective to praise women of different legal statuses. She was, however, employed in a role known to have been performed by many slave women, as funerary monuments alone testify. There is nothing in the epitaphs of Plangon (F 24) and Soteris (F 89) to otherwise indicate their status.

Alternatively, Plangon (F 24) and Soteris (F 89) may well have been slaves and instead their depiction on their stelai may well be regarded as so idealized that it in no way represents them. This does not necessarily mean that how they were depicted was a passive copying of iconography not intended for them and not a choice. Plangon and Soteris, or the relatives left behind to make the funerary arrangements, may have been well aware that such scenes did not truly represent them, but chose them anyway. While this chapter has shown that the repertoire of Attic funerary iconography is limited and idealized, it has also shown that choices could be and were made by the deceased or on their behalf. If the depictions of Plangon and Soteris are misleading, this may have been by choice. Whether or not those slaves

shown attending metic and citizen women on their memorials should be seen as a reflection of such women really owning slaves in life is equally contestable.

Finally, Plangon (**F 24**) and Soteris (**F 89**) may have been exactly what they appear to be – slaves with slaves. Though by legal definition a slave could not own another slave because they could not own property, these two women could have been privileged slaves allowed to live in independent households and put in charge of other of their master's slaves. In the *Odyssey* (14.146-155), Odysseus' slave Eumaeus had purchased his own slave, Mesaulius, in his master's absence. Theopompus of Chios (*FGrHist* 115 F253) describes a fourth-century BC case of a slave owning a slave (Lewis 2018: 44). Sinope, a Thracian madam, who moved her brothel from Aegina to Athens owned a slave named Bakchis who in turn was said to a slave called Pythionike, who became the famous hetaera and lover of Harpalus, Alexander's treasurer (Lewis 2018: 44). It was, therefore, possible for slaves to 'own' slaves, that is it was in their master's or mistress' gift let them own slaves, and so Plangon (**F 24**) and Soteris (**F 89**) could have been slave women with their own slaves, but this cannot be taken for granted.

IV.4.2.3 Banquet Scenes

Seven of the non-citizen stelai collected in this chapter are banquet scenes (**F 21, F 78, F 98, F 102, F 109, F 147, F 172**). Such imagery is rare in a funerary context in Attica and almost exclusively used by non-citizens (Closterman 2015: 13; Stamatopoulou 2010: 13). Like depictions of most occupational identities, then, banquet scenes cannot be said to belong to the shared iconography used by most citizens and non-citizens, instead representing a deliberate choice to be different.

Only 19 banquet scenes are attested on funerary stelai from Attica (Clostermann 2015: 1, 2, 11). Of these, three are now lost and only ten have a preserved inscription (Clostermann 2015: 1, 2, 11). Only ten, therefore, have the potential to make the legal status of the deceased known. Of the seven included here, three commemorate metics (**F 98, F 102, F 109**), one an *isotelês* (**F 172**), and three potential slaves (**F 25, F 78, F 147**). Two stelai with banquet scenes are known to have commemorated citizens, from the demes of Thorai and Korydallos respectively (NM 990, Piraeus

261). The tenth stele with a preserved inscription bears only a name and remains undefined and excluded from the dataset here (*IG II2 12553*). Excluding the nine examples of banquet scenes without preserved inscriptions and the one with only a name, 77 per cent of funerary monuments with banquet scenes honour non-citizens.

While only 19 banquet scenes are known from the cemeteries, the motif is more frequently attested in the sanctuaries, a popular choice for votive reliefs, and was popular in both funerary and sanctuary contexts across many parts of the Greek World between the sixth and second century BC (see **Chapter V**; Stamatopoulou 2010: 11; Thönges-Stringaris 1965: 2, 15-24, 48). The earliest examples of the motif of a reclining male come from a royal relief at Nineveh dating to the middle of the seventh century BC and silver and bronze cups from Cyprus dating to the seventh and sixth centuries BC (Thönges-Stringaris 1965: 6-7; Closterman 2015: n.9). That there was an initial eastern influence for the adoption of banquet scenes across the Greek world seems likely (Stamatopoulou 2010: 11). Some 200 examples of the banquet scenes are known from across mainland Greece, the islands and Asia Minor, displayed on funerary and votive stelai of course, but also on terracottas and sarcophagi (Thönges-Stringaris 1965: 33-40).

In a recent article on banquet imagery on funerary reliefs in Athens, Wendy Closterman (2015: 1-2) explains its relationship to more common funerary iconography,

Currently, the most common funerary depictions are understood as associating the deceased with idealized familial relationships and civic roles rather than as portraying an event in the deceased's life, burial, or afterlife... the banquet image on Classical Athenian stelai does not represent a significant departure from this meaning of standard funerary iconography. It is best understood as presenting a variation of the family gathering so common on tombstones from the period.

In the past banqueting imagery in a funerary context has been interpreted as a way of heroizing the dead or as showing the dead in the afterlife, and in turn has been

associated with the symposium and aristocratic prestige (Closterman 2015: 6-10). The symposium, however, was a male affair that “typically includes women only in the roles of entertainers and sexual companions” (Closterman 2015: 9). Of the seven funerary monuments baring banquet scenes included in this thesis four depict couples; Pyrrhias and his wife Thettale (**F 78**); Hermogenes and Rhode from Gerenaioi, the only attestation of this ethnic in Attica (**F 98**; M. Osborne and Byrne 1996: no.1446-1448); a worthy nurse and her presumed husband (**F 147**); and *isotelês* Sparton and his wife (**F 172**; Closterman 2015: 11). As the women are often named as well, and in the case of the nurse the only figure named, the men should not be seen as the primary focus of these memorials and this helps negate the idea that these memorials depict symposia (Closterman 2015: 11). Closterman (2015: 13-14) argues that the banquet scene was another variant in the Attic funerary repertoire that stressed the values of family and marriage by referencing the votive imagery of the hero and heroic family (**see Chapter V**). This interpretation reconciles the banquet scene with the broader corpus of Attic funerary imagery and demonstrates the common values held by citizens, metics and slaves. It does not, however, explain why this particular imagery for expressing the importance of family and marriage predominantly appealed to non-citizens. Following Scholl and Fabricius, Closterman (2015: 13) suggests, “the banquet iconography was adopted primarily by metics, who generally employed a greater variety of imagery in their tombstones than did citizens.” Depictions of occupations and banquet scenes are the only metic, or non-citizen, variants in the whole corpus of Attic funerary monuments, admittedly demonstrating more variety but not much, and certainly not conveying identities or values not also common to citizens.

IV.4.2.4 The Kallithea Monument (F 105)

By way of conclusion, this chapter returns to the memorial for metic father and son Nikeratos and Polyxenos from Istros (**F 105**), “the largest private monument of this type surviving from Classical Athens” (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 210). To reiterate the earlier description, the monument stands 8.3 metres high and comprises a podium decorated with both an amazonomachy frieze and a frieze featuring bulls and griffins on which stands an Ionic naiskos (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 210-211). Within the naiskos stand the figures of Nikeratos and Polyxenos with a slave

attendant (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 211). The heads of all three figures are missing. The monument has been remarked upon not only due to its size but also because of the clear foreign influence, the monument being comparable to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 211). It has been considered unique within the Attic funerary landscape and the choices made by the metics regarding their memorial as a deliberate attempt to “tap into a symbolic language of personal expression that would be misunderstood and rejected by contemporary Athenians” (Hagemajer Allen 2003: 211). If this was truly their strategy, then, it represents some metics pulling away from a shared iconography that espoused shared values, but at the same time shows that they had the freedom to do this.

In her study of the monument, however, Katarzyna Hagemajer Allen (2003a: 211) argues that “the case for the uniqueness of the Kallithea monument has been overstated,” with foreign architectural elements having much wider usage in the Attic cemeteries than is perhaps credited, and not just by non-citizens. Animals and animal imagery have wider use in Attic cemeteries. Just among non-citizens there are the lion on the stele of Leon of Sinope (**F 152**) and the rams on the stele of Dionysus of Ikaria (**F 104; figure 4.30**). Furthermore, while the Kallithea monument is the largest private funerary monument, elevation of funerary monuments on podiums or walls in order to ensure their prominence was a tactic used by citizens and non-citizens alike (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 212). The tomb of Dionysios of Kollytos, a citizen, in the Kerameikos is such an example (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 211-212). Dionysios’ monument, a deep naiskos with a bull on its roof, stands atop the *peribolos* walls in order to tower above other monuments and stand out for the passer-by (Hagemajer Allen 2003a: 211-212). The same can be said of other monuments from the Kerameikos and other cemeteries, for example at Rhamnous. Whether they commemorated a citizen or a non-citizen, all funerary monuments were designed to be seen.

Even the supposedly most unique and un-Attic funerary monument, then, can be reconciled with the broader Attic repertoire. Foreign elements were incorporated into the funerary landscape, but they were not exclusively used by foreigners. They became part of the shared iconography, even if they were less commonly used. Large monuments that incorporated foreign elements were not about proclaiming a foreign

identity but rather about proclaiming an elite identity, an identity not necessarily tied to one's legal status. The Kallithea monument demonstrates how contact with the wider Greek world and non-Greek world influenced commemoration in Attica. As will be discussed in **Chapter VII**, the artistic influence flowed the other way too, with Attic iconography being used across the Greek world and beyond. Perhaps some of its appeal stemmed from its creation in and reflection of 'free spaces' and identities shared by Athenians and non-Athenians.

V: The Dedications and The Inclusion of Slaves in Votive Reliefs

In the assessment of sanctuaries as ‘free spaces’ in **Chapter III**, where they were seen as facilitating shared experiences between citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners, a distinction was made between the communal and the personal in Athenian religion. While there are a great many votive reliefs that survive from the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, the majority lack any dedicatory inscription at all, or the inscription is confined to the formula ‘X dedicated to Y,’ with no demotic, ethnic or other indication of status such as *chrestos* (Taylor 2015: 43).

Nonetheless, surviving epigraphic evidence is testament to non-citizen access, including metics, foreigners and slaves, to the sanctuaries and sacred places of Attica. This epigraphic evidence for non-citizens making personal and joint dedications will form the basis of the first section of this chapter. In the second section attention turns to the collective participation of families in religion as depicted in votive reliefs. While the identity and status of these families is unknown, the collected reliefs all include worshippers who are characterised iconographically as slaves among the other worshippers. While these reliefs were not the slaves’ to dedicate, they are included here as evidence of slave inclusion in worship at the family level at least ideologically if not actually as will be discussed below. The chapter closes with a discussion of a dedication to Athena on the Acropolis made by a whole foreign community, serving as a transition to decree reliefs and inter-state relations in the next chapter.

Drawing on epigraphic, iconographic and literary evidence, this chapter offers a layered look at non-citizen inclusion in Athenian religion that follows on from the discussion began in **Chapter III**. While non-citizen access to the sacred was not unconditional or always equal to that of citizens, religious participation, particularly dedication, was not based on the binary construct of citizen and non-citizen. Citizens and non-citizens were united in their identity as mortal worshippers when facing the gods.

VI.1 Dedications by Metics, Slaves, and Foreigners

Whatever form a votive took, be it a statue, relief, metal items such as weapons or jewellery, repurposed household objects, or a product or produce dedicated as first fruits, it was a gift offered to a deity to redeem an earlier vow or to offer thanks for perceived divine intervention (Graf 2004: 342; Ridgway 1997: 194; van Straten 1981: 70). Votive inscriptions “bring us far more closely into contact with the ‘average’ Greek,” whether they were a citizen, metic, foreigner or slave, even if in most instances such information about status is lacking (van Straten 1981: 69). While missing information about status is sometimes the result of poor preservation, there are other instances where the inscription was intentionally restricted to the name of the dedicator, the verb to dedicate, and the name of the deity dedicated to (Hochscheid 2015: 270). As in epitaphs, then, there was apparently no obligation to make one’s legal status clear through the use of a demotic or ethnic (Hochscheid 2015: 270; Taylor 2015: 43). Of course, some dedicators did explicitly identify themselves as citizens, metics or foreigners, and sometimes, as in epitaphs, their names are suggestive of foreign if not servile origins.

	Provenance	Date	Dedicator/s	Recipient/s	Dedication
<i>IG I³ 622</i>	Athens, Acropolis	525-500 BC	Chnaiades of Pallene	Athena(?)	Base for bronze statue
<i>IG I³ 546</i>	Athens, Acropolis	c.500 BC	Phrygia, the bread-seller	Athena(?)	Small bronze shield with gorgoneion
<i>IG I³ 741</i>	Athens, Acropolis	500-480 BC	[----]theos of Sikyon	Athena(?)	Marble pillar (probably crowned with a cavetto capital)
<i>IG I³ 823</i>	Athens, Acropolis	480-470 BC	Phayllos of Kroton	Athena(?)	Base for marble statue
<i>IG I³ 1006 / I.Eleusis 10</i>	Eleusis	500-475 BC	Aristodamos of Metapontum	_____	Base (for statue?)

Table 5.1: Non-citizen dedications in the Archaic period.

The earliest dedications identifiable as being dedicated by foreigners date to the late Archaic period, between the last quarter of the sixth century BC and the first quarter of the fifth century BC (see **table 5.1**). Of the five identifiable dedications, four were dedicated on the Acropolis, while the fifth was dedicated at Eleusis. Four were dedicated by men who give their ethnics, confirming their status as non-citizens though not whether they were resident in Attica or not, and the fifth is dedicated by a woman, who while giving no ethnic bears a name suggestive of foreign origins and, therefore, non-citizen status. With the exception of the dedication made by the woman, the exact forms these dedications took are unknown, as only the base or pillar bearing the dedicatory inscription survives, giving the identity of the dedicator but not what they dedicated. Cuttings in the surviving base suggest Chnaiades of Pallene dedicated a bronze statue (Raubitschek 1949 no.311), while those in the base of Phayllos of Kroton's dedication suggest a marble statue (Raubitschek 1949 no.76; Hurwit 1999: 60). A man from Sikyon whose name is damaged dedicated a pillar that was probably crowned with a cavetto capital (Raubitschek 1949 no.252). At Eleusis, Aristodamos of Metapontum also dedicated a statue on the basis of cutting to the surviving base, though whether it was of bronze or marble is uncertain (Clinton 2005: no.10). Back on the Acropolis, bread-seller Phrygia, a possible metic on the basis of her name – if it is appropriate to speak of an official metic status as early as 500 BC – dedicated a small bronze shield featuring a gorgoneion (Hurwit 1999: 60, 126, 336 fn.151).

From the beginning of the Classical period to the end of the fourth-century BC the number of dedications identifiable as dedicated by non-citizens, including slaves, is at least 29 (see **table 5.2**), no doubt a reflection of a general increase in dedications of a durable nature in this period, but also of surviving inventories that testify to dedications that do not actually survive.

Beginning with the inventories, while metics and foreigners apparently made no distinction between themselves in their own dedicatory inscriptions (Hochscheid 2015: 270), the same is not true of the Athenian treasurers responsible for keeping inventories. Here there is a care to distinguish between those dedicators who were legally metics and those foreigners who were legally citizens of somewhere else. In the Parthenon inventory of 398/7 BC, Archias (*IG II² 1388, 67-68*) and Dorkas (*IG*

IG I² 1403, 11-12), who dedicated a gold and ivory palladion and gilded shield to Athena and a gold ring to Artemis Brauronia respectively, are both described as living in the Piraeus, and were therefore metics (D. Harris 1995: 225; Hurwit 1999: 60). Contemporary and later dedicators are identified with ethnics, which in the context of the Parthenon inventories where the ‘living in’ formula has been used, means they were visiting foreigners or foreigners who had sent their dedications from abroad. A similar incongruence between public and private inscriptions was encountered in the cemeteries, where on the *demosion sema* metics are identified with the ‘living in’ formula but on their own private funerary monuments chose to identify themselves with an ethnic. There was a clear tension between how metics identified themselves and how the Athenian state identified them running through the commemorative landscape.

	Provenance	Date	Dedicator/s	Recipient/s	Dedication
IG I ³ 858	Athens, Acropolis	470-450 BC	Aristomache and Charikleia, daughters of Glaukinos of Argos	Athena(?)	Marble stele(?) – inscribed base survives
IG I ³ 850	Athens, Acropolis	470-460 BC	Hegelochos, son of Ekphantos	Athena(?)	Base for statue of warrior or Athena Promachos
IG II ² 1386, 2-4 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 401/0 BC	Lysander of Sparta, son of Aristokritos	Athena	Gold wreath
IG II ² 1386, 6-7 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 401/0 BC	Gelon of Pellana, son of Tlesonides	Athena(?)	Gold wreath
IG II ² 1386, 7-9 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 401/0 BC	Hierokles of Phaselis	Athena(?)	Gold wreath
IG II ² 1386, 9-10 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 401/0 BC	Platthis of Aegina	Athena(?)	Gold ring
IG II ² 1388, 58-60	Athens, Acropolis	By 398/7	Phryniskos of Thessaly	Athena(?)	Gold ring and unfired

(Parthenon Inventory)		BC			gold bound in silver
<i>IG II²</i> 1388, 67-68 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 398/7 BC	Archias, metic living in the Piraeus	Athena	Gold and ivory Palladion and gilded shield
<i>IG II²</i> 1403, 11-12 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 398/7 BC	Dorkas, metic living in the Piraeus	Artemis Brauronia	Gold ring
<i>IG II²</i> 1412, 11 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 382/1 BC	Persian Pharnabazos	Athena(?)	Robe
<i>IG II²</i> 1486, 14-19 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	After 307/6 BC	Spartokos of Pontos	Athenian Demos	Gold Wreath
<i>IG II²</i> 1492, 51-57 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 305/4 BC(?)	Roxanne, wife of Alexander the Great	Athena Polias	Gold necklaces and a gold rhyton
<i>IG II²</i> 1473, 6-11 (Parthenon Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 304/3 BC	Alexander, son of Polyperchon (Macedonian)	Athena(?)	Panoply: a complete ceremonial breast-plate, a complete light shield, gilt, bronze greaves with silver work
<i>IG II²</i> 1489, 17-19 (Erechtheion Inventory)	Athens, Acropolis	By 307/6 BC	Phryniskos of Thessaly	Athena Polias	Silver phiale
<i>SEG XXI</i> 784	Athens, Agora	4 th century BC	Malthake on behalf of Thraittis	Aphrodite(?)	Teardrop-shaped marble plaque
<i>IG II²</i> 4430	Athens, Asklepieion	Late 4 th / early 3 rd century	[---]nos and Kallistone (husband and wife) of Thebes	Asklepios	_____

		BC			
<i>IG II² 2934</i>	Athens, Ilissos stream	mid-4 th century BC	The washers dedicated to the Nymphs and all the gods, Zoagoras son of Zokypros, Zokypros son of Zoagoras, Thallos, Leuke, Sokrates son of Polykrates, Apollophanes son of Euporion, Sosistratos, Manes, Myrrine, Sosias, Sosigenes, and Midas.	The Nymphs and all the gods	Marble dedication with two reliefs separated by the inscription. Upper relief: head of Acheloos, Hermes, three Nymphs, Pan sat with his legs crossed. Lower relief: Hero leading horse, altar, Kore (standing), Demeter (seated).
<i>IG I³ 1018</i>	Piraeus	475-450 BC	Python, son of Hermostratos of Abdera	Hermes	Herm
<i>IG II² 4609</i>	Piraeus	Late 4 th century BC	Manes and Mika	Mother of the Gods	
<i>IG II² 4636</i>	Piraeus	After 333/2 BC	Aristoklea of Kition	Aphrodite Ourania	
<i>IG II² 4583</i>	Daphni	mid-4 th century BC	Kallima[chos] of Soloi	Peitho	
<i>IG II² 4633</i>	Kamariza	4 th century BC	Manes	Artemis	
<i>IG II² 2938</i>	Laurion	4 th century BC	..r[--], Chore[gos], Sosias, Moschos,	Herakles(?)	

			Kolianos and [N]oumen[ios]		
<i>IG II² 2940</i>	Laurion	4 th century BC	Kadous, Manes, Kallias, Attas, Artemidoros, Maes, Sosias, Saggarios, Hermaios, Tibeios, and Hermos	Herakles(?)	
<i>IG II² 4598</i>	Laurion	4 th century BC	Azaratos	Heros	
<i>IG II² 2937</i>	Sounion	4 th century BC	Kadous, Beltion, Kallias, Mandion, Philon, Tibeios, Phantias, Stephanos, Elpinikos, Agathokles, and Syros	Herakles(?)	
<i>AM 62, 1937, 8, no.6</i>	Sounion, Argileza	c.350 BC	Numenios	Artemis	
<i>IG I³ 980</i>	Vari	c.400 BC	Archedemos of Thera	The Nymphs	
<i>SEG LIV 318 (Figure 5.1)</i>	Vari	c.320-300 BC	Eporos, Sosias, Xenokrates, Lydos, Hermaios, Hermon, Pryx, Herakleides, [---]on, [---]as, Parmenon, Soteris, and [..]mes	The Nymphs	Marble relief depicting Hermes leading three nymphs away from a mask of Acheloos while Pan watches from above

Table 5.2 Non-citizen dedications in the Classical / early Hellenistic period.

Archias and Dorkas are the only two metic dedicators in what survives of the Parthenon inventories, which began in 434/3 BC and continue until the end of the fourth-century BC (D. Harris 1995: 20, 38). There are more foreign dedicators listed in the inventories, with nine names surviving (D. Harris 1995: 224, 226, 229). With the exception of a robe dedicated by Persian satrap Pharnabazos, all the foreign dedicators, and the two metic men, dedicated items of precious metal. Lysander of Sparta – the Spartan leader at the end of the Peloponnesian War – Gelon of Pellana, and Hierokles of Phaselis all dedicated gold wreaths, and Platthis of Aegina dedicated a gold ring by 401/0 BC (D. Harris 1995: 141, 192). By 398/7 BC Phryniskos of Thessaly had dedicated a gold ring and unfired gold bound in silver, and by 382/1 BC Pharnabazos had dedicated a robe (D. Harris 1995: 121, 142). Phryniskos of Thessaly is the only foreigner whose name survives in the inventories of the Erechtheion, though record of his dedication of a silver phiale to Athena Polias does not appear until the inventory of 307/6 BC, so if this is the same man who dedicated a gold ring in the Parthenon inventories by 398/7 BC this phiale must have been dedicated earlier than 307/6 BC (D. Harris 1995: 227). After these there are no surviving entries of dedications by foreigners until the end of the fourth-century BC. In an inventory dating after 307/6 BC, the dedication of a gold wreath by Spartokos of Pontos earlier in the century is recorded (D. Harris 1995: 183). In the inventory of 304/3 BC Macedonian Alexander son of Polyperchon is listed as dedicating a panoply consisting of a complete ceremonial breast-plate, a complete light shield, gilt, bronze greaves with silver work, but Alexander died in 314 BC and so the dedication must have been made before then (D. Harris 1995: 117, 233; Themelis 2003: 165).

“The most famous female dedicant” in the Parthenon inventories, indeed one of the most famous dedicants irrespective of gender, was Roxanne, wife of Alexander the Great (D. Harris 1995: 234). She dedicated a gold rhyton and necklaces to Athena Polias, which first appear in the inventory of 305/4 BC, but must have been dedicated sometime between Alexander’s death in 323 BC, before which time she had not visited Athens, and her own death in 310 BC (D. Harris 1995: 140, 179, 234; Themelis 2003: 165). Though not appearing in the Parthenon inventories, her husband too was one of the most famous figures to dedicate on the Acropolis in fourth-century BC, sending 300 suits of Persian armour to Athens to be affixed to

the Parthenon's architrave after the battle of Granikos in 334 BC (Arr. 1.16.7; D. Harris 1995: 38, 235; Hurwit 1999: 253-254; Themelis 2003: 163). No doubt Alexander had in mind the dedication of spoils from the Persian Wars to various sanctuaries when he sent the spoils of his own campaign against the Persian Empire (on spoils of the Persian Wars see Miller 1997: 29-62; Themelis 2003: 163).

Also dedicated on the Acropolis by foreigners or metics – for in private dedicatory inscriptions themselves there is no distinction (Hochscheid 2015: 270) – were two dedications of early Classical date. The names Aristomache and Charikleia, daughters of Glaukinos of Argos, are inscribed on a pillar that may have carried a relief (Raubitschek 1949 no.297; Hochscheid 2015: 274 fn.113; Hurwit 1999: 60). Hegelochos, son of Ekphantos, the dialect of his dedicatory inscription suggesting he was Ionian, dedicated a statue, the cuttings on the surviving base suggestive of “violent motion... either a warrior or an Athena of the early Promachos type” (Raubitschek 1949 no.121).

Moving to the Asklepieion on the south slope of the Acropolis, a number of foreigners are identifiable from among the inventories and surviving dedications, though only the dedication of a couple from Thebes can be dated to the end of the fourth-century BC, if not in fact the early third century BC (Aleshire 1989: 66). Other dedications made by metics / foreigners come from the third century BC and later (Aleshire 1989: 66). Though the identities of the dedicators are unknown, many of the votive reliefs in which slaves appear among the worshippers were dedicated at the Asklepieion (**see table 5.3**). This is not to say that the inclusion of slaves in cult was exclusive to the Asklepieion and Asklepios, but that beginning with the establishment of his cult in Athens by Telemachos in 419/8 BC he and his daughter Hygieia were the recipients of more votive reliefs than any other deity (Aleshire 1989: 7; Flower 2009: 5; Lawton 2009: 75; Mitropoulou 1977: 120; Ridgway 1997: 203).

A dedication found in the Agora, its form indicating it had been a dedication to Aphrodite, was probably originally dedicated on the north slope of the Acropolis where the goddess had a shrine (Geagan 2011: 290, V559). The dedication was a marble plaque of inverted teardrop shape known as an ‘Aphrodite stone’ or phallus,

and was dedicated by one Malthake on behalf of Thraittis, an alternative spelling of the name Thraitta known among slaves (Geagan 2011: 290, V559). While these dedicators give no demotic or ethnic, the name Thraittis suggests this female dedicator was a likely metic or slave. Perhaps she was a prostitute, many of whom were metics and slaves, which would account for her dedicating to Aphrodite as patron goddess of her trade (Dillon 2002: 206; Rosenzweig 2004: 76-77).

The dedications made by worshippers identifiable as metics or foreigners described so far have been the undertaking of an individual or at most a pair. A dedication, however, could be a joint enterprise. While joint dedications were more common from the third century BC with the rise of the cultic associations of *eranistai* and *thiasotai* (Jones 1999: 6), examples do survive from the second half of the fourth-century BC, non-citizens being among the groups of dedicators (Purvis 2003: 2). One of these joint dedications with non-citizens among the dedicators comes from the city of Athens itself, another from Vari, and three more from the mining region of Lavreotiki. The joint dedication from Athens was found near the Ilissos stream, “not far from the shrine of Pan, Acheloos and the Nymphs,” and is a votive relief dedicated to the Nymphs and all the gods made in the middle of the fourth-century BC by a group of washers who “presumably worked nearby” (Dillon 2002: 206). The dedication in fact has two reliefs, the upper depicting Acheloos, Hermes, three Nymphs and Pan, the lower a hero with a horse, an altar, Kore and Demeter (Dillon 2002: 206; Löhr 2000: 98-100, no.116; Mitropoulou 1968: 256-259, no.147). While such a double relief is rare, the iconography of the upper relief is standard for dedications to the Nymphs (Mitropoulou 1968: 1018-1023). The washers who dedicated it were ten men and two women, four of the men giving their patronymic, which has been taken to indicate their citizen status, although this is not explicitly stated (Dillon 2002: 206; Taylor 2015: 43). Two of them – Zoagoras son of Zokypros and Zokypros son of Zoagoras – were perhaps father and son, hence its inclusion in Löhr’s (2000: 98-100, no.116) *Griechische Familienweihungen*, the former naming the latter after his own father (Herman 1990: 349-363). The other six male dedicators and the two women are known only by name, taken to indicate that they were metics if not slaves (Dillon 2002: 206; Taylor 2015: 43). As the dedicatory inscription states, these men and women were united by their occupation as washers,

a commonality which “allowed these citizens and non-citizens to cross both gender and ethnic boundaries in dedicating this thanksgiving offering” (Dillon 2002: 206).

Figure 5.1 Joint dedication to the Nymphs at Vari. Athens, National Archaeological Museum 2009. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by Eir. Miari).
© Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

The joint dedication from Vari, another relief dedicated to the Nymphs, does not state if the dedicators were brought together by a shared occupation. The late fourth-century BC relief shows Hermes leading three nymphs away from a mask of Acheloos while Pan watches the scene from above (**Figure 5.1**; Mitropoulou 1968: 847-850, no.B15; Taylor 2015: 35). It was dedicated by 13 individuals, none of whom give patronymics, demotics or ethnics, but some among them have slave-attested names, including Lydos, Parmenon and Soteris (Taylor 2015: 45). Perhaps all 13 dedicators were slaves or perhaps the group was a mix of citizens, metics and slaves as is proposed of the Nymph relief from the Ilissos stream. Foreigner or metic Archedemos of Thera (**see table 5.2**) furnished the cave at Vari for the nymphs, leaving six inscriptions within the cave to lay claim to his work and devotion, as well as a portrait of himself, but many other dedicators were known to be citizens, so even if the late fourth-century BC relief was a dedication by 13 slaves, the cave still

brought worshippers of different statuses together (Purvis 2003: 31-33; Shörner and Goette 2004: 21-22; Taylor 2015: 46).

As the Lavreotiki region was known for mining and high concentrations of slaves, the dedicators of the two joint dedications from Laurion and the one from Sounion were likely united by their servile status (Lauffer 1979: 178, table 12; Taylor 2015: 47). On none of the three dedications, all suggested as being dedications to Herakles (Lauffer 1979: 178, table 12), do the dedicators give patronymics, demotics or ethnics, but as with the dedicators of the Ilissos and Vari reliefs many of them have slave-attested names, including Manes and Syros. The names Kadous, Kallias, Sosias and Tibeios each occur twice across the three joint dedications, leading to speculation that these may be the same men contributing to different dedications, particularly in the cases of Kadous and Tibeios, which are less common names (Lauffer 1979: 129; Taylor 2015: 47). Three dedications that may have been the dedications of individual slaves are also known from Lavreotiki; Manes dedicating to Artemis (Lauffer 1979: 126), Azaratos dedicating to the heros (Lauffer 1979: 124, 131, 186), and Numenios also dedicating to Artemis (Lauffer 1979: 127). Folkert van Straten (2000: 220) in a chapter on votives suggests it is doubtful that there were slaves among the dedicators of votive reliefs, it being “perhaps unlikely that they could afford such a rather expensive gift.” Even if it had to be a joint enterprise, dedicating a gift was not beyond the means of all slaves, and some may even have been able to afford to do it more than once.

Non-citizens did not only dedicate to Athenian deities but also introduced their own gods to Attica, nowhere more so than in Piraeus, where from the second half of the fifth century BC “the introduction of new deities was beginning to reflect the composition of an increasingly mixed population” (Garland 1987: 101). It cannot be assumed, however, that dedications where the dedicator is unknown were made by non-citizens, as these foreign deities were adopted by the Athenians themselves who then also dedicated to them. At least three dedications come from Piraeus that can be identified as having been dedicated by non-citizens, although doubtless many more were the offerings of metics, slaves and foreigners. The earliest of these dates to the second quarter of the fifth century BC and was a dedication to Hermes by Python, son of Hermostros, of Abdera (**see table 5.2**). Aristoklea of Kition on Cyprus made

a dedication to Aphrodite Ourania sometime after 333/2 BC, when the Kitians were granted land (*IG II² 337*) to establish a shrine for the Syrian goddess (Dillon 2002: 206; Garland 1987: 112; Rosenzweig 2004: 90-91). The cult was particularly popular among prostitutes, and so perhaps Aristoklea – a foreign or metic woman – was a prostitute, as has been suggested of Thraittis who dedicated to Aphrodite on the north slope of the Acropolis (Garland 1987: 112; Rosenzweig 2004: 91). There is a dedication from Daphni, where a cult of Aphrodite in the Gardens was located, of mid-fourth-century BC date that Kallima[chos] of Soloi, another Cypriot city, dedicated to Peitho (persuasion), Aphrodite's daughter (Rosenzweig 2004: 30-31; Smith 2011: 55). It was not only women who dedicated to Aphrodite and related entities. Couple Manes and Mika, the former's name being a typically Phrygian one, made a dedication to the Mother of the Gods towards the end of the fourth century BC (Dillon 2002: 206; Garland 1987: 236). The cult had Phrygian-Anatolian origins and so it is no surprise to find a likely Phrygian couple making a dedication.

While identifiable non-citizen dedications or record of their dedications in inventories are relatively few in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, what does survive provides a picture of individuals of diverse origins and statuses cementing their relationships not only with various deities both Athenian and foreign, but with other worshippers. Metics, foreigners and slaves did have access to the sanctuaries and sacred places of the Attica landscape, as well as adding new ones, and it is through their dedications that they found representation in these sacred spaces. Having access and representation in sacred spaces was not the end point for many of these worshippers, as shared worship and dedication could serve as the outcome or basis for social networks with others of their own status and ethnicity, as well as social networks between worshippers of different legal status, social status, and ethnic origin (Dillon 2002: 206; Taylor 2015: 44). The sanctuaries, then, were spaces where citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners could have shared experience and articulate that experience and their shared identity as worshippers of a given deity by making dedications. The sanctuaries became 'free spaces,' or rather 'open spaces' or 'accessible spaces' (see **III.2**), through the act of dedication.

VI.2 The Depiction of Slaves as Worshippers on Votive Reliefs

Though the identity of their dedicators is unknown, hundreds of votive reliefs survive from the fifth and particularly the fourth-century BC (Ridgway 1997: 193). While votive reliefs were produced throughout the fifth century BC, production began to thrive with the revival of funerary reliefs by 430 BC – also when the first decree reliefs were produced – until the late fourth- or early third-century BC (Ridgway 1997: 193). These votive reliefs depicted the deities they were dedicated to, the worshippers who dedicated them, and worshippers approaching one or more deities, and could take the form of a landscape scene – with architectural or natural features depicted – or a banquet scene (Ridgway 1997: 194-204). In the case of dedications to Asklepios and other healing deities, reliefs could depict the afflicted body part or healing in progress, incubation scenes, although the latter are less common (Ridgway 1997: 194).

Certain of the reliefs that depict worshippers, with or without deities, are of interest here, for they depict people of different statuses worshipping together. It is not that the identities of the dedicators of these reliefs are known, but rather through reading the iconography that certain figures can be identified as slaves among the other presumably free worshippers, even if the status of these free worshippers is unknown. Recognition of status follows principles already encountered in the analysis of funerary iconography and will be encountered again on decree reliefs (**see Chapter VI**). On decree reliefs mortal honorands are depicted smaller than the deities who bestow or witness their honours, and the same scaling applies to worshippers and deities in votive reliefs. In funerary reliefs, attending servants or slaves are differentiated from their masters and mistresses through their relative size, their dress, objects they carry, or a combination of the three. The typical slave-girl attending in funerary scenes is slightly shorter than her mistress, wears a long-sleeved chiton and sakkos, and carries a box (**for example on the stele of Plangon – F 24, Figure 4.11**). The typical slave-boy is also short, nude or wearing a short chiton and carries his master's cloak, athletic equipment or military equipment (**for example the slave boy carrying Polyxenos' cloak on the Kallithea monument – F 105, Figure 4.31**). While relative size is still an important distinction in their depiction in votive reliefs, dress and other attributes used to characterise slave-girls

– there is more continuity in the depiction of slave-boys – do not carry over from funerary reliefs.

VR no.	Provenance	Date	Dedicator/s / Recipient/s	Relief
VR 1	Piraeus, Asklepieion	c.400-350 BC	Unknown / Asklepios or one of his children(?)	Asklepios is approached by a family of worshippers. A slave boy leads a ram to an altar. He is followed a male worshipper, a female worshipper, a child and a possible servant-girl.
VR 2	Athens, Asklepieion	c.384/3 BC	Unknown / Asklepios or one of his children(?)	The only surviving figures are a female worshipper in a long chiton followed by smaller female worshipper, possibly a servant-girl, carrying a child.
VR 3	Athens	c.375/4 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only some of the left side of relief survives showing a male worshipper wearing a himation, followed by a female worshipper in long chiton and himation. Behind her and overlapping the anta is a servant-girl wearing a long chiton and himation and carrying a kiste on her head. In front of the adults are a girl and boy.

VR 4	Athens	c.355/4 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only some of the right side of the relief survives showing a male worshipper (only his head and shoulders preserved), followed by a female worshipper in himation (preserved to the hips). Behind her and overlapping the anta is a servant-girl (also preserved to the hips) carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 5 (Figure 5.2)	Athens or Piraeus	c.350 BC	Unknown / Zeus Meilichios	Zeus Meilichios (or Philios) sits on a throne on the left side of the relief. A female worshipper kneels before him. Following behind her are another woman, a boy at her side, a girl behind him and another boy behind her who brings a ram for sacrifice and carries a basket. At the back of the group, overlapping the anta, is a female servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 6	Rhamnous	c.350 BC	Boidion, Hippokrates, Evangelos, Aischylos / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. A slave boy leads the procession carrying a basket of offerings. He is followed by a male worshipper, a female worshipper, a servant-girl

				carrying a kiste on her head and three children.
VR 7	Agora	c.350 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. A male worshipper leads the procession followed by two female worshippers. In front of the women is a slave boy trying to control an animal that is now missing.
VR 8	Agora	c.350 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. There are three adult worshippers, their heads missing, the first male and the following two female, the second shorter and perhaps a servant-girl. A child stands in front of each adult worshipper.
VR 9	Athens	c.337/6 BC	Unknown / Hero(?)	A hero wearing a short, belted chiton and chlamys holds the reins of a horse and a phiale, into which a goddess pours wine from an oinochoe. The goddess wears a long chiton and shorter himation. Behind her follow five worshippers; a man, a woman and, overlapping the anta, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head. In front of them are a girl and a boy.

VR 10	Acropolis	c.332 BC	Unknown / Athena	Athena and her worshippers stand either side of an altar. The surviving worshippers are a young man, a girl and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 11 (Figure 5.3)	Athens, Asklepieion	c.332 BC	Unknown / Asklepios and Hygieia	Hygieia follows Asklepios who stands before a small square altar. A boy stands behind the altar, bringing a bull (not preserved) for sacrifice. On the other side of the altar is a line of worshippers; two men in himatia, a woman in a long chiton and himation (all three's heads missing), and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 12	Athens	c.332 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – A nude youth stands in front of the right anta, having probably held an oinochoe, now missing. Two gods recline on a couch, a goddess in long chiton and himation sat on a stool by their feet. In front of them is a table with fruit on it. Seven worshippers are lined up behind the goddess: two men, a woman, a servant-girl, overlapping the

				anta, carrying a kiste on her head, and three children – boy, girl, boy - in a line in front of the adults.
VR 13	Unknown	c.332 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – only the left side of the relief is preserved. A seated goddess wearing a himation is preserved from the chest down. Behind her are six worshippers: a man, two women, a servant-girl, overlapping the anta, carrying a kiste on her head, a boy and a girl in front of the adults.
VR 14 (Figure 5.4)	Brauron	c.332/0 BC	Aristonike, wife of Antiphanes of deme of Thorai / Artemis	Artemis stands to the right of the relief, a small square altar in front of her. A deer stands behind her. On the other side of the altar a boy leads a bull for sacrifice. 13 worshippers follow him; a man, two women, a man, a woman, two men, a possible servant-girl holding a child, and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head. Three children – two girls and a boy – stand in front of the adults.
VR 15	Brauron	c.332/1 BC	Persis / Artemis	To the right of a small square altar stands Artemis holding a bundle of torches. Behind her sits Leto, behind

				whom stands Apollo. Behind the altar stands a youth bringing a bull for sacrifice. On the left of the altar are eight worshippers; a man, two women, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of the adults, two girls and two boys.
VR 16	Athens, Asklepieion	c.332/0 BC	Unknown / Unknown	The relief survives in two parts. A god reclining of couch in the middle is largely missing. To the right of the couch are six worshippers; girl, man, two women, two boys. To the left of the couch, a boy leads a ram to sacrifice, followed by eight worshippers: man, woman, man, servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, with four children, all appear to be boys, in front of the adults.
VR 17	Athens	c.332/0 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only part of the left anta and the head of a female worshipper and that of a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head survive.
VR 18 (Figure 5.5)	Athens, Asklepieion	c.330 BC	Unknown / Asklepios and Hygieia	Asklepios is seated but only his legs are preserved. Next to him stands Hygieia. In front of them is an altar. A boy leads a bull to

				sacrifice. He is followed by six other worshippers: a man, a woman, a man, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of the adults, a girl and a boy.
VR 19	Athens	c.330 BC	Unknown / Asklepios and Hygieia	On the left side of the relief Hygieia leans against the back of a throne. Asklepios sits on the throne, a snake coiled underneath it. Seven worshippers approach the two deities; a man, a woman and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, four children – a boy, a girl and two more boys – in front of them.
VR 20	Athens, Asklepieion	c.330 BC	Unknown / Asklepios and Hygieia	Asklepios and Hygieia stand on the left side of the relief, approached by eight worshippers; the first of unknown sex, followed by three men, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, a woman, and two boys in front of the woman.
VR 21	Athens	c.330 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – to the right a nude youth stands bearing an oinochoe. A god reclines on a couch, a goddess sat by his

				feet. Table laden with fruits is positioned in front of them, a snake coiled underneath it. Behind the goddess is an altar to which a boy brings a ram for sacrifice. He is followed by an adult male worshipper, in turn followed by a servant-boy dressed in a knee-length chiton. There is a horse's head above these worshippers.
VR 22	Athens, Asklepieion	c.330 BC	Unknown / Asklepios, Hygieia and Epione	On the left of the relief Asklepios and Hygieia stand while Epione sits on a stool, under which is a goose. A nude boy leads a pig for sacrifice, followed by 11 more worshippers; a man, a woman, a man, two women, two men, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, a boy and a girl. On the left wall of the relief stands Hekate and on the right stands Hermes.
VR 23	Unknown	c.330 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the right side of the relief survives, preserving a female worshipper and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.

VR 24	Unknown	c.330 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive; a woman, a man, four women, a boy clinging to the second, and a servant-girl, overlapping the anta, carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 25	Athens	c.330/28 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive; a woman, a man, a woman, and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 26	Eleusis	c.329/8 BC	Unknown / Demeter	Demeter is seated on a rock to the right and approached by five worshippers; two men, a woman, a man, and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 27	Athens	325-300 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – overlapping the right anta is a nude servant holding a bowl. A god reclines on a couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits on the foot of the couch. There is a table in front of the couch, a snake coiled under it. Behind the goddess a boy leads a pig to an altar, followed by six other worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, three

				children, one chasing a goose. Above the worshippers is a horse's head.
VR 28	Athens, Asklepieion	c.323/2 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. A boy leads a ram to an altar followed by seven more worshippers; a man, a woman, a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two boys.
VR 29	Unknown	c.323/2 BC	Unknown / Unknown	To the right only the arm of a goddess survives. She is approached by a boy leading a pig and eight other worshippers; a man, two women, a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, a boy and a girl.
VR 30	Athens	c.323/2 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – Only the seated goddess and worshippers survive; a boy leading a pig, a man, two women, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two girls.
VR 31	Athens, Varvakeion	c.323/2 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – the right half depicting a reclining god is missing. A naked youth stands with a volute krater,

				approached by five worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, a boy and a girl.
VR 32	Brauron	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / Artemis	Artemis is sat on the left of the relief, a deer at her side. She is approached a boy leading another deer, another nine worshippers following him; a boy, a woman, four men, a servant-girl carrying a kiste between the third and four man, and, in front of them, a girl and a boy.
VR 33	Eleusis	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / unknown	Only the worshippers survive; three men, a girl in front of the first, a woman, and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 34	Athens	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / Zeus	Zeus, holding a sceptre, is seated on a throne on the left of the relief. He is approached by a boy leading a ram and six other worshippers, three men, a woman, a child in front of her, and lastly, a servant-girl, overlapping the anta, carrying a kiste on her head
VR 35	Athens, Asklepieion	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Two reliefs. A – a boy leading a ram approaches an altar followed by six other

				worshippers; a man, two women, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on head (now missing), and, in front of the adults, two boys. B – the legs of a couch and, to the left of it, the legs of a male worshipper.
VR 36	Piraeus, Asklepieion	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. A boy leads an ox to an altar followed by nine more worshippers; a man, a woman, three men, a girl and two women in front of them and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head behind them.
VR 37	Athens, Asklepieion	c.318/7 BC	Unknown / Asklepios	Asklepios sits on a stool facing to the left. Five worshippers approach him from behind; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, a boy and a girl.
VR 38	Unknown	c.313-306 BC	Unknown / Demeter and Kore	Demeter is seated on a throne to the left. Kore stands before her holding a burning torch in each hand. They are approached by a boy leading a pig to an altar and seven more worshippers; a woman, a man, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on

				her head, and, in front of them, two girls and two boys.
VR 39	Athens	c.313-306 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – A nude youth stands to the right of the couch holding an oinochoe. A god reclines on the couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch, a table bearing fruits in front of her. Seven worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, two women, a servant-girl, and, in front of them, a boy and two girls.
VR 40	Unknown	c.313-306 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – only the goddess seated on the end of the couch and the worshippers survive. A boy leading a pig approaches the goddess from behind, followed by six more worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, a boy, a girl, and a boy. Above the worshippers is a horse's head.
VR 41	Athens	c.308/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – a nude youth stands overlapping the right anta. A god holding up a rhyton reclines on a couch. A goddess sits by his feet, a table with

				fruits in front of them both. Behind the goddess a boy leads a pig to the altar, followed by four worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of the woman, a boy.
VR 42	Athens, Asklepieion	c.308/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Worshippers approach an altar from either side. On the left; boy leading a pig, worshipper of unknown sex, a man, and another worshipper of unknown sex. On the right; a boy leading a pig, two men, a woman, and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 43	Piraeus	c.308/7 BC	[--]tobole / Zeus Meilichios	Zeus Meilichios sits on a throne on the left of the relief. A boy leads a pig to a altar in front of Zeus and is followed by six more worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head between them, and, in front of them, three children.
VR 44	Unknown	c.308/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – a god reclines on a couch, a goddess sat at his feet, a table in front of them. A nude youth stands behind the goddess with a

				krater. Six worshippers follow him; two men, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two boys.
VR 45	Athens	c.308/7 BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – a god reclines on a couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch. There is a table in front of them. Three worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, a woman and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 46	Agora	End of fourth-century BC	Unknown / Hero (?)	Banquet scene – a god or hero reclines on a couch. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch. The worshippers process behind the goddess. First comes a slave boy carrying a basket of offerings, followed by two female worshippers, a male worshipper and two children.
VR 47	Agora	End of the fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. The four of them – two male worshippers, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and a female worshipper – approach an altar.

VR 48	Agora	End of the fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. A slave boy leads an animal to sacrifice. He is followed by a male worshipper, a female worshipper, and servant-girl who may originally have carried a kiste on her head. In front of the adult worshippers are three children.
VR 49	Agora	End of the fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a male worshipper, a female worshipper, a servant-girl and three children.
VR 50	Agora	End of the fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers, perhaps only some of them, survive – a female worshipper, a servant-girl and a child.
VR 51	Athens	End of fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet scene – a nude youth stands to the right of the couch. A god reclines on the couch and holds up a horn. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch, a table in front of her. Five worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two boys.

VR 52	Between Keratea and Laurion	End of fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – a god reclines on a couch and raises a rhyton, a goddess sat by his feet. There is a table in front of them. Five worshippers approach from behind the goddess; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two children.
VR 53	Agora	End of fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Banquet Scene – the reclining god is not preserved. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch. A nude youth stands behind her with a krater. Five worshippers follow; a man, a woman, a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head, and, in front of them, two boys.
VR 54	Agora	End of fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only some worshippers survive – two women, a boy and a servant-girl carrying a kiste on her head.
VR 55	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Asklepios and Hygieia	Asklepios and Hygieia stand beside an altar. The only worshipper to survive is a slave boy who brings a pig to sacrifice.
VR 56	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a man, a woman, a worshipper of indistinguishable

				sex, and, in front of them, a slave boy bringing a pig to sacrifice.
VR 57	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Apart from some drapery that belonged to the figure of the deity, only two worshippers survive. These are a male worshipper and a slave boy bringing a pig to sacrifice.
VR 58	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a slave boy, a male worshipper, two female worshippers and a servant-girl.
VR 59	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a slave boy, a male worshipper and a boy.
VR 60	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only some of the worshippers survive – a slave boy and a female worshipper.
VR 61	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Five worshippers survive. The first two are of indistinguishable sex, followed by a female worshipper, a servant-girl and a child.
VR 62	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the legs of a female figure and a child survive. The female figure was frontal and is thought to have been a servant-girl.

VR 63	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a male worshipper, a female worshipper, a servant-girl, and a child.
VR 64	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive – a male worshipper, a female worshipper and a smaller female worshipper and, therefore, possible servant-girl.
VR 65	Agora	Fourth-century BC	Unknown / Unknown	Only the worshippers survive. They are a male worshipper, a child at his side, a female worshipper and a smaller female worshipper, and, therefore, possible servant-girl.

Table 5.3 Votive reliefs with slaves depicted amongst the worshippers (VR 1-65).

At least 65 reliefs survive from the fourth-century BC that appear to depict slaves among the gathered worshippers (see table 5.3). Slaves do not appear in votive reliefs in the sixth and fifth centuries BC, and even in the fourth-century BC most date to the middle of the century and later (Mitropoulou 1977: 87). Of the 65 reliefs collected here 33 depict slave girls along with other worshippers (VR 2, VR 3, VR 4, VR 8, VR 9, VR 10, VR 12, VR 13, VR 17, VR 19, VR 20, VR 23, VR 24, VR 25, VR 26, VR 31, VR 33, VR 37, VR 39, VR 44, VR 45, VR 47, VR 49, VR 50, VR 51, VR 52, VR 53, VR 54, VR 61, VR 62, VR 63, VR 64, VR 65). 8 depict slave boys who lead sacrificial animals and carry baskets of offerings (VR 7, VR 21, VR 46, VR 55, VR 56, VR 57, VR 59, VR 60). Finally, 24 reliefs include both a slave boy and a slave girl among the worshippers (VR 1, VR 5, VR 6, VR 11, VR 14, VR 15, VR 16, VR 18, VR 22, VR 27, VR 28, VR 29, VR 30, VR 32, VR 34,

VR 35, VR 36, VR 38, VR 40, VR 41, VR 42, VR 43, VR 48, VR 58). With the exception of the slave-girl in a relief dedicated to Artemis at Brauron (**VR 15**), which Elpis Mitropoulou (1968: 362, no.211) describes as “quite unique in the whole series of reliefs,” the slave girls in votive reliefs are not characterised by their wearing of a long-sleeved chiton. Most appear to wear short-sleeved chitons and himations like other women depicted alongside them in the reliefs. Instead female figures are distinguished as slave-girls by their carrying of a *kiste* on their heads (Dillon 2002: 35 referring to **VR 27**; Ridgway 1997: 201 referring to **VR 14, Figure 5.4**; van Straten 2000: 218 also referring to **VR 14**). A *kiste* was a basket most often of cylindrical shape, which in ritual contexts was used to carry offerings or sacrificial equipment and to conceal the sacred things in festivals for Demeter and Dionysus (Warre Cornish 1898: 168). The slave girl figures carrying *kistai* in votive scenes, however, are not exclusively associated with these two deities, appearing in reliefs dedicated to Artemis (for example **VR 14, Figure 5.4**), Asklepios with or without Hygieia (for example **VR 11, Figure 11, VR 18, Figure 5.5**), Demeter with or without Kore, Zeus (for example **VR 5, Figure 5.2**), gods and goddesses in banquet scenes whose identities are uncertain, and among worshippers were no deity was depicted or elsewhere no longer survives (see **table 5.3**).

Figure 5.2 Votive relief depicting Zeus Meilichios / Philios and Worshippers (VR 5).
Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1408. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by H.R. Goette). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 5.3 Votive relief depicting Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (VR 11).
Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1331. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Figure 5.4 Votive relief depicting Artemis and worshippers (VR 14). Brauron, Brauron Museum 1151. Courtesy of Rhamnous Museum, Attica (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Ephorate of Antiquities of East Attica.

Figure 5.5 Votive relief depicting Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (VR 18).
Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1333. Courtesy of the National Archaeological Museum, Athens (Photograph by M. Zorias). © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

The carrying of *kistai* was not a duty assigned exclusively to slave women in Athenian cult, particularly as they were so often excluded from festivals where official roles were assigned. Athenian daughters carried baskets in the Panathenaia, and in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (241-262) the daughter of Dicaeopolis carries a basket as part of the rites for the rural Dionysia (Faraone 2008: 214). In Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* (280-294), Mnesilochus, while attempting to infiltrate the women-only Thesmophoria, addresses imaginary slave Thratta, instructing her to leave the basket, *kiste*, and leave, as slaves were not permitted to attend the festival (Dillon 2002: 112). While slaves were denied access to most festivals, surviving votive reliefs reflect their inclusion in worship by the family they served.

The number of worshippers depicted in these 65 votive reliefs ranges widely, but a number of scenes seemingly depict a nuclear family (on families dedicating together and the nuclear family as unusual in ancient Greece see Löhr 2000). Most often a male worshipper, a figure who may be taken as the head of the household, as husband and father, is the first to approach the deity or altar, though sometimes he is preceded by the slave boy leading an animal to be sacrificed (Dillon 2002: 35; Ridgway 1997: 201; van Straten 2000: 217). A female worshipper, presumably his

wife, follows the male worshipper, and is in turn followed by a slave-girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. One or more children are then depicted standing in front of their parents (see **table 5.3 and appendix II**). In the case of scenes with many adult worshippers, it is difficult to assign relationships to all the figures, but if these *kiste*-carrying women and boys leading sacrificial animals were indeed slaves, they presumably belonged to one of the adult worshippers depicted who allowed them to participate in the sacrifice. Other female worshippers carrying infants or attending to children might be characterised as nurses and, therefore, as more slaves participating in worship, or depicted as participating in worship (on nurses on votives, and in Greek and Roman art more generally, see Shulze (1998) *Ammen und Pädagogen: Sklavinnen und Sklaven als Erziehen in der antiken Kunst und Gesellschaft*). While participation in festivals was defined by the Athenian state, slave participation in worship at the level of the *oikos* “may have varied according to the preferences of individual masters” (Parker 2015: 78). Furthermore, there were slaves living independently from their masters who would have managed their own religious affairs. The epigraphic attestations for non-citizen dedicators, slaves among them, in the first section of this chapter are testament to this.

Like funerary iconography, it must be remembered that votive iconography was idealized. While these scenes many have been representative of family worship, they were not portraits. Not all families would have had slaves and not all those that did may have let them participate in cult. What these votive reliefs do demonstrate, however, is that some slaves could expect to be included in cult by the family that owned them, even if they had no place in most festivals. While the most of the 65 reliefs that depict slaves among the worshippers cannot be assigned to a dedicator of known status, only four have surviving inscriptions (**VR 6, VR 14, VR 15, VR 43**), they demonstrate the use of the same imagery again and again. This imagery was used in sanctuaries across Attica, and would have been seen by citizens and non-citizens alike. Epigraphic attestations show that non-citizens were able to dedicate and so non-citizens were likely making use of the same imagery, created for and in the sanctuaries as ‘free space’ environments. Perhaps some of these votive reliefs depicting slaves were even dedicated by slaves, just as possible slaves Plangon (**F 24**) and Soteris (**F 89**) were depicted with slaves (see **IV.4.2.2**).

VI.3 A Dedication by a Whole Foreign Community

Foreign individuals making dedications on the Acropolis has already been treated in section one of this chapter, but dedications from abroad could be the gift of an entire foreign community. Such a dedication was recorded by Pausanias (1.28.2), who describes the dedication of a statue of Athena from an Athenian cleruchy on Lemnos as “the best worth seeing of the works of Pheidias.” The Athena Lemnia represents not only the devotion of that community to Athena, but also the maintenance of a relationship with the cleruchy’s mother city of Athens. The residents of the cleruchy were not foreigners in the same sense as the foreign dedicators listed in the Parthenon inventories, they were Athenian citizens living abroad, but such a dedication would have served to keep these citizens who were removed from the city in the minds of their fellow Athenians, other residents and other foreigners.

Dedicating and votive imagery allowed citizens and non-citizens both at home and abroad to show their devotion to the gods and cast them in the shared role of mortal worshipper. Votive imagery allowed for the articulation of roles within the family that would have been common to many citizens, metics and slaves. Slave status was made apparent through their depiction relative to other worshippers, but this imagery may have been used by slaves just as it may have been used by them in the cemeteries to articulate order and status within a slave household rather than to articulate a distinction in legal status. A dedication and votive imagery could express familial relationships and shared identities just as funerary monuments did, but joint dedications demonstrate individuals coming together on the basis of shared identities, e.g. the washers (*IG II² 2934*), outside the context of the family and regardless of legal status. A dedication allowed for the articulate of new identities across the Athenian community. Dedications also allowed for the articulation of relationships between the Athenian community and other communities, just as decree reliefs did.

VI: Decree Reliefs

While funerary commemoration could be public, interment in the demotion sema, or private, the commissions of relatives – or masters? – decrees were always the public commissions of the Athenian *boule* and demos or another official body. Private individuals could not take it upon themselves to erect a decree in the same way they could, provided they had sufficient funds, erect a funerary monument or make a dedication. The publication of decisions in stone made them available to view not only by citizens but also by anyone else who could and wanted to read them where they stood on the Acropolis (Lawton 1995: 14; Liddel 2003: 80, 84).

Though a variety of decisions were published in stone, alliances and grants of honours were one of the types of decision to be commemorated most frequently (Lawton 1995: 5, 8-9; Lawton 2003: 117; Whitehead 1983: 67). Foreign states and individuals who were well placed to do some service for the Athenians could expect to receive honours in return (see II.3). The setting up of an honorary decree was in itself part of the package of Athenian honours, publicising as it did the good service of the individual or state and what they were to receive in return (Hagemajer Allen 2003b: 206; Hedrick Jr. 1999: 425; Herman 1987: 84). The publication of honours not only further honoured Athens' allies and benefactors but must also have inspired future benefaction towards the Athenians by other foreigners who saw or heard of these honours and aspired to the same for themselves (Hedrick Jr. 1999: 425; Miller 2016: 386; Whitehead 1983: 68). While competition could have posed a danger to the democracy, the Athenians harnessed the competitive spirit of their own citizens and other residents, for example through the *choregia* and other liturgies (see II.2), and of foreigners, through honours for service in foreign affairs, and used it to the advantage of the democracy and its citizens (Whitehead 1983: 68). Foreigners through their service, then, found representation in the commemorative landscape of Attica.

The culture of honour and competition that alliance and honorary decrees were a product of accounts for them being some of the most likely decisions to be inscribed and erected on the Acropolis, but also for them being the most likely decisions to be

embellished with decorative reliefs. It is the decoration of alliances and honours for foreigners that forms the basis of the present chapter. 60 preserved or partially preserved reliefs that are known to have decorated such decrees will be subject to iconographic analysis here, exploring how the relationships between Athens and her allies and benefactors were visually represented. How that representation changed over the course of the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC with shifts in Athens' and her allies' fortunes is a thread that will run throughout what will be a chronological analysis.

V.1 Setting up a decree

All decisions of the Athenian *boule*, *ekklesia* and demos were recorded on perishable material and, from the late fifth century BC when it was built, stored in the Metroon (Meyer 1989: 9; Sickinger 1999: 1, 4, 81). Publication in stone constituted a special measure not afforded to all decisions recorded in the Metroon but, increasingly in the fifth and continuing into the --century BC, more and more decisions were recorded on stone at Athens, in part symptomatic of democracy but in the fifth century BC also of empire (Adcock and Mosley 1975: 122, 177; Hedrick Jr. 1999: 388, 425; Lawton 1993: 27; Sickinger 1999: 5). As already mentioned, no one type of decision was always inscribed on stone and “no single type of document always has reliefs” (Lawton 1995: 5). Whilst grants of honours and alliances were more frequently published and given reliefs, other documents given reliefs include accounts, inventories, decrees concerning cults and sanctuaries, public dedications, and laws (Lawton 1995: 5; Sickinger 1999: 64). All these documents show Athenian officials as accountable to the Athenian demos and in the case of alliance and honorary decrees foreign states and individuals were also accountable to the Athenian people.

The publication of documents was the responsibility of the secretary who worked to a formula, which while continually developing from the fifth century BC down to the Roman period, usually contained the same constituent elements (Hagemajer Allen 2003: 206; Henry 2002: 92; Lawton 1995: 23; Meyer 1989: 13). A decree could be headed with a superscript, “naming the individual or state affected by the decree, or by specifying the nature of the business transacted” (Henry 1977: xi). The prescript either follows such a heading or, in the absence of a heading, begins the

decree. Alan Henry (1977: xi) has shown that the information included in a prescript and the order in which it was inscribed changed over the course of the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods, but it was always intended to convey “the details of the meeting at which the decree was enacted.” At one time or another this included the archon, the prytanising tribe, the secretary, the chairman, the proposer of the decree, the month and day of its proposal, and the enactment formula – ‘the *boule* (and demos) decided’ – though not necessarily in that order. The prescript was followed by the decree proper, which included the reasons for the grants of honours or forming of an alliance, the honours granted or terms of alliance, provision for the secretary to inscribe the decree, where it should be erected and who would be paying for it (Henry 1977: xi; Herman 1987: 84-88; Lawton 1995: 23-27).

While the secretary was responsible for erecting the decrees of the Athenian *boule* and demos, who was responsible for deciding whether a decree had a relief and commissioning that relief and choosing the iconography, has been disputed (Lawton 1995: 23). Provision for the expense incurred when erecting a decree is sometimes included in the decree text itself, though the reliefs themselves are not mentioned in the decree formula (Lawton 1995: 23, 25). Responsibility for commissioning a decree relief has variably been placed with the secretary, the proposer of the decree and the honorand himself on the grounds that these were private commissions added to an otherwise public document (Lawton 1995: 23). With no surviving provisions for reliefs it is difficult to know where responsibility lay, but Carol Lawton (1995: 24) describes the suggestion that privately financed reliefs were added to decrees at the behest of the proposer or honorand as “weak.” Instead Lawton (1995: 26-27) makes the more plausible suggestion that

the choice of documents to be given reliefs must have lain with the secretary... who must have also collaborated with a member of the workshop receiving the commission in calculating the feasibility of providing a relief for the sum appropriated and in determining the subject of the relief.

The secretary, on behalf of the *boule* and demos, saw to the commission of reliefs that must have attracted further attention to such documents and further enriched the

Acropolis as a landscape of honour and competition. Not all documents were given reliefs and so many alliance and honorary decrees must have stood out amongst the sea of other documents and dedications.

The sum for the commission of a decree came either from the treasury and was therefore publicly financed (**DR 20, DR 22, DR 38**) or the honorand or ally was called on to finance their own decree (Adcock and Mosley 1975: 178; Lawton 1995: 23). Though none of the honoured foreigners apparently had any say in how they were to be represented in these decree reliefs, some of them were expected to foot the bill for a public commission, just as they would for a private commission such as a funerary stelai or votive relief. This is known to have been required of the Neapolitans (**DR 11**) in a decree of 410/9 BC. Sochares of Apollonia (**DR 37**), honoured for his assistance to the Athenians at the battle of Methone, was to pay for his own decree, which the secretary was to erect within ten days of its enactment (*IG II²* 130, lines 16-18; Lawton 1995: 23, 96). The decree granting Euphron of Sikyon Athenian citizenship (**DR 58**), originally published at public expense in 323/2 BC, had to be republished in 318/7 BC after the original was destroyed by the oligarchy that governed Athens between 322 and 318 BC (Lawton 1995: 107; Lawton 2003: 127-128). A second decree that accompanied the republication of the first stated that this new decree was to be paid for by Euphron's friends and relatives, Euphron himself having been killed by the Macedonians in the interim (Lawton 1995: 107; Lawton 2003: 127-128). In some cases, then, "if one wanted an honour one had to be prepared to pay for it" (Adcock and Mosley 1975: 178).

While making one's status explicit seems to have been a matter of preference in epitaphs and dedicatory inscriptions, the ethnic or title of a foreign honorand was always given as part of the formula of Athenian decrees, if not first in a superscript then at least in the decree proper. Where this information is lacking, it is the result of preservation and not of preference, again demonstrating a distinction between public and private inscriptions already evidenced in funerary contexts. There are some further 45 decree reliefs of fifth- and fourth-century BC date that resemble honorary decree reliefs that are not included among the 60 alliance and honorary decrees for foreigners in this chapter owing to their damaged or missing inscriptions (Lawton 1995: no.33, 74, 77, 81-83, 89, 90, 103, 105, 106, 111, 115, 116, 118, 123, 124, 126,

129, 131, 133, 134, 136, 137, 140-142, 146, 148, 149, 153, 163, 165-175, 178, 183, 184). Without a decree, just as without an epitaph or dedicatory inscription, the identity of the honorand cannot be known and so cannot be included in this assessment of the iconography of decree reliefs concerning alliances and honours for foreigners. Based on honorary decrees with reliefs that remain largely intact, however, many if not most of these 45 reliefs probably honoured foreigners, as foreigners were more often the recipients of such publications, and particularly the decorated ones (Blanshard 2004: 3; Hagemajer Allen 2003: 204; Lawton 1995: 5; Whitehead 1983: 67).

Athenian decrees commemorating alliances and honouring foreigners were published on the Acropolis in Athens, but some were also published in the allied state (Hagemajer Allen 2003: 238; Lawton 1995: 17; Liddel 2003: 83-84; Smith 2011: 107). Though more alliance decrees may have had clauses that instructed an ally to have a copy of the Athenian decree inscribed and erected at home, only two decrees have surviving duplication clauses. The decree of 410/9 BC concerning Athens and Thracian Neapolis (**DR 11**) already mentioned commanded the Neapolitans to write up their own copy of the text and erect it in their temple of Parthenos at their own expense, the Athenian copy also being set up at the expense of the Neapolitans (*IG I³ 101*, lines 42-45; Lawton 1995: 17; Smith 2011: 107). The decree of 403/2 BC granting the people of Samos Athenian citizenship (**DR 15**), which was a republication of a decree issued in 405/4 BC destroyed by the Thirty Tyrants at the end of the Peloponnesian War, was to be set up in Athens with money from the Greek treasurers, but set up in Samos at the Samians own expense (*IG I³ 127*, lines 38-40; Lawton 1995: 17; Smith 2011: 107). It is not included in the clause whether or not the copies of these decrees were to have had reliefs as well and unfortunately the Neapolitan and Samian copies do not survive (Lawton 1995: 17; Smith 2011: 107).

An Attic – or atticizing – decree relief that was previously mistaken for a votive relief does, however, survive from Sigeion in the Troad (Budde and Nicholls 1964: 12, no.27). The relief is dated to the third quarter of the fourth-century BC, and while nothing of the decree itself survives, two of the three figures depicted in the relief are labelled; Athena on the left; Protesilaos – a local hero – on the right (Budde and

Nicholls 1964: 11-12, no.27; Lawton 1995: 18; Meyer 1989: 288, no.A 81; Smith 2011: 140, no.DR 44). The third, central figure is possibly a personification of the Athenian demos, a figure known from other Athenian decree reliefs of fourth-century BC date (Budde and Nicholls 1964: 12, no. 27; Smith 2011: 140, no.DR 44). This decree relief from Sigeion may have been a copy of an Athenian alliance or honorary decree that does not survive, which if it was shows that copies such as those commanded of the Neapolitans and Samians could have had reliefs (Budde and Nicholls 1964: 12, no.27). As no Athenian version of this decree survives, whether or not the relief was an exact copy of an original cannot be known, but the iconography is comparable with other Athenian alliance and honorary decree reliefs. In the case of this particular relief from Sigeion, however, Carol Lawton (1995: 19) wonders if it was in fact a copy of a specific Athenian decree or another example of the adoption of Athenian practices in that city, where Athenian coin types were also imitated.

While the relationship of the Sigeion relief to Athenian decree reliefs remains unclear – was it a copy of a specific decree or general imitation of Athenian practice? – it provokes discussion of the audience of Athenian decree reliefs. While the recipient allies and honorands may never have seen the decrees and reliefs that honoured them, on the Acropolis these texts and images would have been read, or at least seen, not just by citizens, but also by metics, slaves and visiting foreigners. Any visitor to the Acropolis would be witness to the good service of Athens' allies and benefactors, hence the additional honour brought by publication but also the encouragement of future benefaction. Residents and non-residents alike may have been provoked to ask themselves what they could do for Athens and, consequently, for themselves. The duplication abroad of decrees, and also perhaps their reliefs, not only served as a reminder to allies and honorands that they were accountable to Athens, but also disseminated the bestowal of their honours further and reached a wider audience of individuals to encourage being future benefactors.

V.2 An Overview of Decree Relief Iconography

In her *Attic Document Reliefs* Carol Lawton (1995: 81-157) has collected all surviving document reliefs, a total of 187 across the fifth to second century BC, though all but five belong to the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC. Compared with over 2500 surviving decorated funerary monuments and hundreds of surviving votive reliefs from the same two centuries, “the genre of documentary relief sculpture is not large” (Blanshard 2007: 25). While there were no doubt more decrees with reliefs erected in the fifth- and fourth-centuries BC, surviving evidence shows these public commissions were far fewer than private funerary and votives reliefs that were accessible to citizens, metics and slaves. Decree relief iconography does, however, borrow heavily from the funerary and votive genres, using similar framing devices, figures and gestures (Blanshard 2007: 25; Ridgway 1997: 215). This must have been apparent to anyone viewing the decree reliefs on the Acropolis, particularly when there must have been many votive reliefs in close proximity with which to compare them. While the reliefs do reflect the content of their individual decrees, their “symbolic and allegorical nature” limits the extent to which they convey the specific details or circumstances laid down in the decrees themselves (Lawton 1995: 29). “Iconography needs the text to make sense,” as the application of similar imagery to different documents means its “meaning is not fixed” (Blanshard 2007: 29).

In the case of alliance reliefs, the parties involved are most regularly represented by deities (Lawton 1995: 36; Smith 2011: 92, 102). Athena continually represents Athens, while allied states are represented by deities or heroes whose cult was known to have been important locally (Lawton 1995: 36; Smith 2011: 92, 102). Alternatively, and rarely, an allied city is represented by a personification of the city itself instead of by a deity or hero (Lawton 1995: 59; Smith 2011: 102-103). These female figures resemble goddesses and so secure identification of figures as the personification of cities relies on these figures being labelled (Lawton 1995: 59). Particularly in the reliefs of the second half of the fifth century BC, when Athens exercised considerable control and influence through empire, Athena and the deity, hero, or personification representing an ally engaged in *dexiosis*, the handshake gesture also known from funerary monuments and other art, to signify the agreement and unity of alliance (Blanshard 2007: 21; Davis 1985: 627-628; Lawton 1995: 36).

The imagery suggests the relationships that existed between Athens and her allies in the second half of the fifth century BC were ones of equality, but in reality these ‘allies’ were the subjects of empire, the iconography “a convenient fiction at once flattering to the allied envoys and gratifying to the Athenians themselves” (Lawton 1995: 36). Though Athens formed the Second Athenian League in the 370s BC, after defeat in the Peloponnesian War in 404 BC the city never regained the position of power it had held previously, and alliance relief iconography reflected this change (Lawton 1995: 36-37).

Honorary decrees utilised many of the same figures as alliance reliefs. The main difference is the depiction of a mortal figure, smaller than the deities, heroes or personifications he accompanies, who is the recipient of the honours bestowed by the decree (Lawton 1995: 60). Athena once again usually represents Athens and bestows honours on the mortal honorand, usually through the gesture of crowning, crowns of course being one of the honours that could be granted (Lawton 1995: 30). An appropriate deity, hero, or personification, where present, represents the honorand’s home city just as in alliance reliefs (Lawton 1995: 31). Unlike in alliance reliefs, however, Athena is not always the representative of Athens, or at least not the city’s only representative. Athens is represented by the personification of *demos* instead of or alongside Athena (Lawton 1995: 55-58; Ridgway 1997: 216; Smith 2011: 99-101). *Demos*, the Athenian citizen body, is depicted as an older, bearded man dressed in a himation who often, but not always, stands equal in height to Athena (Lawton 1995: 58; Smith 2011: 99). The personification of the citizen body received cult from as early as 462 BC, and Pausanias (1.3.3-5) refers to a painting of *demos* by Euphranor in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios, as well as two statues of *demos*, one in Piraeus, the other near the Bouleuterion (Lawton 1995: 31, 56-57; Smith 2011: 96-100). The figure would have been recognisable from other contexts by the time he became prevalent in decree reliefs from the middle of the fourth-century BC (Lawton 1995: 31, 57). As alliance and honorary decrees were enacted by the *boule* and *demos*, the personification would have been well placed in any such relief, though *demos* does not appear in alliance reliefs (Lawton 1995: 55). The *boule* too is personified in honorary decree reliefs, but she is attested far less frequently than Athena and *demos*, with whom she appears rather than replaces (Lawton 1995: 58).

While individual reliefs reflect the content of their decrees, or at least the type of decree they decorated, they were still stock scenes, just as stock scenes were used by citizens and non-citizens on their funerary monuments and votives. Instead the interactions between deities, heroes, personifications, and mortals served “as a useful shorthand throughout the entire Greek world” (Smith 2011: 107).

V.3 Collected Alliance and Honorary Decree Reliefs for Foreigners

60 reliefs decorating alliance decrees or honorary decrees for foreigners survive from the 130 years between 430 and 300 BC, or possibly the 150 years between 450 and 300 BC (see **DR 1 and DR 2**). The first decree reliefs, then, were contemporary with the revival of decorated funerary monuments during and after the Periklean building program (Ridgway 1997: 193; Smith 2011: 9). The nature of decree reliefs, however, means that unlike most funerary monuments, which can only be dated stylistically, many of them can be dated to a specific year on the basis of officials’ names or mention of a datable event. It is possible, then, to analyse the 60 decree reliefs in a stricter chronological order than is possible for funerary and votive iconography. The analysis will, therefore, be broken down into shorter epochs defined by events that altered Athens’ position in the wider Greek world, for as has already been alluded to in the previous section fluctuations in the city’s prominence affected iconography. The four epochs are as follows; from the earliest decree reliefs to the end of the Peloponnesian War, 450 / 426 to 404 BC (**DR 1-14**); from the restoration of democracy to the formation of the Second Athenian League, 403 to 379 BC (**DR 16-29**); The Second Athenian League, 378-338 BC (**DR 30-46**); after Battle of Chaeronea to the end of the fourth-century BC, 337-300 BC (**DR 47-60**).

Period	Alliance Decrees	Honorary Decrees
450 / 426 to 404 BC (DR 1-15)	DR 1, DR 4, DR 6, DR 8, DR 9, DR 10, DR 11, DR 12,	DR 2, DR 3, DR 5, DR 7, DR 13, DR 14
403 to 379 BC (DR 16-29)	DR 15, DR 17, DR 21, DR 23, DR 24, DR 29	DR 16, DR 18, DR 19, DR 20, DR 22, DR 25, DR 26, DR 27, DR 28
378-338 BC (DR 30-46)	DR 30, DR 33, DR 34, DR 35, DR 36, DR 39	DR 31, DR 32, DR 38, DR 40, DR 41, DR 42, DR 43, DR 44, DR 45, DR 46
337-300 BC (DR 47-60)	DR 54	DR 47, DR 48, DR 49, DR 50, DR 51, DR 52, DR 53, DR 55, DR 56, DR 57, DR 58, DR 59, DR 60

Table 6.1 Breakdown of alliance and honorary decree reliefs.

V.3.1 From the Earliest Decrees Reliefs to the End of the Peloponnesian War, 450 / 426 to 404 BC (DR 1-14)

In the nearly fifty years from the battle of Plataea in 479 BC, which concluded the Persian Wars with a Greek victory, to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War in 431 BC, Athens came to exercise hegemony over large parts of the Aegean and surrounding territories (Meiggs 1972: 1; Rhodes 2010: 88). From the Delian League established in 478/7 BC to safeguard against future Persian invasion, the Athenians fashioned themselves an empire, the transfer of the League's treasury from Delos to Athens in 454/3 BC being "a symbol, a brutal state of the reality, but not the reality itself," for the Athenians already dominated their allies by this date (Finley 1979: 104). The alliance decrees and honours for foreigners adorned with reliefs from the 420s BC - if not the 450s BC - when the first such reliefs appear, to the year 404 BC, when the Peloponnesian War ended with the Athenians being defeated by the Spartans and consequently losing the hegemony they had previously enjoyed, are

concerned with maintaining empire and, subsequently, with battling Sparta and the Peloponnesian League.

The Regulations for Miletus (**DR 1**) is perhaps the earliest surviving decree relief depending on whether its traditional date of 450/49 BC or its revised date of 426/5 BC is accepted (Lawton 1995: 112). Miletus was an ‘ally’ of the Athenian Empire but in the mid-450s BC the city had revolted by not paying tribute to Athens that had previously been paid to the treasury on Delos (Lawton 1995: 112; Rhodes 2010: 53). The regulations laid down in this fragmentary decree were the Athenian response to the city’s dissent, Miletus being coerced to remain allied to Athens. The relief itself is fragmentary. Only the feet of two presumably female figures remain, the left figure standing, the right seated. Lawton (1995: 112) suggests these figures were Artemis, standing, representing rebellious Miletus and Athena, seated, representing Athens. The relief may have resembled that on a decree for Methone (**DR 4**), an ally of strategic importance to Athens, where a seated Athena represents Athens, whilst Artemis represents Methone. Even these two early reliefs, then, demonstrate the recurring iconography of decree reliefs and their ability to convey the idea of alliance but not the particulars of the decrees, of Miletus being forced back into the fold, of Methone being exonerated from having to pay outstanding tribute (*IG I³ 61*, lines 29-32).

In either the 440s or 420s BC a decree declared the sons of Iphiades *proxenoi* (**DR 2**). No ethnic survives for Iphiades or his sons, but a grant of proxeny is enough to confirm that they were foreign and not citizen honorands. Only the lower right corner of the relief survives, leaving the number of figures and their identities unknown. The reliefs of other *proxeny* decrees might be looked to for inspiration (**DR 5, DR 7, DR 16, DR 25-28, DR 37, DR 38, DR 41, DR 45, DR 50, DR 58**), however, multiple honorands mentioned in the decree does not necessitate the depiction of multiple honorands in the relief, as in the relief on a later grant of *proxeny* for five men from Abydos, where only one man is depicted (**DR 25; Figure 6.3**). At least four sons of Iphiades are mentioned in the decree, but they were not necessarily all depicted (*IG I³ 28*, lines 1-4). The idea of the grant of proxeny or honours in general is conveyed by a mortal in the presence of Athena or another representative of Athens and a representative of the honorand’s own city, but the

particulars of the grant, i.e. to how many the grant was made, might not be made apparent.

The relief of the decree honouring Apollonophanes of Kolophon (**DR 3**) in 427/6 BC appears to conform to the archetypal *proxeny* / honorary decree relief just described, even though the relief is fragmentary. Athena, her head missing, stands to the right leaning on her shield with her left arm and crowning Apollonophanes with her right. The left edge of the relief is missing, but another deity or hero representing the city of Kolophon may have originally stood behind Apollonophanes (Lawton 1995: 113). The cult of Athena Polias is attested at Kolophon (Rubinstein 2004: 1079), but Athena is nowhere attested as representing any city but Athens in Athenian decree reliefs and so another figure must have represented that city.

The relief of the decree concerning relations between Athens and Methone (**DR 4**) had already been mentioned. Athena, her head missing, is seated to the right and engages in *dexiosis* with Artemis who stands before her. A hunting dog, which serves to verify the goddess' identity, follows Artemis, whose upper body is missing.

Sotimos of Herakleia (**DR 5**) was granted *proxeny* between 424/3 and 410 BC. Though the relief is damaged it is clear three figures are depicted. Athena is seated to the left, though she is only preserved from the waist down. She may have crowned Sotimos as she crowns other *proxenoi* in other reliefs, but her right hand, with which she usually crowns honorands, hangs by her side holding a helmet, and her left arm is not preserved. Sotimos is preserved from the knees down. He wears a himation. Behind him stands a male figure, again preserved only from the knees down. He is presumed to be Herakles, Herakleia's eponymous hero (Lawton 1995: 118).

Only the head and torso of a female figure labelled ΜΕΣΣ[Ι---] survive of a relief of a decree of the 420s BC concerning Athens and either Messenia in the Peloponnese or Messana on Sicily (**DR 6**; Lawton 1995: 114; Smith 2011: 103). This figure wears a peplos and polos headdress. She is one of only very few definite personifications of place representing an Athenian ally in place of a deity or hero (Lawton 1995: 59; Smith 2011: 103). Whether Athena stood opposite Messenia / Messana as she does other deities in other alliance reliefs is unknown.

Figure 6.1 Decree relief honouring Proxenides of Knidos (DR 7). Athens, Acropolis Museum 2996. Courtesy of the Acropolis Museum, Athens (Photograph by MAV); © Acropolis Museum photo.

The relief of the *proxeny* decree for Proxenides of Knidos (**DR 7; Figure 6.1**) around 420 BC is much better preserved than those of the decrees for Apollophanes of Kolophon (**DR 3**) and Sotimos of Herakleia (**DR 5**), but enough survives of these reliefs to attest to similarities with that for Proxenides. Two deities, Athena and Aphrodite, are depicted, along with mortal honorand Proxenides himself in between them, just as, as far as can be made out, in the reliefs for Apollonophanes (**DR 3**) and Sotimos (**DR 5**). Unlike in the relief for Apollophanes (**DR 3**), Aphrodite rather than Athena crowns Proxenides and instead Athena looks to engage in *dexiosis* with Proxenides, though as the gesture is only seen between either two deities /

personifications or two mortals, Lawton (1995: 115) suggests Athena hands him a crown. Sotimos (**DR 5**) could have been crowned by Herakles instead of Athena, though if Athena offered him a crown she did so with her left hand (see above). It is more likely that the Athena in Sotimos' (**DR 5**) relief held in her left hand, if anything, a spear, as she does in other reliefs (e.g. **DR 15**).

A decree of 417/6 BC renewed an alliance between Athens and Argos (**DR 8**) against Sparta in the Peloponnesian War (Lawton 1995: 84). The relief is fragmentary but the figure to the right, of whom only an arm survives, was probably Athena. She engages in *dexiosis* with Hera, who stands in the centre of the relief. She wears a veil, which characterises her as the bride of Zeus, who sits on a throne behind his wife, his lower body covered by a himation, his left hand raised holding his sceptre (Lawton 1995: 84).

The relief of a decree concerning the Samians (**DR 9**), dating to either 412/1 or 405 BC, perhaps resembles that of the earlier relief of the alliance between Athens and Argos (**DR 8**). It too is fragmentary, with only the legs of two figures preserved. To the left is seated Athena, accompanied by a coiled snake. In front of her stands a female figure identified as Hera, who also represents the Samians in a later, better-preserved relief (**DR 15**). Hera appears to turn away from Athena, suggesting a third figure stood on the other side of Hera, perhaps Zeus (Lawton 1995: 117). The exchange between Athena and Hera (**DR 8**, **DR 9**, **DR 15**) represents alliance or accord between Athens and another city, but as Hera was an important deity in a number of cities across the Greek world, she could be called upon to represent any of them when they entered into a relationship with Athens (Blanshard 2007: 29). Without the accompanying decree, then, Hera – and the same can be said of other deities – cannot be identified as representing a particular ally (Blanshard 2007: 29).

A relief survives with the heading Mytilene (**DR 10**), no doubt concerning Athenian relations with that city. It has been associated with a decree concerning the revolt of Mytilene from Athens in 428 BC (*IG I³ 66*), but differences both in the lettering and the colour of the marble point to this not being the case (Lawton 1995: 116). Instead it may belong to some later decree concerning Mytilene. Only Athena, who stands bearing shield and spear, survives. She presumably faced a divine representative of

Mytilene but he or she does not survive. Like the regulations for Miletus (**DR 1**), this relief is fragmentary but probably resembled other alliance reliefs even though the party concerned was not, or had recently not been, on good terms with Athens.

In 410/9 BC a decree praised the Neapolitans (**DR 11**) for refusing to revolt against the Athenians despite being besieged by the Thasians and Peloponnesians (*IG I³ 101*, lines 6-9). The relief shows Athena, who leans on her shield, engaging in *dexiosis* with a now lost figure who represented Neapolis. The angle at which Athena extends her hand suggests a figure of her own or similar height, unlike the representative of Neapolis, Parthenos, in a later decree relief (**DR 36**).

Kios in Bithynia was an ‘ally’ of the Athenian empire that appeared regularly in the Athenian tribute lists (Lawton 1995: 87). Only three lines of a decree of 406/5 BC concerning relations between Athens and Kios survives but its relief is one of the better-preserved examples pre-dating the end of the Peloponnesian War (**DR 12**). Again resembling earlier alliance reliefs, Athena is depicted engaged in *dexiosis* with another figure. He is an older, bearded figure shorter than Athena and is labelled Kios, a companion of Herakles and eponymous hero of this Athenian ally (Lawton 1995: 87). That he was labelled probably attests to the fact that he was a figure seldom seen in Athenian art whose identity might otherwise have been mistaken. The same is true of the earlier personification of Messenia / Messana (**DR 6**).

In the last year of the Peloponnesian War, 405/4 BC, Athens honoured two men who received reliefs on their decrees (**DR 13**, **DR 14**). Epikerdes of Kyrene (**DR 13**) was honoured for giving gifts to the Athenian people, while [P]oly[p]os (**DR 14**), possibly from Gortyn if his ethnic is restored correctly, was made a *proxenos*. The reliefs of both decrees are fragmentary but seem to resemble the earlier honorary reliefs for Apollonophanes of Kolophon (**DR 3**), Sotimos of Herakleia (**DR 5**), and Proxenides of Knidos (**DR 7**). Epikerdes stands before a female figure assumed to be Athena. Epikerdes’ head is missing and only the lower length of Athena’s peplos is preserved. [P]oly[p]os stands before a seated Athena with a shield resting at her side, only the legs of either figure preserved. A representative of Kyrene may have stood behind Epikerdes and one of Gortyn behind [P]oly[p]os, just as Herakles accompanied Sotimos (**DR 5**) and Aphrodite accompanied Proxenides (**DR 7**).

The iconography of decree reliefs down to the end of the Peloponnesian War, then, exhibit consistency and repetition, even in instances where the party had tried to rebel against Athenian control. The iconography of alliance showed the strength of Athens' position, being able to force cities back into service, and mask such politically unattractive incidents. While much of the same iconography persisted down to the end of the fourth-century BC, the power that lay behind it was much reduced.

V.3.2 From the Restoration of Democracy to the Formation of the Second Athenian League, 403 to 379 BC (DR 15-29)

With their victory over the Athenians in 404 BC, the Spartans replaced the democratic government of their quashed enemy with a pro-Spartan oligarchy, the Thirty Tyrants (Rhodes 2010: 160-161). The rule of the Thirty, under which many citizens were disenfranchised and the property of many metics confiscated, did not last the year, with democracy restored in 403 BC (Rhodes 2010: 161). Though the restoration of democracy brought the resumption and republication of decrees of the *boule* and *demos*, it did not restore Athens' position on the world stage. Allies formerly under Athenian control now answered to Sparta (Rhodes 2010: 160). In the years between the end of the Peloponnesian War and the founding of the Second Athenian League, more of the decrees with reliefs relating to foreign relations were increasingly honours for foreigners rather than out right alliances (Lawton 1995: 37).

A decree honouring the Samians (**DR 15; Figure 6.2**) and granting them Athenian citizenship for their loyalty after the Athenians were defeated at the battle of Aigospotamoi in 405 BC was republished in 403/2 BC after it had been destroyed under the Thirty Tyrants (Blanshard 2007: 19; Lawton 1995: 88). The relief, one of the best-preserved Athenian decree reliefs and consequently one most often cited as an example of the genre, depicted once again Athena and Hera engaged in *dexiosis* (Blanshard 2007: 19-20; Lawton 1995: 88). Athena wears a peplos, himation, aegis with small gorgoneion, and an Attic helmet, a spear in her left hand and her shield leaning against an olive tree behind her (Blanshard 2007: 19-20; Lawton 1995: 88). Hera wears a sleeveless peplos, shoulder mantle, and diadem. In her left hand she

holds a long sceptre (Blanshard 2007: 19-20; Lawton 1995: 88). This relief, while not decorating an alliance per se, resembles earlier alliance reliefs such as those for Argos (**DR 8**), Samos (**DR 9**), Neapolis (**DR 11**), and Kios (**DR 12**). When this relief was erected in 403/2 BC, however, Athenian power was reduced and Samos was the scene factionalism, many of the islands citizens facing exile (Blanshard 2007: 31-33). “This narrative of confusion, pain and exile is far removed from the serenity of the *dexiosis* of Athena and Hera” (Blanshard 2007: 33). Though Athens’ fortunes had changed, this relief still demonstrates how iconography could mask reality, as in the reliefs for Miletus (**DR 1**) and Mytilene (**DR 10**). Whereas in these earlier reliefs Athenian despotism was masked by imagery that reflected agreement and equality, here that same imagery masked Athenian and Samian weakness.

Figure 6.2 Decree relief commemorating an alliance between Athens and Samos (DR 15). Athens, Acropolis Museum 1333a-d. Courtesy of the Acropolis Museum, Athens (Photograph by MAVR); © Acropolis Museum photo.

The relief of the decree making Arist[oxen]os of Boeotia (**DR 16**), perhaps specifically of Plataea, a *proxenos*, dating to either 403/2 or 382/1 BC, is the first surviving example of a different type of imagery in decree reliefs (Lawton 1995: 120-121). Instead of depicting the honorand Arist[oxen]os receiving his rewards from the appropriate deities, what survives of the relief are the legs of a bull. The bull was symbolic of the Boeotians who were known and named for their cattle (Lawton 1995: 121). Such a symbol, as far as can be made out from what survives of the relief, completely removes Athens from the depiction, emphasising instead the region from which *proxenos* Arist[oxen]os hailed. Animal imagery associated with a foreign state, while never prolific, continues to be used on decrees for the rest of the century (**DR 21, DR 22, DR 28, DR 31, DR 34, DR 35, DR 40, DR 50**).

The relief over a decree concerning an alliance between Athens and Eretria (**DR 17**) is very fragmentary but may have resembled the earlier reliefs on the decrees between Athens and Methone (**DR 4**) and Athens and Samos (**DR 9**) respectively. Only the feet of a seated female figure, presumably Athena, survive on the left side of the relief. Nothing of any representative of Eretria survives but Artemis could have been an appropriate figure as on the decree concerning Athens and Eretrian city Methone (**DR 4**), being as she was an important deity in the region (Lawton 1995: 82).

In 394/3 BC, Athens honoured Dionysios I of Syracuse, his brothers, and his brother-in-law (**DR 18**). What honours they were granted are unknown as only the prescript of the decree survives, but the decree may have contained interstate agreements, as the relief resembles that of an alliance (Lawton 1995: 90). Athena, accompanied by a snake, engages in *dexiosis* with a female figure identified as Demeter, or more likely Persephone (Kore), on the basis of the large torch she holds in her left hand (Lawton 1995: 90-91). Though foreign affairs came to be conducted through honorary decrees rather than out and out alliances, the iconography of alliance persisted in some reliefs.

Possibly in the same year as Dionysios I (**DR 18**) was honoured, the Athenians honoured Euagoras king of Cypriot Salamis (**DR 19**), though this decree is less securely dated. Of the relief, only the legs of a female figure wearing a chiton and

himation survive. It is not possible to say who this figure was, whether she represented Athens or Salamis, or whether what was depicted in the relief bore more resemblance to other alliance reliefs rather than other honorary reliefs, as did the relief for Dionysios I (**DR 18**).

Between 389 and 386 BC, the Athenians honoured Archippos and Hipparchos (**DR 20**), brothers from Thasos who had been part of a delegation to Athens. Only the head and torso of Athena survive from the relief. Whether both brothers were depicted, or only one as in the relief for the sons from Abydos (**DR 25**) also dating to the 380s BC, is, therefore, unknown.

A decree of 387/6 BC praising Klazomenai (**DR 21**) for loyalty and affirming their duty to pay *eikoste*, new tribute payable to Athens just as Klazomenai had paid tribute as a member of the Delian League, also made use of animal imagery (Lawton 1995: 91). The relief shows two rams facing each other, this animal being depicted on Klazomenian coins from about the same date as this decree (Lawton 1995: 91). Whether reference to Klazomenian coinage was a deliberate irony, the city being obliged to make payments to Athens, or just a symbol of that city as the bull was of Boeotia on the *proxeny* decree of Arist[oxen]os (**DR 16**), cannot be known.

The relief over the decree honouring Hebryzelmis king of the Thracian Odrysians (**DR 22**), enacted in 386/5 BC, also depicts animals, this time horses. The relief shows an unidentified female figure, preserved only from the waist down, flanked by a horse on either side, though like the female figure only their legs are preserved. Like bulls for Boeotia (**DR 16**) and rams for Klazomenai, the Athenians associated Thrace with horses (Lawton 1995: 91). These reliefs must have been erected on the understanding that there was a shared knowledge of where these animals were meant to represent amongst those who viewed them, Athenian citizens, but also other residents as well as foreigners.

Like Klazomenai, Chios was a former Delian League member who re-entered into alliance with Athens after the Peloponnesian War (**DR 23**). An unidentified female figure is all that survives of the relief. She is not Athena and so presumably represented Chios. Athena likely stood in the right portion of the relief now lost.

Unlike in earlier alliance reliefs, however, the two could not have engaged in *dexiosis*, as the surviving female figure draws one hand across her front and the other behind her back.

Little survives of a relief from a decree concerning an alliance between Athens and Olynthus (**DR 24**), its date disputed either as in the 380s, 370s or 350s BC (Lawton 1995: 124). The feet of a female figure, possible with a shield and therefore making her Athena, and a male figure, possibly Apollo, are all that survive of the relief.

Figure 6.3 Decree relief honouring the sons of Leomestor and Diagoras of Abydos (DR 25). Athens, Acropolis Museum 1330. Courtesy of the Acropolis Museum, Athens (Photograph by Tsiamis); © Acropolis Museum photo.

The honorary decree of the 380s BC making five men, the sons of Leomestor and Diagoras of Abydos, *proxenoi* has already been mentioned twice above (**DR 25; Figure 6.3**). Its relief depicts Athena seated to the right. She rests her left arm on her shield and held a painted spear in her right hand. Her helmet lies on the ground beside her and an eagle perches on her knees. An eagle appeared on the contemporary coins of Abydos, and must here serve to represent that city in the absence of any deity or other personification (Lawton 1995: 123). Instead of five men representing the five honoured sons processing in front of Athena, there is only

one mortal honorand depicted. Anyone looking at the relief would be unaware there were multiple honorands if they did not read the decree.

Komaïos of Abdera was made a *proxenos* at some point in the first quarter of the fourth-century BC (**DR 26**). The relief is very fragmentary, but, based on the preserved feet of the figures, it depicted Athena and Komaïos himself. Athena may have crowned Komaïos as she crowned Apollonophanes (**DR 3**). There does not appear to have been room for the depiction of a representative of Abdera, unless some animal or symbol from Abdera's coinage accompanied Athena as in the relief for the sons from Abydos (**DR 25**).

A further two men were granted *proxeny* in the first quarter to the first half of the fourth-century BC whose honorary decrees were decorated with reliefs. Only feet and drapery in the right corner survive of the relief for [---]psikles (**DR 27**). A relief similar to that of earlier *proxeny* decrees might be imagined. The *proxenos* from Naukratis (**DR 28**) was not represented himself in his relief. Instead a bull and a ram facing each other are depicted. Another man from Naukratis (**DR 40**) honoured by the Athenians had a bull depicted on his decree. The animal must have been associated with Naukratis as well as Boeotia, showing that, as with the depiction of the same deities to represent different cities, a viewer needed the decree to be sure which city was being referred to (Lawton 1995: 97, 132).

A decree between Athens and Siphnos (**DR 29**) concerning the punishment of Athenians in cases at Siphnos has a relief, however, only the legs of a seated Athena survive (Lawton 1995: 128). The relief may have resembled other alliance reliefs, but there is no trace of who represented Siphnos.

The Athenian decree reliefs of the first two decades of the fourth-century BC demonstrate continuity from the period of the Peloponnesian War but with some additions. Athena continues to represent the Athenians in dealings with foreign states and individuals, but in some reliefs she and other deities are absent, replaced by animals symbolic of the allied or honoured city. In these reliefs, Athens is not represented visually, placing all focus on their ally or the honorand's own city, even in preference of the honorand himself.

V.3.3 The Second Athenian League, 378-338 BC (DR 30-46)

The alliance and honorary decrees enacted by Athens between 403 and 379 BC demonstrate that even after the break up of its empire with its defeat in the Peloponnesian War, the city was still very active in maintaining and establishing foreign relations. In the years after the Peloponnesian War, Sparta exercised hegemony over the Greek world but “soon became no less popular than the Athenians” (Rhodes 2010: 160). This prompted the founding of the Second Athenian League in 378 BC, which was to be a defensive organisation in opposition to further Spartan encroachment, though not a second Athenian empire (Cargill 1981: 1, 189-196; Rhodes 2010: 265-267). Alliance and honorary decrees between 378 and 338 BC concern relations between Athens and other cities under the auspices of the Second Athenian League against Sparta, but these years also saw the rise of Macedon as a threat from the north to the whole of the Greek world. The Athenians honoured cities and kingdoms to the north, or individuals from those cities or kingdoms, which served as buffers between them and Philip II (Lawton 2003: 117). Alliance and honorary decree relief imagery was already seen from the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, and earlier (**DR 1**, **DR 2**), down to the formation of the League persists under the League, but some reliefs place more emphasis on the honorands, their identities and their achievements (Lawton 2003: 117).

In 375/4 BC Athens contracted an alliance with Korkyra (**DR 30**) that was to last ‘for all time’ (Cargill 1981: 68; Lawton 1995: 126). The relief is similar to earlier alliance reliefs, particularly that between Athens and Argos (**DR 8**), though this later relief is much better preserved. Like Argos (**DR 8**), Korkyra (**DR 30**) is represented by Hera and Zeus together, while Athena once again represents Athens. Zeus is seated as in the Argos alliance relief, but unlike in the Argos alliance relief Hera faces her husband and not Athena, and, therefore, the two goddesses do not engage in *dexiosis* as they appear to do in the earlier relief. Athena stands to the right at a distance from Zeus and Hera, almost as if just an onlooker and as less active than in the Argos alliance relief. Perhaps the intention was to reflect Athens’ more humbled position, even in the wake of the founding of the new league.

Figure 6.4 Decree relief honouring Alketas of Syracuse (DR 31). Acropolis Museum 1349. Courtesy of the Acropolis Museum, Athens (Photograph by Spyrou); © Acropolis Museum photo.

The horse imagery seen first on the decree honouring Hebryzelmis king of the Thracian Odrysai (**DR 22**) reoccurs on the decree honouring Alketas of Syracuse (**DR 31; Figure 6.4**) in 373/2 BC. A horse is depicted stood facing to the left. Below it is carved an olive crown. It has been suggested that in this instance the horse together with the crown represents some equestrian victory of Alketas' rather than serving to represent Syracuse (Lawton 1995: 93). Though Alketas himself is not depicted, if the horse really does allude to an equestrian victory then this relief is more personalised than earlier honorary reliefs. A later relief alludes to the similar achievements of Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**).

The relief of the 363/2 BC decree honouring Menelaos of Pelagonia (**DR 32**) for his assistance to Athens against Amphipolis and the Chalkidian League, while fragmentary, resembles other honorary – particularly *proxeny* – decree reliefs (Lawton 1995: 93). Only the feet of the three figures are preserved. To the left is a small figure wearing a himation who must be taken for Menelaos himself. In the

centre is a larger male also wearing a himation who may be a deity but could also be Demos personified. He may have crowned Menelaos. Athena follows behind Demos, once again side-lined in the depiction as in the relief of the alliance between Athens and Korkyra (**DR 30**).

In 362/1 BC, Athens enacted a decree for an alliance with Arkadia, Achaia, Elis and Phleious (**DR 33**), the relief of which “is very similar to that of the alliance between Athens and Korkyra” (Lawton 1995: 94). Once again Zeus and Hera are depicted as the joint representatives of Athens’ ally, or in this case allies, and Athena represents Athens. The heads of all three deities are missing. Zeus is seated on throne and Hera stands facing him as she does in the Korkyra alliance relief (**DR 30**) rather than facing Athena as she does in the Argos alliance relief in 417/6 BC (**DR 8**).

Athens entered into another alliance ‘for all time’ in 461/0 BC, this time with Thessaly (**DR 34**). The relief is another depiction of a horse, though only its hooves are preserved, horses being associated with Thessaly as well as with Thrace (**DR 22**). The association of horses with Thrace is borne out again in the relief of an alliance in 356/5 BC between Athens and Thrace, Paionia and Illyria (**DR 35; Figure 6.5**). Only the hind legs of the rearing horse survive. Once again iconography was not enough to indicate what, who or where the decree concerned, as horses, like so many deities, served to represent more than one region or kingdom. The relief needs the decree to be truly understood.

Figure 6.5 Decree relief commemorating an alliance between Athens, Thrace, Paionia, and Illyria (DR 35). Athens, Epigraphic Museum 6966a-c. Courtesy of the Epigraphic Museum, Athens (Photograph from archive); © Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sport / Archaeological Receipts Fund.

Neapolis had been honoured for their loyalty to Athens back in 410/9 BC (**DR 11**) but the city was the subject of another decree in 356/5 BC (**DR 36**). The decree was the Athenian response to a Neapolitan embassy whose visit was probably prompted by the growing Macedonian threat (Lawton 1995: 95; Lawton 2003: 118). Its relief is better preserved than the 410/9 BC decree relief and shows Athena engaged in *dexiosis* with Parthenos, who is labelled as such. Athena wears a peplos and Attic helmet and rests her left hand on her shield. Parthenos, a figure closer in size to mortal honorands than deities and personifications, wears a peplos and polos. This figure is known from Neapolitan coins, and from the decree of 410/9 BC it is known that there was a temple of Parthenos in Neapolis where a duplicate of this earlier decree was to be erected.

Sochares of Apollonia (**DR 37**), who had to pay for his own decree, was made a *proxenos* by the Athenians in 355/4 BC for aiding them at the battle of Methone

against Philip, though Methone fell to Philip in 354 BC (Lawton 1995: 96; Lawton 2003: 119). Sochares himself must have stood on the left side of the relief: he is not preserved. Athena, in the middle of the scene, reaches out her right arm to crown the missing Sochares. Behind her are Apollo, patron deity of the city of Apollonia, who is seated and his mother Leto. The relief honouring Sochares resembles earlier honorary reliefs and Athena remains central to the scene, unlike in some of the alliance reliefs of this period of the Second Athenian League and the rise of Macedon. In the same year the Athenians also made Philiskos of Sestos a *proxenos* (**DR 38**), publicly financing his decree, in recognition of him providing them information on the fleet of Byzantion at a time when they were working to regain control of supply routes to the Black Sea (Lawton 1995: 96; Lawton 2003: 119). Philiskos is depicted as about to be crowned for his efforts, not an unfamiliar motif, but he is to be crowned by a small Nike that Athena holds in her hand rather than by Athena herself. Behind Athena are a horse and its rider, the horse rearing up. This rider presumably represented the Thracian city of Sestos. What significance Nike held in crowning Philiskos in place of Athena can only be guessed at. Perhaps he had enjoyed some personal victory like Alketas of Syracuse honoured before him (**DR 31**) or Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**) honoured after him.

At some point in the second quarter of the fourth-century BC, the Athenians allied with or honoured the city of Aphytis (**DR 39**), no doubt a strategic move in the face of growing Macedonian power based on the city's location in the Chalcidice. The decree's relief is fragmentary. Only one female figure survives, and only from the waist down. This figure, wearing peplos, chiton and himation and holding a phiale in her right hand, is unidentified. She is presumably some goddess important in Aphytis or a personification of that city.

The decree of 354/3 BC honouring Moschos of Naukratis (**DR 40**) has already been mentioned, as it mimics the iconography of an earlier *proxeny* decree for a man from the same city. Of the relief for Moschos (**DR 40**) only the hind legs of the bull are preserved.

The relief of a *proxeny* decree (**DR 41**), the honorand's name restored as Andron, is rather fragmentary. Only the feet of two male figures survive; in the centre Andron

himself; behind him the personification of the Athenian demos, identified by a label. There was probably room for a third figure to the left of Andron, the figure perhaps being Athena or *boule* (Lawton 1995: 133). If this relief is a rare example of the personification of *boule*, it perhaps resembled the later relief honouring Asklepiodoros of Phokis (**DR 55**), where both *boule* and demos crown the honorand, the scene watched over by Athena.

The honorary decree of 347/6 BC ensuring honours for the sons of the preceding King of the Bosporan Kingdom (**DR 42**) is unusual both on account of its size and “its strong characterization of the honorands” (Lawton 1995: 98). At over 2 metres in height the stele is one of the largest preserved, and with a height of 0.69 and a width of 0.615 metres the relief itself is one of the largest decree reliefs (Lawton 1995: 98; Lawton 2003: 120). The stele was to be set up in the Piraeus alongside a stele granting honours to the preceding king, Leukon, and not on the Acropolis like most alliance and honorary decrees (Lawton 1995: 98). The relief depicts the brother kings Spartokos II and Pairisades I and their other brother Apollonios. The two kings are seated on a claw-footed throne, their brother stood to the right leaning on a stick. The kings are depicted bearded but also with long hair, an attribute characterising them as non-Greek (Lawton 1995: 98; Lawton 2003: 120). Such attention to detail had not been applied to the depiction of previous honorands, whether Greek or non-Greek, who are all depicted as the same sort of stock figure resembling a male worshipper already repeatedly described (Lawton 2003: 120). The importance of good relations with the kings in order to maintain access to grain routes in the Bosphorus in the face of growing Macedonian aggression probably accounted for their special treatment in decree relief genre (Lawton 2003: 120). The kings, however, were unlikely to see the relief themselves, but their depiction distinguished them amongst other depicted honorands as important to both an Athenian audience and any visiting Bosporans. The decree’s location in the Piraeus also meant it was more likely to be seen by those merchants who brought grain into Athens from the Bosphorus, the very movement the decree was enacted to maintain.

Another decree originally given a relief in the 340s BC honoured Damoxenos of Taras (**DR 43**). Little is preserved of either the decree or the relief. What Damoxenos was honoured for is unknown, though if it is the same man he is known to have

served as *thearodokos* at Epidauros (*IG IV² 95*), but it seems he was made a *proxenos* by this Athenian decree (*IG II² 248*, lines 15-16; Lawton 1995: 134). Only the right bottom corner of the relief survives. Whether it resembled other *proxeny* decree reliefs is, therefore, unknowable.

The decree reaffirming Athenian citizenship for Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**), like that honouring the Bosporan kings (**DR 42**), is unusual in its size and its depiction of the honorand. Furthermore, the decree is unique among surviving stelai in having been given not one but two reliefs, one above and one below the inscription (Lawton 1995: 135; Lawton 2003: 121). Both reliefs depict Arybbas' equestrian victories in the Olympic and Pythian games, the upper relief showing a quadriga, of which two horses are preserved, with a charioteer and Arybbas himself in the chariot, while the lower relief is another quadriga with Nike as charioteer, Arybbas following behind on horseback (Lawton 1995: 135; Lawton 2003: 122). The equestrian victory of a honorand was the subject of the relief for Altekas of Syracuse (**DR 31**) in 373/2 BC, but it was just the one relief and not nearly so elaborate, showing only a horse and no rider. Arybbas' reliefs, like the relief of the Bosporan kings (**DR 42**), have to be understood in the context of growing Macedonian power (Lawton 1995: 135; Lawton 2003: 121-122). Arybbas had been driven out of his kingdom by Philip in 350 BC and had come to reside in Athens by 342 BC, this decree reaffirming his Athenian citizenship no doubt prompted by his presence (Lawton 1995: 134-135; Lawton 2003: 121). He was probably one of few Athenian honorands to actually see the publication of his honours. Arybbas' equestrian victories portrayed him as a rival to Philip, who had also enjoyed Olympic victories (Lawton 1995: 135). His depiction had as much if not more to do with Athens' enemy Philip as with their ally Arybbas himself.

A grant of *proxeny* to three men, Phokinos, Nikandros and Dexi[ppos], in 340/39 BC (**DR 45**) also demonstrates increasing individuality assigned to honorands in this period. While the earlier relief of a decree granting *proxeny* to the five men from Abydos (**DR 25**) only depicted one mortal receiving praise from Athena, the present relief shows all three men lining up to be crowned by Athena. Furthermore, the dress of all three men, tunic, hoplite corselet and helmet, suggests they were made *proxenoi* in reward for some military assistance (Lawton 1995: 99). Most other

honorands, where enough of the figure survives, are dressed in a himation and not particularly characterised as anything.

The relief of a decree of the third quarter of the fourth-century BC honouring a man from Kroton (**DR 46**), however, does not depict the honorand at all. In comparison to many other reliefs this one is well preserved and it is clear that the figure of the honorand was never present. Instead Athena stands to the right, holding Nike in her hand and accompanied by a snake. The figure opposite her is an old, bearded man leaning on a stick, taken to be either Demos or Asklepios (Lawton 1995: 139). While some reliefs in this period exhibited increasing focus on the honorand and individuality, this was clearly not a general trend. The importance and origins of the honorand were clearly the more important factor at play, rather than any new artistic consideration.

V.3.4 The Battle of Chaeronea to the End of the Fourth Century BC, 338-300 BC (DR 47-60)

The tensions between the cities of the Greek world and the kingdom of Macedon came to a head in 338 BC with the battle of Chaeronea. The victorious Philip now controlled the Greek world, disbanding the Second Athenian League and forming the League of Corinth, forced membership of which made cities subject to a common peace treaty (Lawton 2003: 123; Rhodes 2010: 357). Under Philip, and then Alexander, the Athenians were no longer masters of their own foreign policy, but they continued to honour foreigners with decrees and reliefs (Lawton 2003: 123). With Alexander's death in 323 BC, the Athenians led Greek cities in a revolt against Macedonian control, the Lamian War, but were ultimately unsuccessful (Rhodes 2010: 384). Honorary decrees with reliefs for foreigners continued at Athens until the end of the fourth- or early third-century BC, when such reliefs, along with funerary and votive reliefs, ceased to be produced (Lawton 1995: 22).

After the battle of Chaeronea, the Athenians honoured a man named Alkimachos (**DR 47**), possibly Alkimachos of Pella, general and envoy of Philip and Alexander (Lambert 2012: 126; Lawton 1995: 99). Only the lower left corner of the relief survives, preserving traces of a seated figure, possibly Athena as in earlier reliefs.

Euenor of Akarnania (**DR 48**) was first honoured by the Athenians in 337/6 BC, he and his descendants being made *proxenoi* (*IG II³ 324* lines 19-23; Lawton 1995: 100-101). A second decree was added to this same stele in 322/1 BC, granting Euenor an olive crown and a house in Attica (*IG II³ 324* lines 43-45; Lawton 1995: 100-101). Of the relief, only the legs of a female figure, probably Athena, survive. The relief honouring Euenor may have resembled other known *proxeny* reliefs (**DR 5**, **DR 7**, **DR 14**, **DR 25**, **DR 26**, **DR 37**, **DR 41**).

In 333/2 BC, one Archippos (**DR 49**), thought to be the son of Archippos of Thasos honoured in an earlier decree (**DR 20**), had his grant of Athenian citizenship reaffirmed by a decree, this reaffirmation suggesting that he was one of few honorands who came to reside in Athens and claim their awarded citizenship, like Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**). If Archippos did come and claim Athenian citizenship, he was one of the few honorands who can be assumed to have seen their published honours. Of the relief accompanying the decrees reaffirming Archippos' Athenian citizenship, only the lower left corner survives, preserving the feet of a standing female figure and the feet of a seated male figure. The couple is taken to be Zeus and Hera, but as Zeus faces Hera to the left he must have turned his back on any figures depicted on the right half of the relief, perhaps Archippos and Athena (Lawton 1995: 101-102). As in the reliefs of the alliance decrees after the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Korkyra (**DR 30**) and Athens and Arkadia, Achaia, Elis and Phleious (**DR 33**), Zeus and Hera are concerned with each other and Athena, if she was depicted in this relief, stands apart from them, as does Archippos if he was depicted. Though this was an honorary decree, the attention of at least some of the deities depicted is not on the honorand himself. Unlike the Bosporan kings (**DR 42**) and Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**), whose decree reliefs were commissioned under the Second Athenian League, Archippos (**DR 30**), honoured by and coming to live in an Athens under Macedonian control, was probably depicted like a male worshipper as earlier honorands had been. The individualised depictions of important allies had done the Athenians no good in the face of growing Macedonian power.

In the same year as Archippos' (**DR 49**) Athenian citizenship was reaffirmed the Athenians made a man from Chios a *proxenos* (**DR 50**). The relief does not depict

the honorand himself, instead depicting an amphora and a sphinx, symbols of Chios, the island being famous for its wine, the sphinx appearing on coins, weights and amphora stamps (Lawton 1995: 102). The relief places more emphasis on the city the honorand hailed from rather than the honorand himself, as on decrees honouring Arist[oxen]os of Boeotia (**DR 16**), where a bull is depicted, and two men from Naukratis (**DR 28, DR 40**), a bull and a ram and a bull depicted respectively.

The decrees honouring a man from Plataea (**DR 51**) and Amphis from Andros (**DR 52**) were passed on the same day in 332/1 BC (Lawton 1995: 103). Only the legs of the figures are preserved in either relief. In the relief for the man from Plataea (**DR 51**), the bare legs of a male figure are preserved to the left, along with the lower drapery of a female figure's garment in the middle of the relief, this figure probably being Athena. The male figure may have been the honorand but his legs suggest he may have been nearly if not as tall as Athena, suggesting he was a male deity or hero. The honorand may have stood to the right of Athena, the non-joining fragment on which the lower right corner of the relief and more of the decree are preserved showing that there would be room for a third figure. Such a three-figure composition would resemble earlier *proxeny* decree reliefs. There were only two figures in the relief for Amphis of Andron (**DR 52**), Amphis himself, the smaller figure on the left, and demos personified, the slightly larger figure on the right. Both figures worn himatia.

Rheboulas the Odrysian had previously been granted Athenian citizenship but was honoured again in 331/0 BC (**DR 53**) "perhaps in connection with growing Thracian resistance to Macedon" (Lawton 1995: 104). The decree's relief shows Athena, on the right, possibly crowning the frontal facing figure of Rheboulas. Though he is smaller than Athena the difference between their heights appears less than that between Athena and other honorands in other reliefs. To the left of Rheboulas are two horses, though only their legs survive. Horses were associated with Thrace as attested by earlier reliefs (**DR 22, DR 35, DR 38**), but also with the equestrian victories of the honorand (**DR 31, DR 44**). Rheboulas' size and frontal facing position, if not reference to some equestrian victory, focus attention on the honorand once again, perhaps because of some role in resistance against Macedon like the

Bosporan kings (**DR 42**) and Arybbas the Molossian (**DR 44**) whose reliefs exhibited more individuality than what had gone before.

Only the head and upper body of Athena survive of a relief of a decree that honoured the Megalopolitans (**DR 54**). The relief cannot be dated more accurately than being from the third quarter of the fourth-century BC, and may have been erected during the last years of the Second Athenian League or else after the battle of Chaeronea.

The relief of the 323/2 BC decree honouring Asklepiodoros of Phokis (**DR 55**), an ambassador from that city which joined in the revolt after Alexander's death that was the Lamian War, is a rare example of the depiction of the female personification of *boule*. In the relief Asklepiodoros is crowned by both *demos*, to the right, and *boule*, to the left. On the far left stands Athena waiting with another crown. The depiction of *demos* and *boule* was "the Athenian democracy personified as it prepares once and for all to free itself from Macedon" (Lawton 2003: 126). Asklepiodoros in negotiating alliance between Athens and Phokis in the struggle against Macedon is depicted as helping to restore sovereignty to the Athenian democracy and is thanked by democracy for his efforts.

Also in 323/2 BC, probably also in relation to the Lamian War, several Bosporans (**DR 56**) were honoured by the Athenians for supplying grain and other assistance to the Athenians (Lawton 1995: 106). While the moulding suggests the relief must have been large, only the foot of one figure survives (Lawton 1995: 106; Lawton 2003: 120).

Sometime in the last quarter of the fourth-century BC, Sostr[atos] (**DR 57**) was made a *proxenos* by the Athenians. The relief shows Herakles, naked except his lionskin on his left arm and leaning on his club with his right, and Athena, though only her legs are preserved. Sostr[atos] himself may have stood to the right where the relief is now destroyed.

Euphron of Sikyon had initially been granted Athenian citizenship in 323/2 BC for establishing democracy at Sikyon and supporting Athens in the Lamian War, but when an oligarchy was imposed on Athens after the war the stele was destroyed

(Lawton 1995: 107; Lawton 2003: 126-127). Euphron's grant of citizenship was republished in 318/7 BC (**DR 58**), with his family and friends having to pay for the publication. The relief shows Euphron's arrival in Athens. Euphron is handed a crown by demos, the exchange watched over by Athena on the left. Behind Euphron are his horse, upon which he must just have arrived in Athens, and a groom who restrains the animal. As Euphron had established democracy in Sikyon and supported the Athenians in trying to restore power to their own democracy, demos was a more fitting figure to honour Euphron than Athena herself (Lawton 1995: 108; Lawton 2003: 126).

After the Athenian defeat in the Lamian War there are no surviving decrees with reliefs honouring foreigners until the very end of the fourth-century BC. A decree of 303/2 BC honours Nikon of Abydos (**DR 59**) for aiding shipwrecked Athenians (Lawton 1995: 109). Though the decree is dated to 303/2 BC, Nikon may have been being honoured for aid he offered during the Lamian War (Lawton 1995: 109). Of the relief only the feet of a male figure, either Nikon or a male deity or hero, survive.

The latest decree relief in this collection, securely dated to 302/1 BC, does not honour some foreigner performing some service for the Athenians abroad, but it does honour a non-citizen. Antiphates (**DR 60**), a public slave, was honoured for his service to Athens' military (Lawton 1995: 109). Sadly, the feet of three figures are all that survive of the relief. The left figure wore a long garment, and was therefore probably female and probably Athena. The middle figure, of which the naked feet survive, was probably Antiphates himself. The third figure cannot be the representative of the honorand's own city as in so many earlier decree reliefs, and must be another representative of Athens or perhaps a warrior or hero to convey the reason for Antiphates being honoured.

Athenian decree reliefs, then, gave foreigners a place in the commemorative landscape of Attica, but at the same time they were Athenian monuments that reflected Athens' changing position in the Greek world. Like funerary and votive iconography, decree relief iconography had a rather limited repertoire, with many of

the assembled 60 decree reliefs resembling each. Indeed there is resemblance between funerary, votive and decree relief iconography, no doubt a result of their production in the same workshops, but also their location in the same spaces or spaces in close proximity. While decree reliefs were public monuments they occupied the 'free space' of the Acropolis as a sanctuary and belonged to a broader iconographic landscape that was contributed to and consumed by a mixed audience of citizens and non-citizens. Decrees were not just for the Athenian demos, nor were they just for their honorands. They had wider meaning both in Attica and beyond.

VII: Concluding Discussion: ‘Free Spaces’ Assessed

Over the previous three chapters the iconographic representation of non-citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners, within two types of commemorative spaces, cemeteries and sanctuaries, has been analysed. In **Chapter IV**, 173 funerary monuments from the cemeteries of Attica have been recognised as the memorials of non-citizens or probable non-citizens on the basis of accompanying epigraphy. In **Chapter V**, 34 epigraphic attestations of non-citizens dedicating at various sanctuaries, the evidence primarily from the Acropolis and surrounding area, are known from the fifth and fourth centuries BC (see **Tables 5.1** and **5.2**). Unlike the collected funerary monuments, however, only two of these 34 epigraphic attestations have accompanying iconography: a dedication to the nymphs and all the gods by a group of washers found near the Ilissos stream at Athens (*IG II² 2934*); and a group dedication to the Nymphs at Vari (*SEG LIV 318*; **Figure 5.1**). 65 votive reliefs accompany the collected epigraphy in **Chapter V**, though only four of these have preserved inscriptions (**VR 6**, **VR 14**, **VR 15**, **VR 43**). Of these four only the status of the dedicator of **VR 14** is known for certain, the wife of a citizen from the deme of Thorai. The dedicator of **VR 15**, Persis, could be a non-citizen woman as her name is ethnically derived, but as is discussed with regard to epitaphs (**IV.2.1.3**), names alone can be misleading. What unites the 65 votive reliefs is the depiction of one or more slaves among the party of worshippers, attesting to the inclusion of slaves among family worship, or at least the desire to make it look like they were included, just as slaves are depicted on the funerary monuments of citizens, metics and possibly even other slaves (**F 24**, **F 89**). Finally in **Chapter VI**, 60 decree reliefs honouring foreigners and one slave (**DR 60**) have been presented and analysed. While there are far fewer surviving decree reliefs overall compared to the number of surviving funerary monuments and votives, this type of commemoration was skewed towards foreigners.

In this chapter, the iconography of all three types of commemoration will receive a final assessment together and the designation of sanctuaries and cemeteries as ‘free spaces’ in the light of the iconographic analysis of the last three chapters will be reassessed. This assessment will be presented at three levels. The first is the level of

the individual ‘free space,’ considering how ‘free’ it was in terms of iconographic choice and the identities made salient therein and to what extent such choice and identities were representative of non-citizens.

The second level will be an assessment of ‘free spaces’ as a network. The sanctuaries and cemeteries did not exist in isolation nor were they the only ‘free spaces,’ within Attica, as outlined in **Chapter III**. The identities practiced in one space found representation with another. Equally the same iconography found use in both the sanctuaries and cemeteries. There is a feedback loop within ‘free spaces’ as hinted at in **Chapter III** and then evidenced in the intervening three chapters and that is to be considered in the first section of this chapter, but it is also evident that there was feedback between one commemorative space and another, and that other spaces, or more accurately what happened in those spaces, informed commemorative spaces and their iconography.

The final section of this chapter expands the idea of the feedback loop and the existence of ‘free spaces’ as a network to a level that cannot be treated conclusively here and invites further study. Returning to Vlassopoulos’ (2007a: 36-38) original adaptation of the paradigm, he describes ‘free spaces’ as a third space between that of the Athenian *polis* itself and Athens’ position as a cosmopolitan centre within the wider Greek world. The presence of metics, slaves and foreigners in Attica attests to Athens’ place in the wider Greek world and the Athenian state’s reliance on such non-citizen residents and visitors and helps to explain why they were allowed to participate in the commemorative landscape when, as described in **Chapter II**, Athenian law was concerned with defining and separating them from Athenian citizens. While ‘free spaces’ served to blur legal identities within Athens and on the basis of other shared identities create communities across legal distinctions, commemorative ‘free spaces’ serve to create and enshrine relationships between communities across the Greek world, and not just in the form of decree reliefs.

VII.1 Assessing ‘Free Spaces’: The Iconographic Feedback Loop

Whether considering funerary monuments, votive reliefs, or decree reliefs, it has been observed that each genre adhered to a relatively small repertoire of scenes and, as will be built upon in the following section, that certain scenes or elements appeared across these genres. The more frequent preservation of iconography and epigraphy together on funerary monuments allows for the observation that the majority of citizen and non-citizen memorials resemble each other. For this reason, little can be said about the status of the deceased individuals commemorated by those memorials for which the epitaph does not survive. Few votive reliefs have a surviving inscription but, as with funerary monuments, the adherence to a limited set of iconographic tropes means little can be said about the status of the dedicator, only about the status of worshippers relative to other worshippers within the same relief. With decree reliefs, there is iconographic distinction based on the content of the decree, though this is not dependent on the legal status of the honorand, who is more often than not a foreign benefactor, but on whether the decree honours an individual or is instead an alliance, personifying the whole community rather than depicting an individual.

Within all three genres, then, the same iconography was shared by citizens and non-citizens alike. As already asserted in **Chapter III**, non-citizen use of iconography used by citizens should not be considered as the passive copying of a citizen iconography that was not intended to represent them. This assessment receives support in **Chapter IV** where it is considered that metics are some of the first patrons of sculpted funerary monuments around the middle of the fifth century BC. Epigraphic evidence shows there is a steady continuation of dedications by metics and foreigners from the Archaic into the Classical period, though sadly there is no surviving votive iconography that can be attributed to non-citizen dedicators until the second half of the fourth century BC (*IG II² 2934*; *SEG LIV 318*).

The same iconography was used by citizens and non-citizens alike in the commemorative spaces of the sanctuaries and cemeteries because it adequately represented worshippers and the deceased of any legal status. Most worshippers and

deceased are depicted as one of a few idealised types, which as has been seen include soldier, athlete, husband, father, wife and mother. This shared, idealised iconography had the capacity to represent most Attic residents because it projected identities and experience common to most residents regardless of their legal status. Being at home together or making a dedication or sacrifice together would have been common to many families of all legal statuses, and such shared moments find permanence in the iconography used in the cemeteries and sanctuaries. The scenes are idealised snapshots but they belong to no one individual. In the case of the more unique memorials that made a working identity salient – the archer (**F 3**), the cobbler (**F 5**), the copper-smelter (**F 6**), the flute-players (**F 8**), the butcher (**F 30**), and the priest (**F 82**) – this does not mean that the more common, idealised scenes of various family members bidding farewell could not have represented them, but rather that they had the choice to represent themselves another way. The opportunity to choose to convey other identities like this was a product of the cemetery as a ‘free space.’ Though most metics and slaves adhere to the same few tropes used on funerary monuments, the presence of different imagery that extols different though not conflicting identities shows that to use more ‘mainstream’ iconography was an active choice rather than all that was available. The memorial of Xanthippos (**F 5**) is a good case in point as it reflects both his identity as a cobbler while still showing him as a loving and beloved father, which is a more common depiction. Not only could Xanthippos, or his family left behind, make choices about his memorial, but they could also choose not to choose between making just one identity salient. The scene of the departing soldier, more common among citizens and non-citizens alike than the handful of occupationally orientated memorials, represents a similar projection of multiple identities for the same deceased individual. The male, be he citizen or metic (there is no depiction of a departing soldier recognisable as the memorial of a slave, though Skiapos (**F 171**) based on his name is a potential slave depicted as a soldier), is presented in the public persona of soldier, while at the same time being depicted and mourned as someone’s husband or son.

The small number of monuments that make an occupational identity salient, not counting the memorials of nurses where the epigraphy rather than the iconography does more to identify the woman’s occupation, appear early in the Classical Attic funerary monument series and then disappear by the middle of the fourth century

BC. Perhaps this is because, commemorating very specific occupations as they do, they were impractical as more and more Attic residents were commissioning sculpted memorials. While an occupational identity of some sort would have been common to most citizens, metics, and slaves, and enough of a unifying identity to make a dedication together as the washers did (*IG II² 2934*), there would surely have been too much variety or no way of conveying certain occupations, like the case of the nurses, to allow anyone and everyone to depict their occupation. Occupational identities were certainly played out and referenced in free spaces but they were perhaps not general enough to become part of the idealised repertoire that made up a shared iconography. Most citizens, metics and slaves worked but what they did and how to portray that varied too greatly for occupations to be commonly conveyed in the cemetery or sanctuary landscape. Edward Harris (2002: 69) has identified some 170 occupations from Attic texts and inscriptions.

Vlassopoulos (2007) in his original adaptation of the ‘free spaces’ model conceives of an almost working-class consciousness that transcends the divides of legal statuses. The inclusion of working class Athenians in the citizen body made it harder to exclude metics and slaves from shared spaces and the discourses within them. It is also important to remember that whilst there were identities that united citizens, metics and slaves, there were also divisions among the people defined by a single legal status. There would have been rich and poor among citizens and non-citizens alike, most having to work but not all. The idealised family scenes seen on most funerary monuments and votive reliefs had a broad appeal not just across legal statuses, then, but within a legal status. There was freedom to be different, consider the banquet scenes popular among metics in the later fourth century BC (**see IV.4.2.3**), but for most families, whether in a funerary or votive context, what was common to most Attic residents, family and familial relationships, seems to have had the most appeal. Family, the loss of family and a family’s connection to the gods were all of universal importance and a universal concern regardless of legal status or socio-economic status. This importance and concern received representation in the commemorative landscape by citizens, metics and slaves, and was in turn seen by other citizens, metics and slaves and they too had themselves or their loved ones remembered or honouring the gods in this way.

Making one's legal status salient if that was what the deceased or worshipper desired would surely have proven a challenge to any sculptor, since the legal status of the residents of Attica was imperceptible based on appearances alone (Ps. Xen. *Const. Pol.* 1.10). Across the collected funerary monuments, votive reliefs and decree reliefs, there is not one example of the legal status of the primary individual or individuals depicted being made apparent through iconography. There are, however, two examples, one funerary monument (**F 150**) and one decree relief (**DR 42**), where the ethnic identity of the individuals depicted is made salient through their appearance, their ethnic identity having implications for their legal status. The Scythian archers (**F 150**) are characterised by their dress – caps and long trousers – and the Bosphoran kings (**DR 42**) by their long hair and beards. It is interesting, however, that these two examples of ethnic identity being made salient in the commemorative landscape were not commissioned by non-citizens themselves. As already discussed (**IV.3.5**), the Scythian archer statues were *peribolos* boundary markers, comparable to sculpted lions and other creatures used in the cemeteries, rather than the memorials of real Scythian archers. The decree relief, while it really did honour the Bosphoran kings, like all decree reliefs would have been commissioned by the Athenian state and in most cases never seen by the honorand. The relief was one of only a few decree reliefs to make particular reference to honorands' identities and achievements.

Within the cemeteries and sanctuaries, then, the iconography available for use in commemoration was limited, but that limited iconography had a broad appeal and resonance. Exceptions in the cemeteries in particular demonstrate that adherence to this limited iconography was a choice rather than a necessity. Citizens and non-citizens shared iconography because it represented them.

VII.2 A Network of 'Free Spaces'

With notable exceptions, then, the iconography within the cemeteries and sanctuaries, votives and decrees, adhered to a limited number of idealised types. These idealised types and how they were conveyed were not only reiterated within the cemeteries and sanctuaries, but between the cemeteries and sanctuaries. The

importance of family in both contexts has already been addressed. Identities common to citizens, metics and slaves that they performed in their homes, workplaces and the agora, all potential ‘free spaces’ according to Vlassopoulos (2007: 52), found favour in the iconography they all created and shared in.

How relationships were conveyed was the same on funerary, votive and decree reliefs. Size, dress, and gestures encoded the sculpture for the consumer, enabling them to recognise age and familial relationships. While legal status is usually indistinguishable from one monument to the next, the relative status of figures upon the same monument was recognisable. Though slaves would have seen to their own representation, or that of their relatives, in funerary commemoration, and no doubt on votives, slaves were included on the memorials and votives of citizens and metics and perhaps even other slaves (**F 24, F 89; see IV.4.2.2**). On the others’ memorials, a slave’s status as such was marked by their relative size, their dress – the long-sleeved chiton and sakkos for female slaves and nakedness or a short chiton for male slaves – and other attributes – boxes and *kiste* for female slaves and carrying their master’s cloak or weaponry or attending to sacrificial animals for male slaves. While metics and slaves did not, and probably had no iconographic recourse or desire to, mark their own legal status, it was clearly important and became conventional to mark the status of individuals within the same household when they were committed to posterity in the commemorative landscape, even if the status of the dedicator or deceased subject of one monument to the next, and between one household and the next, was often imperceptible. The convention of relative size as a way of marking relative status was of course not confined to the depiction of mortals. Next to the gods, mortal worshippers were scaled down, a convention used on both votive and decree reliefs, showing how all three genres adhered to conventions that, while conveying status, often transcended status, as well as transcending different commemorative spaces and genres.

The banquet scene provides another example of the same iconography finding use across ‘free spaces.’ While the use of relative size to convey status, and not just legal status, was common to citizens, metics, slaves, and foreigners in the cemeteries and the sanctuaries, the banquet scene, while seemingly having shared use in the sanctuaries, was a peculiarly non-citizen trope in the cemeteries (**see IV.4.2.3**). It’s

meaning in a funerary context was transformed. Whereas the gods reclined and dined in votive reliefs, it was the metic and slave deceased who did so on their funerary monuments. While the banquet scene was common in both funerary and votive contexts in other areas of the Greek world, in Attica it did not appear to be taken up by citizens, or indeed most non-citizens, in a funerary context. Here again the capacity for choice regarding commemorative iconography can be seen, and in the case of banqueting imagery in the cemeteries, the choice to use or not to use does appear to be split along legal status lines.

The banquet scene in a funerary context, then, appears to show influences and preferences of the wider Greek world at play within the ‘free spaces’ of Attica, and in the next section the reverse will be considered: the reception of the shared iconography created in Attica in the wider Greek world.

VII.3 Attic Artistic Influence across the Greek World and ‘Free Spaces’

With the luxury decree of Demetrius of Phaleron in 317 BC, sculpted funerary monuments ceased to be produced in Attica by the end of the century. Though as far as is known votives and decree reliefs were not legislated against, their production also begins to wane around the end of the fourth to the beginning of the third century BC. Viewed in their historical context, decree reliefs ceased to be erected at this time because Athens no longer administered to its own foreign affairs, brought under Macedonian hegemony after defeat at the battle of Chaeronea.

Though the iconography of the fifth and fourth centuries BC was not perpetuated in the commemorative landscapes of Attica in the Hellenistic period, or at least not as prolifically, the iconographic feedback loop did not end. The shared iconography that was a product of ‘free spaces’ in fifth and fourth century BC Attica had its legacy in the wider Greek world. During the fourth century BC and later, Attic-style funerary monuments found favour across the Greek world, reaching “in the south as far as Cyrene, in the east to Rhodes and Cyprus, in the west to Sicily and the Epirus... in the north to Macedonia” (Clairmont 1993: introductory volume, 77).

While the iconography was no doubt desirable as an Athenian product, owing to Athens' position of power in the Greek world during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, perhaps its appeal was also due to its creation and use by citizens, metics and slaves in the context of 'free spaces.' The large metic and slave population in Attica meant that the wider Greek world was present in Attica, that the Attic iconography that appealed across the Greek world was in part created by people from across that world. Earlier in this chapter, it was argued that the idealised nature of funerary iconography – or votive or decree iconography – meant that that iconography could be representative of most of the Attic population. The taking up of this iconography in the wider Greek world sees this writ large, capable not only of representing most Attic residents but of representing much of the population of the entire Greek world and those in contact with the Greek world.

While it has been shown in this thesis that funerary, votive, and decree relief iconography was created by and for citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners, or at least spoke to them all, in 'free spaces' that allowed them all to create and express shared identities, it does not follow that when this product of 'free spaces' was received in the wider Greek world that it operated within 'free space' contexts. Vlassopoulos (2007: 47) argues that 'free spaces' were a result of the "peculiar nature of Athenian democracy." Athens' very size, geographically and demographically, made it a peculiar *polis* and meant it was not a face-to-face society. This combined with the inclusion of non-agricultural workers in the citizen body meant it was often difficult to distinguish between citizen and non-citizens and discriminate against the latter. The constitution and the size and composition of the population would vary from one *polis* to the next, and the conditions would not always be conducive to the creation of 'free spaces.' The reception of 'Athenian' iconography in the wider Greek world is certainly a topic that requires further study, particularly in light of this thesis' contribution to understanding the creation and use of that iconography within Attica.

Funerary, votive and decree relief iconography was representative of citizens and non-citizens alike owing to its idealised nature that had been developed and refined in the context of 'free spaces.' Exceptions across all three genres attests to the capacity for choice when it came to commemorative iconography and that most individuals, regardless of their status, chose to adhere to and repeat the iconography

they had already seen displayed in the cemeteries and sanctuaries. The capacity of the shared iconography to represent most Attic residents helps to explain its appeal across the Greek world, though more research is need at this level, as while initially created in a ‘free space’ context, it cannot be assumed it was going to operate in a ‘free space’ context outside of Attica.

This thesis began by looking for a way to make non-citizens, metics, slaves and foreigners, visible, to attribute them with greater agency. Having surveyed funerary, votive and decree relief iconography, in many ways they remain invisible, using an iconography they shared with citizens and so being distinguishable on epigraphic rather than iconographic grounds. What this thesis has shown, however, is that non-citizens need not be understood as copying citizen iconography, but rather they helped create an iconography that represented them along with citizens. In being able to interact with citizens in the cemeteries and sanctuaries as ‘free spaces,’ non-citizens were part of the iconographic discussion. Their experiences, identities and values that they shared with citizens helped shape the commemorative landscape of Attica, and, arguably, the wider Greek world.

Appendix I: The Funerary Monuments

F 1 Thessalian Stele of a woman (Figure 4.1)

NM 711.

Found in the Piraeus

Dimensions: H 1.05, W 0.32.

Date: 450-420 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment. A woman is seated on a high-backed chair facing left. She wears a chiton and a himation that also covers her head. In her right hand she holds a bowl and in her left a bird. The scene itself is not usual but stylistically it is not Attic but rather Thessalian.

Bibliography: Johansen 1951: 137, fig.69; Kaltsas 2002: 145, no.277, fig.277.

F 2 Stele of Lisas of Tegea

Tatoi Royal Greek Collection.

Found at Tatoi-Dekelia.

Dimensions: H 0.80, W 0.43.

Date: 420-400 BC.

Inscription: Λίσας Τεγεάτης (*IG II² 10436*).

Lisas of Tegea.

Relief: Lisas is depicted striding toward the right as if going into battle. He is shown wearing an exomis and on his head a pilos. His left arm bears a shield that he draws up towards his face as he advanced.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.194; *FRA* 7091; Bergemann 1997: anm 163; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 160, no.36.

F 3 Stele of Getas the Archer (Figure 4.2)

NM 2611.

Found in the Kerameikos.

Dimensions: H 0.69, W 0.20.

Date: 420-400 BC.

Inscription: Γέτο. Ἀριστομήδης ἐπέθηκεν (*IG I² 1068*).

Getas. Aristomedes dedicated [this].

Relief: The stele is decorated with a painted representation of a gorytos, bow and arrow case. There is no relief decoration.

Bibliography: Kaltsas 2002: 156, no.308; Posamentir 2006: no. 26; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 220.

F 4 Stele of Euempolos (Figure 4.3)

NM 778.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.55, W 0.42.

Date: 420-400 BC.

Inscription: Εὐέμπολος (*IG II² 11379*).

Euempolos.

Relief: Euempolos is seated on a high-backed chair facing left. He is bearded, bare-chested and has a himation draped round his waist. In his right hand he holds out a bird to two children standing before him. The child closest to Euempolos is a boy

wearing a himation who reaches for his father's left hand resting on his lap. Behind the boy is an older girl, who wears sleeved and sleeveless chitons and a himation. Bibliography: *CAT* 1.690; Scholl 1996: no. 80, taf 5,5; Bergemann 1997: anm. 63; Kaltsas 2002: 155, no.304, fig.304; Shapiro 2003: 106-107, fig 23; Beaumont 2012: 116-117, fig 4.11, 198-199.

F 5 Stele of Xanthippos

British Museum 1805.7-3.183.

Found in a monastery in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.84, W 0.50.

Date: 420-400 BC.

Inscription: Ξάνθιππος (*IG II²* 12332).

Xanthippos.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment. Xanthippos sits on a high-backed chair facing to the left. He is bearded, bare-chested and has a himation draped another his waist. He holds up his right hand in which he is holding a cobbler's last, indicating his profession in life. His left arm is drawn around a girl stood at his side. She is dressed in a chiton and reaches her arms up to her father. By Xanthippos' knees is a second small female figure who has been interpreted as either another daughter or the cobbler's wife. She wears a chiton and a mantle, and, on her head, an opisthosphendone. She may be holding a bird to her chest.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 42; Burford 1972: 71, plate 6, 178; Golden 1990: 18; *CAT* 1.630; Oakley 2003: 184 fig 25; Cohen 2011: 465-467; Beaumont 2012: 114-116, fig 4.10, 198-199; Oakley 2013: 164; Hochscheid 2015: 295-296.

F 6 Stele of Sosinous of Gortyn

Louvre MA 769.

Believed to have been found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 1.00, W 0.60.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Σωσίνοϛ Γορτύνιοϛ χαλκόπτηϛ.

μνήμα δικαιοσύνηϛ καὶ σωφροσύνηϛ ἀρετῆϛ τε

Σωσίνοϛ ἔστησαν παῖδεϛ ἀποφθιμένο (*IG II²* 8464).

Sosinous of Gortyn, a copper-smelter.

A monument to his sense of justice, prudence and excellence, erected by Sosinous children.

Relief: Sosinous is seated on a high-backed chair facing right. He is bearded, bare-chested but with a himation draped over his left shoulder and arm and running down to be draped around his waist. His right arm hangs at his side with his hand resting on an object that has been interpreted as a bellows. Sosinous' left arm is raised to hold a stick.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 49, 62, 80-82, no.15, plate 8; *CAT* 1.202; *FRA* 1453; Scholl 1996: no.464; Bergemann 1997: nr. 79, plate 77,3,4; Osborne 2011: 73-74.

F 7 Stele of Ktesileos and Theano of Erythrae (Figure 4.4)

NM 3472

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.93, W 0.50.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Κτησίλεω Ἐρυθραίο. Θεανόϛ (*IG II²* 8501a).

Ktesileos of Erythrae. Theano.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment. Ktesileos is standing to the left. He is bearded, bare-chested but with a himation draped over his shoulders and around his waist and legs. He supports himself with a stick. He inclines his head to look at his wife Theano who is seated to the right. She is seated on a stool and wears a sleeved chiton and himation with a sphenone on her head. Her bare feet rest on a footstool. Her left hand rests in her lap while she holds the edge of her himation with her right. Bibliography: Diepolder 1931: no. 28 plate 22; Johansen 1951: 41-42, fig.21; *CAT* 2.206; *FRA* 1570; Kaltsas 2002: 158, no.310, fig.310; Osborne 2011: 108 fn127.

F 8 Stele of Olympichos and Potamon of Thebes (Figure 4.5)

NM 1962.

Found at Moschato.

Dimensions: H 0.88, W 0.33.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Ἐλλάς μὲν πρωτεῖα τέχνης αὐλῶν ἀπένειμεν
Θηβαίωι Πο<τ>άμωνι, τάφος δ' ὄδε δέξατο σῶμα·
πατὴρ δὲ μνήμασιν Ὀλυμπίχου αὔξειτ' ἔπαινος
οἷον ἐτέκνωσεμ παῖδα σοφοῖς βάσανον.

Πατρόκλεια Ποτάμωνος γυνή (*IG* II² 8883).

Greece awarded first prize in the craft of pipes
to Potamon of Thebes. This tomb has received his body.
In our recollections, praise for his father Olympichos will grow
for having fathered such a son, a touchstone for the discerning.

Patrokleia wife of Potamon (translation Wilson 2007: 146).

Relief: Olympichos is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. He is bearded and wears his himation draped over his shoulders, waist and legs. In his left hand he holds a double flute. With his right hand he shakes hands with his son Potamon, who stands before him to the right. The younger Potamon is beardless and wears his himation over his left shoulder and lower body. In his lowered left hand he too holds a double flute.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 58, 111-112; *CAT* 2.235; *FRA* 2443 + 2453; Scholl 1996: no. 189; Wilson 2007: 144-148, plate 4; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 183, no.80, fig.65.

F 9 Stele of [A]ntiochos of Knidos

Lourve MA 773.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.775, W 0.42.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: [A]ντίχοχος Κνίδιος (*IG* II² 9040).
[A]ntiochos of Knidos.

Relief: [A]ntiochos stands on the left. He is bearded and wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and his lower body. He leans on a stick, now missing, with his left arm and reaches out his right hand to the small boy in front of him. He perhaps

held a bird. The boy wears a mantle and holds an aryballos attached to a string in his left hand. [A]ntiochos and the boy were probably father and son.
Bibliography: *CAT* 1.713; *FRA* 2912; Bergemann 1997: Nr. 224; Beaumont 2012: fn309; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 273, no.318.

F 10 Stele of Demokrita and Arnion of Korinth (Figure 4.6)

Piraeus Museum 5253.

Found in the Piraeus, North Cemetery alongside Thebes Road.

Dimensions: H 0.73, W 0.44.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Δημοκριτα Κορινθια. Αρνιων (*CAT* 2.287).

Demokrita of Korinth. Arnion.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Demokrita is seated on a stool to the left. She wears a chiton and a himation, which is drawn up over her head. Her right hand rests in her lap, while she grasps the edge of her himation with her left. In front of Demokrita stands the youth Arnion. He inclines his head to look at Demokrita, probably his mother, though she does not meet his gaze. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and his lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.287; *FRA* 2956 + 2961; Bergemann 1997: Nr. 757; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 149-150, no.13.

F 11 Loutrophoros of Kydrokles and Stephanos of Kos

NM 1042.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.55.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Κυδροκλής Βακύλο Κῶος. Στέφανος Κυδροκλέος Κῶος (*IG* II² 9143).

Kydrokles son of Baikylos of Kos. Stephanos son of Kydrokles of Kos.

Relief: Kydrokles, an elderly man, is seated on a chair to the left. He wears a himation over his right shoulder, arms and lower body. His left arm is raised to take hold of a stick. With his right hand, Kydrokles shakes hands with the younger Stephanos who stands to the right. Stephanos wears his himation around his lower body, to his knees, and lowered left arm. Stephanos is followed by a squire who carries his shield. In height the squire only just passes Stephanos' elbow. He wears a chiton or exomis.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.746; *FRA* 3162 + 3164 + 3169; Bergemann 1997: Anm. 32 + 121; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 261, no.287.

F 12 Stele of Hagetor of Megara (Figure 4.7)

Piraeus Museum 13.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.84, 0.456.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Αγήτωρ Ἀπολλοδώρο Με<γ>αρεύς (*IG* II² 9301).

Hagetor son of Apollodoros of Megara.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment. Hagetor stands naked to the right. He holds a strigil in his right hand. On the left of the relief, Hagetor's himation and aryballos are hanging from a now missing pillar. The stele is broken just below Hagetor's knees.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.221; *FRA* 3576 + 3584; Bergemann 1997: nr. 51, plate 91; Osborne 2011: 74; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 50.

F 13 Stele of Menekles of Megara

Piraeus Museum 5284.

Found in the Piraeus, North Cemetery alongside Thebes Road.

Dimensions: H 0.48, W 0.305.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Μενεκλῆς Μεγαρεὺς (Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no. 49).
Menekles of Megara.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a circular finial. Menekles is seated on a high-backed chair facing to the left. His lower body is draped in a himation. His right arm is raised to hold a stick that was painted rather than added in relief. The stele is broken on the right just below the seat of Menekles chair.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.272; *FRA* 3629; Bergemann 1997: nr. 758; Osborne 2011: 74; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 168, no. 49.

F 14 Stele of [Ask]epiades of Miletus (Figure 4.8)

Piraeus Museum 206.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.55, W 0.48.

Date: stele 400-375 BC, inscription Roman.

Inscription: [Ἀσκλ]ηπιάδης Λυκόφρονος Μιλήσιος (*IG* II² 9442/3).
[Ask]epiades son of Lukophrone of Miletus.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a roof sima. A youth, not originally representing [Ask]epiades of Miletus as the inscription is later than the first quarter of the fourth century BC, is depicted alone, his head slightly inclined. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and holds a stick in his left hand. The stele is only preserved to just below the youth's chest.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.274, *FRA* 4032.

F 15 Stele of Tito of Samos

NM 900.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.84, W 0.31.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Τίτῳ Σαμία (*IG* II² 10231).
Tito of Samos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Tito is depicted sitting on a high-backed chair and faces to the right. She wears a chiton and himation that covers the back of her head. Her left arm is raised to hold the edge of her himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.290; *FRA* 6566; Scholl 1996: no. 101; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 274.

F 16 Stele of Kallimandros of Siphnos

Piraeus Museum 348.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.41, W 0.375.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Καλλίμανδρος Σίπνιος (*IG II² 10362*).

Kallimandros of Siphnos.

Relief: Only the lower half of the stele survives, preserving only the lower half of the sunken relief. The legs of a youth, Kallimandros, are preserved to the right. To the left a child is crawling toward Kallimandros on the right. The child has a himation wrapped around his legs. The two were perhaps brothers.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.758; *FRA* 6884; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 241.

F 17 Stele of Tibeios of Tieion

NM 2594

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.33, W 0.25.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Τίβειος Τιανός (*IG II² 10450*).

Tibeios of Tieion.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a horizontal moulding, the inscription just beneath it. Tibeios is rendered in paint alone and not relief. He stands facing to the right, but is only preserved to the waist, where the stele is broken.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.262; *FRA* 7134; Scholl 1996: no. 212; Bäbler 1998: no. 37; Posamentir 2006: no. 42; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 397; Öztürk 2013: fig 4.

F 18 Lekythos of Eukleidas of Phokis

Piraeus Museum 49.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.48.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Εὐκλείδας Φωκεύς (*IG II² 10493*).

Eukleidas of Phokis.

Relief: A family of four are depicted on the body of the lekythos. A bearded man, Eukleidas, wears a mantle and supports himself on a stick. He shakes hands with a woman, his wife, who wears a chiton and himation. On the ground between them are two small children clad in mantles, each reaching out to one of their parents.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.785; *FRA* 7265; Bergemann 1997: Anm. 120; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 357.

F 19 Stele of Herseis

EM 9361.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.41, W 0.23.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Ἑρσηίς.

τηλοπατρίδος ὅσ' ἔθανον κλειναῖς ἐν Ἀθήν<α>ις
Ἑ<ρ>σηίς γνωτοῖσιν πᾶσι λιπόσα πόθον (*IG II² 11345*).

Relief: The stele is crowned by a finial. Herseis was rendered in paint and not in relief. What survives suggests she was depicted alone.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 147-148, no.71, pl.29; *CAT* 356; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.332.

F 20 Stele of Asia (Figure 4.9)

NM 767.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.95, W 0.48.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Ἀσία (*IG II² 10882*).

Asia.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Asia is seated on a high-backed chair and faces to the right. She wears a sleeved chiton, sleeveless chiton and himation. On her feet she wears slippers and her feet are on a footstool. A naked boy, her son, stands in front of her and reaches his arms out to her.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.700; Bergemann 1997: nr. 103; Bäbler 1998: no. 9; Oakley 2003: 184 fig 24; Hochscheid 2015: 440.

F 21 Stele of Gelon (Figure 4.10)

NM 971.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.30, W 0.44.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Γέλων. Καλλίστρατος (*IG II² 10991*).

Gelon. Kallistratos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The stele is broken and appears to have originally depicted a carved loutrophoros, of which only the neck and handles survive. To the left of the loutrophoros neck, an elderly man, Gelon, is depicted reclining on a couch. His lower body is draped in a himation. He holds a cup in his right hand. To the right of the loutrophoros neck stands Kallistratos. He wears a himation and supports himself with a stick in his right hand, bringing his left hand to his head in a gesture of mourning.

Bibliography: Thönges-Stringaris 1965: 23, plate 24.3; *CAT* 2.278; Scholl 1996 no. 123; Closterman 2015: 9 fn39.

F 22 Stele of Kypria

Leiden, Rijksmuseum inv. 1821: RO1 A 12.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.82, W 0.35.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Κυπρία (*IG II² 11933*).

Kypria.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Kypria is seated on a high-backed chair facing to the right. She wears a chiton and mantle. She leans forward over a kalathos and appears to be engaged in wool-working, perhaps holding a distaff.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.220; Scholl 1996: 427, plate 29,1; Kosmopoulou 2001: W3.

F 23 Stele of Choregis

Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum H 5021.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.45, W 0.35.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: XOPHΓΙΣ (*CAT* 1.264).

Choregis.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Choregis is seated on a stool facing to the left. She wears a sleeved chiton and himation and an object rests in her lap, perhaps a box. Her feet rest on a footstool.
Bibliography: *CAT* 1.264; Scholl 1996: no. 502, plate 45,1.

F 24 Stele of Plangon (Figure 4.11)

Piraeus Museum 5242.

Found in the Piraeus, North Cemetery alongside Thebes Road.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Πλαγγῶν ἐνθάδε κεῖται χρηστή,
ποθεινὴ δὲ οἷς κατέλειπεν (*SEG* 39: 285).
Here lies worthy Plangon,
missed by those left behind.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a palmette and the relief is within a sunken panel. Plangon is seated on a high-backed chair in the centre of the scene. She wears a sleeved chiton and himation. She shakes hands with a man stood in front of her to the right. He is probably her husband. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and lower body. Behind Plangon stands a young woman. She wears a short-sleeved chiton and himation, a sakkos on her head, and holds a box. She is, therefore, characterised as a servant girl.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.390c.

F 25 Stele of Paideusis, worthy wet-nurse.

NM (inv. no. unknown).

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 1.04, W 0.28.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: Παίδευσίς τίτθη χρηστή {ς} (*IG* II² 12387).
Paideusis, worthy wet-nurse.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semi-circular finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Paideusis is seated on a high-backed chair facing to the right. She wears a chiton and himation and grasps the edges of the garment with her raised left hand. Her right hand is in her lap and her feet rest on a footstool.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.249; Scholl 1996: no. 125, plate 28,3; Bäbler 1998: no. 135; Kosmopoulou 2001: N10; Osborne 2011: 74; MacLachlan 2012: 76.

F 26 Stele of a Hetaira (Figure 4.12)

NM 1896.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.74, W 0.32.

Date: 400-375 BC.

No inscription.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. A young woman stands to the right wearing a sleeveless chiton with straps across her chest. She holds *krotala* in both hands, her right hand raised, her left hand by her side. To the left stands a small boy. He wears a himation around his lower body. In his raised right hand he holds a bird out to the young woman, presumably his mother.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.721; Scholl 1996: no. 188; Kaltsas 2002: 188, no.370, fig.370.

F 27 Stele of Nikaso and Eumares of Aegina

Piraeus Museum 356.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.38, W 0.44.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Νικασὸ Αἰγιναία.

Φανίς. Εὐμάρος
Αἰγινήτο (*IG* II² 7963).

Nikaso of Aegina.

Phanis. Eumares of Aegina.

Relief: The stele was crowned by an anthemion, but it is now broken. The relief is within a sunken panel. Only the head of Nikaso, who was seated, survives. In front of her to the right stands Eumares, who is preserved down to his chest. He wears a himation. The two probably shook hands.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.321; *FRA* 178 + 198 + 209; Scholl 1996: no. 290; Bergemann 1997: nr. 165; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.3, fig 1 + 2.

F 28 Stele of Moschine of Aspendos

Piraeus Museum 1490.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.85, W 0.32.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἐργοκλέος Ἀσπενδίο.

Μοσχίνη (*IG* II² 8390a).

Ergokleon of Aspendos

Moschine.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a circular finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. A young girl, Moschine, stands wearing a sleeved chiton with straps across her chest and a himation draped over her shoulder. She cradles a duck in her left arm and reaches her right hand towards a small dog.

Bibliography: *CAT* 0.840; *FRA* 1272 + 1276.

F 29 Stele of Tokkes of Aphyte

NM 1002.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 1.40, W 0.41.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΤΟΚΚΗΣ ΠΥΡΡΩΝΟΣ Α<Φ>ΥΤΑΙΟΣ (*CAT* 1.388).

Tokkes son of Pyrrhon of Aphyte.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a palmette. The scene is applied only in paint not relief. Tokkes is seated on a rock and faces to the right. He is bearded and wears a mantle across his left shoulder and lower body. A amphora rests against the rock.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.388; *FRA* 1292 + 1293; Scholl 1996: 138; Posamentir 2006: no. 71; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no. 168, fig 104 + 105.

F 30 Stele of Seukes of Bithynia (Figure 4.13)

Piraeus Museum 1483.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.74, W 0.255.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σπόκης Βιθυνός (*IG II² 8410 – CAT 1.380* has as ΣΕΥΚΗΣ).
Seukes of Bithynia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a circular finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Seukes stands wearing a belted, knee-length chiton or exomis and chlamys over his left shoulder and upper body. In his right hand he holds an object that has been taken for a knife, perhaps indicative of some profession.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.380; *FRA* 1332; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no. 374.

F 31 Stele of Onatoridas of Boeotia

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Found at Royal Stables in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.935, W 0.41.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ὀνατωρίδας Βοιωτίας (*IG II² 8420*).
Onatoridas of Boeotia.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Onatoridas, a boy, stands to the right and faces left. He is clad in a himation that covers his entire left arm and lower body. In his right hand he holds a bird and is also accompanied by a small dog.

Bibliography: *CAT* 0.849; *FRA* 1354; Bergemann 1997: nr. 706; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no. 103.

F 32 Stele of Silenis of Boeotia

Berlin, Staatliche Museen 1492.

Provenance is no more precise than Attica.

Dimensions: H 1.10, W 0.50.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σιληνίς Μυίσκου Βοιωτία (*IG II² 8421*).
Silenis daughter of Myiskos of Boeotia.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a roof sima and framed by antae. On the roof are a loutrophoros, a naked, winged siren and a sphinx. Below, Silenis, a young woman, stands to the right. She wears a peplos with straps across her chest and a mantlet. Silenis is accompanied by a small servant girl, who wears a short-sleeved chiton, a tunic and on her head a sakkos. She holds a box in front of her, which Silenis reaches into with her right hand. The feet of both figures are missing where the stele is broken.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.862; *FRA* 1349 + 1356; Bergemann 1997: nr. 431; Posamentir 2006: no. 58.

F 33 Stele of Eirene of Byzantium (Figure 4.14)

Piraeus Museum 3582.

Found in the Piraeus, cemetery for the people of the Chersonnese.

Dimensions: H 0.60, W 0.41.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἐρήνη : Βυζαντία (*IG II² 8440*).
Eirene of Byzantium.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Eirene is seated on a high-backed chair to the right. She wears a sleeved- and

sleeveless-chiton and a himation that is draped over the back of her head. She grasps her himation with her raised right hand. Her left hand lies in her lap. In front of Eirene to the left stands another female figure. She wears a chiton and himation. In her arms she holds an infant, likely Eirene's child, Eirene having died in childbirth. Both women's feet are missing where the stele is broken.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.849; *FRA* 1392; Bergemann 1997: nr. 160; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: 202.

F 34 Stele of Klea, Sosippos and Herakleidas of Delphi

Paris, Louvre Ma 808.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.85, W 0.54.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Κλέα Σώσιππος Ἡρακλείδας Δελφοί (Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no. 121).

Klea, Sosippos, Herakleidas of Delphi.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment, the relief within a sunken panel. Klea is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a sleeved- and sleeveless-chiton and a himation. Her feet rest on a footstool. She grasps her himation with her left hand. With her right hand she shakes hands with Herakleidas, a young man. He wears over his left shoulder and lower body. Between Klea and Herakleidas, Sosippos, a small boy naked but for a mantle, reaches up to Klea, no doubt his mother. Herakleidas was perhaps the older son of Klea and older brother of Sosippos.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.858; *FRA* 1478 + 1479 + 1480; Scholl 1996: no. 475; Bergemann 1997: nr.197.

F 35 Stele of Aristion of Ephesus (Figure 4.15)

NM 4487.

Found in the Kerameikos.

Dimensions: H 1.50, W 0.49.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀριστίων <Ἀρί>στονος Ἐφέσιος (*IG* II² 8507).

Aristion son of <Ari>ston of Ephesus.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a roof sima and framed by antae. On the roof is a naked, winged siren. Below, Aristion, naked except for the chlamys on his left shoulder, stands to the right. He holds the lower part of his chlamys in his lower left hand. In his raised right hand he holds a bird. Aristion is accompanied by a small, naked servant boy. The boy holds a strigil in his right hand.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.855; Bergemann 1997: nr. 337, Grabbezirk A22, plate 91,4; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no. 337.

F 36 Stele of Euarchos of Elis

NM 995.

Found in Brahami, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.78, W 0.36.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Εὐαρχος Ἡλεῖος (*IG* II² 8528).

Euarchos of Elis.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment, the relief within a sunken panel. Euarchos is depicted stood alone facing to the right. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and his lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.344; *FRA* 1639; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no.43, fig 23 + 24.

F 37 Stele of Philiste of Elis

NM (inv. no. unknown).

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.48, W 0.33.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Φιλίστη Ἠλεία (*IG II²* 8530).

Philiste of Elis.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a palmette. The relief is within a sunken, most of which is not preserved. Only the heads of Philiste, seated, and an elderly male figure – her father? – survive.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.366e; *FRA* 1648; Scholl 1996: no. 320; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no.42.

F 38 Xanthippos and Charinos of Thasos

Eichenzell bei Fulda, Museum Schloss Fasanaire Ama 4.

Found at Keratea, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.98, W 0.555.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ξάνθιππος : Θάσιος.

Χαρῖνος : Ξανθίππου (*IG II²* 8829).

Xanthippos of Thasos

Charinos son of Xanthippos.

Relief: The stele was crowned by an anthemion but it is now broken. Two rosettes occupy the space between the anthemion and the sunken panel relief. Father and son Xanthippos and Charinos are depicted. Xanthippos is seated in a high-backed chair to the left. He wears himation over both shoulders and his lower body. His left hand is raised, having originally held a painted stick. With his right hand he shakes hands with Charinos. Charinos wears a mantle over his left shoulder and lower body.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 125, no.12 and 128, no.49, 135; *CAT* 2.351e; Scholl 1996: no. 397, taf 30,2; Bergemann 1997: nr.84.

F 39 Stele of Dexis of Thebes and Eugeitas of Skaphlia

Eleusis Museum (inv. no. unknown).

Found at Eleusis.

Dimensions: H 0.715, W 0.365.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΔΕΞΙΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΑ
ΑΘΑΝΙΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΑ
ΜΥΜΦΙΛΛΑ
ΑΘΑΝΟΓΕΙΤΑ
ΣΚΑΦΛΙΚΑΙ
Dexis of Thebes
Athanis of Thebes
Mymphilla

EΥΕΙΤΑΣ
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ
ΒΑΚΧΙΟΥ
ΑΝΤΑΝΔΡΙΟΣ
(*CAT* 2.333b).
Eugeitas
Demetrios son of Bacchios of Antandros

Athanogeita
Of Skaphlia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Although the inscription names five individuals only two are depicted, incised into the stele. Dexis is seated on a high-backed chair, her feet on a footstool. She wears a chiton and himation and grasps the himation with her raised left hand. With her left hand she shakes hands with Eugeitas. He wears a himation over his shoulder and lower body.
Bibliography: *CAT* 2.333b; *FRA* 544 + 545 6891 + 6896 + 6899; Scholl 1996: no. 389; Bergemann 1997: nr. 166; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no.97.

F 40 [Me]litha and [Me]likrates of Thebes

Piraeus Museum 270.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.645, W 0.35.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: . . . ανθα (*CAT* 2.315a has as ΛΙΘΑ)

. . . λικράτεος
Θηβαία (*IG* II² 8891).
[Me]litha
[Me]likratos
of Thebes.

Relief: The top of the stele does not survive. The relief is within a sunken panel. [Me]likratos, an elderly man, is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. He wears his himation over both shoulders and his lower body. With his left hand he shakes hands with [Me]litha, presumably his daughter and the primary deceased. She wears a chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.315a; Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no. 89, fig 72 + 73.

F 41 Agatheia and Brithon of Kalamyde

Sussex, Bignor Park.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.675, W 0.45.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀγαθεια Βρίθων
 Καλαμυοδα Καλαμυοίδα (*Ginesti-Rosell* 2012: no. 517).
Agatheia Brithon
Of Kalamyde of Kalamyde.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Agatheia is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears and sleeved chiton and himation that is drawn up over the back of her head. She shakes hands with Brithon. He is wearing a knee-length chiton and carrying a bow and quiver. Between the two figures, presumably wife and husband, stands a child wearing a sleeved-chiton.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.868; *FRA* 2640 +2641; Scholl 1996: no.360; Bergemann 1997: nr. 198; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 517.

F 42 Stele of Kosmia from Kelainai, Phrygia (Figure 4.16)

EM 6176.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.46, W 0.33.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Κοσμία ἐκ Κελαινῶν (*IG II² 9009*).

Kosmia from Kelainai.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the figures are incised. Kosmia is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a chiton and himation. She shakes hands with an elderly man stood before her. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and lower body down to his mid-calves.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.389; *FRA* 2828; Scholl 1996: no. 24, plate 25,1; Hildebrandt 2006: 199; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 442.

F 43 Stele of Aristagora of Corinth

NM 1009.

Found in front of the Dipylon, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.50, W 0.42.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀρισταγόρα Κορινθία (*IG II² 9056*).

Aristagora of Corinth.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is within a sunken panel, which is broken, the lower half missing. Aristagora is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a sleeved-chiton and a himation. She is accompanied by a servant girl who wore a long-sleeved chiton and a short tunic. The legs of both women are missing.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.882; *FRA* 2947; Scholl 1996: no. 139; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.14, fig. 6 + 7.

F 44 Stele of Herpyllis of Crete(?)

NM 78.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.608, W 0.30.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἐρπυλλίς Κρησα (*Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no. 295*).

Herpyllis of Crete.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is within a sunken panel, however, the figures overlapped the edges. To the left, overlapping the edge of the sunken panel, stands a small servant girl. She wears a belted chiton and holds a box. In the centre of the scene stands Herpyllis. She wears sleeved chiton and himation. She shakes hands with a woman seated on a high-backed chair, whom Clairmont (*CAT* 2.829) calls Kreusa but if Ginestí-Rosell (2012 no. 295) is right about this name being an ethnic is nameless. This second woman wears a chiton and mantle.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.829; *Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no. 295*.

F 45 Stele of Diokleides of Kythera and Minakos

NM 1013.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.44, W 0.38.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Διοκλείδης Κυθήριος. Μίνακος (*IG II² 9110*).

Diokleides of Kythera. Minakos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel, of which the left edge is broken away. The head of a warrior wearing an Attic helmet

survives to the left. In front of the warrior is an elderly man, Diokleides, seated on a high-backed chair. He wears a himation over his shoulder and lower body and originally held a painted stick in his left hand. With his right hand he shakes hands with Minakos, a young wearing a himation over his shoulder and lower body. Minakos is probably the primary deceased bidding farewell to his father and perhaps brother.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.355b; *FRA* 3094; Scholl 1996: no. 143; Bergemann 1997: nr. 110; Hansen 1997: 227-228; Hansen 2004: 126; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 30.

F 46 Stele of Wet-nurse Malicha of Kythera

EM 8844.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.25, W 0.28.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: <ἐ>νθάδ<ε> γῆ κατέχει τίτην παίδων Διογείτο | ἐκ Πελοποννήσ-
ο τήνδε δικαιοτάτην. | Μαλίχα Κυθηρία (*IG* II² 9112).

Here the earth holds the nurse of the children of Diogeites from the Peloponnesus, she who possessed the highest moral character, Malicha of Kythera (translation from MacLachlan 2012: 55).

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Malicha is depicted in a sunken panel but only the top of her head survives.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 85-86, no.18, pl.10; *CAT* 1.350; *FRA* 3096; Scholl 1996: no. 28; Bäßler 1998: 129; Kosmopoulou 2001: P4; Beaumont 2012: 56; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 29; MacLachlan 2012: 55.

F 47 Stele of Demetria of Kyzikos

Agora I 3174.

Found in the Agora, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.285, W 0.217.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Δημητρία

Κυζικην[ή] (Bradeen no.525).

Demetria Kyzikos.

Relief: Little of the stele survives. Demetria is depicted within a sunken panel, seemingly by herself. She wears a chiton and mantle.

Bibliography: Bradeen 1974: no. 525 plate 44; *CAT* 1.399; Scholl 1996: no.8; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.386; Grossman 2013: no.50 plate 15.

F 48 Stele of Nikomachos of Lemnos

NM 968.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.90, W 0.38.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Νικόμαχος Περαιεύς.

Λήμνο ἀπ' ἠγαθέας κεύθει τάφος ἐνθάδε γαίας
ἄνδρα φιλοπρόβατον· Νικόμαχος δ' ὄνομα (*IG* II² 7180).

Nikomachos of the Piraeus.

F 52 Stele of Arkesilas son of Satyros and Myrtia of Messenia

Present whereabouts unknown.

Probably found at Hagia Marina.

Dimensions: H 1.06, W 0.45.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀρκεσίλας Σατύρου Μυρτία Μεσσήνιος (Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.33).

Arkesilas son of Satyros, Myrtia of Messenia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The decoration was painted and is now lost. Arkesilas and Myrtia, probably husband and wife, were likely depicted together.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.399b; *FRA* 3692 + 3701; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no. 33.

F 53 Stele of Al[k]enor of Miletus

Piraeus Museum 2138.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 1.43, W 0.455.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΑΛ[Κ]ΗΝΩΡ ΜΙΑΗΣΙΟΣ (Clairmont 2.356a).

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The relief is within a sunken panel, only the bottom half of which survives. Al[k]enor stands to the left wearing a himation. To the right, a female figure is seated. She wears a chiton and himation. The upper bodies of both figures are missing.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.356a; *FRA* 3822.

F 54 Stele of Pamphilos of Miletus (Figure 4.17)

NM 1980.

Found at Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.03, W 0.39.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Πάμφιλος : Λαμπίτου : Μιλήσιος (*IG II²* 9835).

Pamphilos son of Lampitos of Miletus.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. Pamphilos, a boy, stands naked except for his chlamys on his left shoulder and arm. In his right hand he holds a ball. At his feet are a dog and a ball.

Bibliography: *CAT* 0.870; *FRA* 5032 + 5301; Bergemann 1997: no. 791.

F 55 Stele of Nikeso and Protar[chos] of Olynthus

Piraeus Museum 266.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.505, W 0.38.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Νικησὼ Σώσωνο[ς]

Ὀλυνθίη. Πρώταρ[χος] (*IG II²* 10026).

Nikeso daughter of Soson

Of Olynthus. Protar[chos].

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within and sunken panel. Nikeso is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She is wearing a sleeved and sleeveless chiton and a himation that is drawn over the back of her head. She grasps the edge of the himation with her left hand. A duck sits in her lap. In front of Nikeso stands a boy, her son Protar[chos]. He is clad in a himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.842; *FRA* 5905 + 5913; Scholl 1996: no. 284; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.162.

F 56 Stele of men from Olynthus (Figure 4.18)

Piraeus Museum 1236.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ὀλύνθιος (*IG* II² 10029).
Of Olynthus.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Only the heads of two men survive.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.392a; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 163, fig. 107.

F 57 Stele of Miltiades and Euprax[i]s of Plataea

NM 725.

Found in the Piraeus, North Cemetery alongside Thebes Road.

Dimensions: H 1.20, W 0.83.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Μιλτιάδης. Εὐπραξί[ι]ς Πλαταιική (*IG* II² 10091).
Miltiades. Euprax[i]s of Plataea.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned with a pediment and framed by antae. Miltiades stands to the right. He wears his himation over both shoulders and his lower body and sandals on his feet. He perhaps supported himself on an originally painted stick. He shakes hands with Euprax[i]s, who is seated on a chair. She wears sleeved and sleeveless chitons and a himation. She wears sandals, her feet resting on a footstool.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.339; *FRA* 6097; Bergemann 1997: nr. 283; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.106.

F 58 Stele of Philon of the deme of Elaious and Chrysallis of Plataea

NM 3919.

Found in Phaleron, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.98.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Φίλων Ἐλαιεύς.
Χρυσάλλης Γρύλλου
Πλαταιέως (*SEG* 17.97).
Philon of deme of Elaieus.
Chrysallis daughter of Gryllos of Plataea.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Philon is stood to the left. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and lower body and is stooped over the stick he is using to support himself. With his right hand he shakes hands with Chrysallis, who is seated on a stool. She wears a chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.386b; *FRA* 6081 + 6144; Scholl 1996: no. 229.

F 59 Stele of Phrynos of Plataea

Agora I 5474.

Found in the Agora, Athens.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Φρῦνος

[Π]λαταεύς

Εὐ[— — —]

Φ#⁷[— — — (*Agora* XVII 649).

Phrynos of Plataea. Eu[---]. Ph<->[---].

Relief: Only the legs of a winged siren survive.

Bibliography: Bradeen 1974: no. 649; Grossman 2013: no. 146 plate 43.

F 60 Stele of Sime of Plataea and Euktemon of Sinope

Agora I 5311.

Found in the Agora, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.305; 0.635.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σίμη Θεῶνος Πλαταιική,

Εὐκτήμων Καλλιμάχο Σινωπε[ύς] (*SEG* 18.122).

Sime daughter of Theon of Plataea,

Euktemon son of Kallimachos of Sinope.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae.

Only the heads of Sime, seated, and Euktemon, standing, survive.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.316; *FRA* 6105 + 6122 + 6816 + 6830; Bergemann 1997: no.1;

Grossman 2013: no. 17 plate 5.

F 61 Stele of Aristophon of Rhegium

Piraeus Museum 1553.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.51, W 0.33.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀριστοφῶν Εὐνίκου Ῥηγῖνος (*IG* II² 10133).

Aristophon son of Eunikos of Rhegium.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a circular finial on which is winged siren.

Aristophon, a boy, is only preserved to his chest, where the stele is broken. He wears a himation over his left shoulder.

Bibliography: *CAT* 0.878; *FRA* 6207 + 6208; Bergemann 1997: no. 824; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.312.

F 62 Lekythos of Hieron of Rhodes

Piraeus Museum 3569.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.49.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΙΕΡΩΝ ΦΙΛΗΡΑΤΟΥ ΡΟΔΙΟΣ (*SEG* XLI 209).

Hieron son of Phileratos of Rhodes.

Relief: Hieron stands to the left. He wears a himation over both shoulders and his lower body. He shakes hands with Phileratos, who is seated on a high-backed chair.

Phileratos wears his himation over his left shoulder and lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.353a; Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no.288.

F 63 Stele of [Aris]tokrates of Salamis

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum inv. I 695.

Found in Athens(?).

Dimensions: H 0.35, W 0.43.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: [Ἄρισ]τοκράτης Πασικράτους Σαλα[μίνιος] (*IG II² 10179*).

[Aris]tokrates son of Pasikratos of Sala[mis].

Relief: The stele is crowned with a roof sima upon which a siren stands, though it is fragmentary. The relief is within a sunken panel. Only [Aris]tokrates survives from the waist upon. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and presumably his lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 0.874a; *FRA* 6410 + 6480; Scholl 1996: no.501; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.463.

F 64 Lekythos of Mnesileos and Astytimos of Salamis

Piraeus Museum 5237.

Found at Tavros, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.44.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Μνησιλεως. Αστυτιμος Φιλοδωτου Σαλ[αμινιος] (*SEG XIII 191*).

Mnesileos. Astytimos son of Philodotos of Sal[amis].

Relief: Three male figures are depicted. Mnesileos stands to the left and shakes hands with Astytimos, an elderly man who is seated. A third man, either unnamed or whose name is lost, stands between Mnesileos and Astytimos. All three wear himatia.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.344; Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no.455.

F 65 Stele of Oinante of Salamis

Present whereabouts unknown.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: unknown.

Inscription: Οινάνθη : Καλλιστράτης Σαλαμινία (*IG II² 10205*).

Oinante daughter of Kallistrate of Salamis.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment featuring a siren. Of the relief below, only the head of Oinante survives. She may have been depicted with her mother Kallistrate.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.313b; *FRA* 6462 + 6477; Foley 2003: 136 fn18; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.471.

F 66 Stele of Sosidemos of Salamis, Cyprus

Private Collection.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.475, W 0.40.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΣΩΣΙΔΗΜΟΣ ΣΑΛΑ-

MINIOS ΑΠΟ ΚΥΠΡΟ (*SEG XLI 210*).

Sosidemos of Salamis, Cyprus.

Relief: Sosidemos, wearing a corselet and carrying a spear, shakes hands with an elderly man.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.392e (supplementary volume); Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.456.

F 67 Stele of Aristodike, Aristarchos and Athenais of Sestos

British Museum 1785.5-27.6.

Found in Athens(?).

Dimensions: H 0.20, W 0.37.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀριστοδίκη Ἀρίσταρχος Ἀθηναῖς Σήστιοι (*IG II² 10262*).

Aristodike, Aristarchos, Athenais of Sestos.

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The only top half of the relief, which is in a sunken panel, is preserved. Only Aristodike's head is preserved, as she is seated.

Aristarchos and Athenais are preserved to the waist. Aristarchos, standing between the two women, wears a himation over his left shoulder, arm and lower body.

Athenais wears a chiton and a himation that is drawn over the back of her head.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.394a; Cargill 1995: 91; *FRA* 6635 + 6636 + 6637; Scholl 1996: no.434; Bergemann 1997: no.221; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.216.

F 68 Lekythos of Ada and Mikon from Sigeion

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 23.2.

Found at Laurion, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.71.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἄδα. Μίκων ἐξ Σιγείου (*IG II² 10575a*).

Ada. Mikon from Sigeion.

Relief: Ada is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and himation. Her feet are on a footstool. Ada shakes hands with Mikon, who wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 124, no.1 and 126, no.30, 133; *CAT* 2.349; *FRA* 6642; Bergemann 1997: no. 168; Bäbler 1998: no. 19; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 366.

F 69 Stele of Kallias and Pamphilos of Sikyon

NM inv. no. unknown.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.42, W 0.35.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Καλλίας Σικυώνιος.

Πάμφιλος Καλλίου (*IG II² 10305*).

Kallias of Sikyon.

Pamphilos son of Kallias.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. Two rosettes separate the two lines of the inscription. Below, a loutrophoros-amphora is incised into the stele. On the vessel, Pamphilos, an elderly man, is seated on chair. In his left hand he holds and stick and with his right he shakes hands with his son Kallias. Both men wear himatia.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.382c; *FRA* 6749 + 6750 + 6759; Bergemann 1997: nr. 148; Grossman 2013: no.199, plate 64.

F 70 Stele of Hermaia and Hermaiondas of Skaphlia

Eleusis Museum inv. no. unknown.

Found at Eleusis.

Dimensions: H 0.69, W 0.345.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἑρμαΐα Φιλοδάμου

Σκαφλικά. Ἑρμαιώνδας (*CAT* 3.391 has as ΕΡΜΑΙΩΝΔΑΣ)

Ἀργοθνίς, Κλεψαΐς Σκαφλικάι (*SEG* 22.190).

Hermaia daughter of Philodamos

Of Skaphlia. Hermaiondas

Argothis, Klepsais of Skaphlia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Hermaia is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a chiton and himation and grasps the himation with her left hand. With her right hand she shakes hands with Hermaiondas. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. A female figure stands between them, but which if any of the other names refers to her is unknown. She wears a chiton and himation and brings her right hand to her cheek in a gesture of mourning.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.391; *FRA* 6892 + 6894 + 6895 + 6898 + 6900; Scholl 1996: 393; Bergemann 1997: no. 215, no. 219; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.102.

F 71 Stele of Pamphilos and Protho of Torone

NM 2607.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.75, W 0.29.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Πάμφιλος Πρωθῶ

Τορωναῖος. Τορωναΐα (*IG* II 10454).

Pamphilos Protho

Of Torone of Torone.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a finial. The scene was rendered in paint only and not in relief. Protho is seated on a high-backed chair to the right. She shakes hands with Pamphilos, who wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He is accompanied by a small servant boy.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.878a; *FRA* 7145 + 7146; Scholl 1996: no. 214; Bergemann 1997: no. 199; Posamentir 2006: no. 67; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.166.

F 72 Stele of Antiochos of Phleious

NM 3662.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.42, W 0.35.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀντίοχος Ἑρμογένους Φλειήσιος (*IG* II² 10479).

Antiochos son of Ermogenes of Phleious.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial and the relief is within a sunken panel, of which the left bottom corner is broken away. A woman is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and mantle and shakes hands with Antiochos, who wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. The figures are likely husband and wife.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.392d; *FRA* 7229 + 7231; Scholl 1996: no.223; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.15.

F 73 Stele of Agaklidas and Dianeta of Boeotia / Megara / Epidaurus

Malibu, J.P. Getty Museum 73.AA.133.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.205, W 0.36.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: [-ca13-16-]αιε, Αγακλειδας μνηματι σος παι[ς]
[-ca13-16-].ον και αδελφαν {Δ}ιανεταν αυτ[ου] (*SEG XXVIII 440*).
[...] Agaklidas with this monument
[...] and his sister Dianeta.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a roof sima. Only the heads of two figures, perhaps Agaklidas and Dianeta, survive. The stele is very fragmentary but there was perhaps room for a third figure. The dialect of the inscriptions suggested the deceased were from Boeotia, Megara or Epidaurus.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.384; Grossman 2001: 35-36, no.11, fig.11; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.516.

F 74 Stele of a Phoenician (Figure 4.19)

Piraeus Museum 3580.

Found in at Moschato.

Dimensions: H 0.79, W 0.48.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: φοινι[ξ] (*CAT* 1.333)
Phoenician inscription (*CISem* I no.121).
Phoinix.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The stele is very fragmentary but looks to have been of the naiskos type. Only the left arm of a figure survives. He holds some object. Clairmont (*CAT* 1.333) suggests this object could be a writing tablet.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.333; Bergemann 1997: no.754; Bäbler 1998: no. 67; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.486.

F 75 Stele of Ada and Ana

Athens Third Ephoria M 1961.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.83, W 0.335.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΑΔΑ ΑΝΑ (*SEG* 32.312).
Ada Ana.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semi-circular finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Ada sits on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears chitons and a himation and holds a bird in her right hand. Ana, a girl, stands in front of Ada, her mother. She wears a sleeved and belted chiton.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.871; Scholl 1996: no. 343; Bergemann 1997: Grabbezirk E2+E3; Bäbler 1998: 22; Posamentir 2006: no.60.

F 76 Lekythos of Ada

British Museum 1816.6-10.188.

Found in Athens(?).

Dimensions: H 0.54.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἄδα (*IG* II² 10573).

Ada.

Relief: The scene is on the body of the Lekythos. An elderly man stands to the left wearing his himation over both shoulders and his lower body. He shakes hands with Ada, probably his wife, who is seated on a chair. She wears sleeved chiton and himation and her feet rest on a footstool.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.384d; Scholl 1996: no. 342; Bergemann 1997: nr.108; Bäbler 1998: 6.

F 77 Stele of Agathokles, Aigyptia and Hiero

Athens Third Ephoria M 1862.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.47, W 0.315.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΑ ΙΕΡΩ (*SEG* 29.241).

Agathokles Aigyptia Hiero.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel, the bottom of which is missing. Hiero stands to the left. She wears a chiton and himation and shakes hands with Agathokles, who is seated on a high-backed chair. He wears his himation over his left arm and lower body. Between the two adults is a child, presumably Aigyptia and therefore a girl.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.881a; Bäbler 1998: 16.

F 78 Stele of Pyrrhias and Thettale (Figure 4.20)

NM 997.

Probably from Amaroussi, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.58, W 0.37.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Πυρρίας.

Θε[τ]ταλή

Πυρρίου γυνή (*IG* II² 12562).

Pyrrhias

Thettale

Wife of Pyrrhias.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a pediment and the relief is within a shallow sunken panel. The scene is a banquet scene. Thettale is seated on a chair placed at the foot of a couch. She wears belted chiton and himation and her feet are on a footstool. Pyrrhias reclines on the couch. He wears his himation over his left arm and lower body. He holds a skyphos in his left hand. There is a table with food in front of the couple.

Bibliography: Fragiadakis 1986: no.201; *CAT* 2.385; Closterman 2015: 2 figure 1.1, 11, 12.

F 79 Stele of [Thra]jitta and Kadous

Brauron Museum 120.

Found at Koropi, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.285, W 0.35.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΘΡΑ] ΙΤΤΑ ΚΑΔΟΥΣ (*SEG* 17.118).

Thra]jitta Kadous.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pointed finial and the relief is within a panel, of which only the top right corner survives. Kadous stands to the right. [Thra]jitta was probably seated to the left.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.382b; Scholl 1996: no.450; Bergemann 1997: no.173; Bäbler 1998: no.120; Taylor 2015: 47.

F 80 Stele of Kosmia (Figure 4.21)

Kerameikos Museum P 286, I 140.

Found in Dipylon Cemetery, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.34, W 0.31.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Κοσμία (*IG* II² 11894).

Kosmia.

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The relief is within a shallow sunken panel. To the left stands an elderly man supporting himself on a stick. He wears a himation over his left arm and lower body. In front of him is Kosmia seated on a stool. She wears a sleeved chiton and himation. Kosmia shakes hands with a young man wearing a himation over his left arm and lower body. Kosmia and the young man could have been wife and husband, the elderly man one of their fathers.

Bibliography: Riemann 1940: 21-22, no.23; *CAT* 3.392; Scholl 1996 no.54.

F 81 Stele of Mali[cha] and Kallimach[e]

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found in Prytaneion, Athens.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Μαλί[χα]. Καλλιμάχ[η] (*IG* II² 12028).

Mali[cha]. Kallimach[e].

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The relief is within a sunken panel. Malicha stands to the left and wears a chiton and himation. Kallimache is seated to the right.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.349d; Scholl 1996: no.336/337; Bäbler 1998: nr.64; Kennedy 2014: 134; Closterman 2015: n5.10.

F 82 Lekythos of [P]antaleon (Figure 4.22)

NM 4495.

Found at Brahami, Attica.

Dimensions: H 1.63.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: (Π)Ἀνταλέων (*IG* II² 10679).

[P]antaleon.

Relief: [P]antaleon stands facing to the left. He wears a short-sleeved, long chiton and holds a kantharos in his right hand. His dress and the kantharos suggest he was a priest.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.377; Kaltsas 2002: 190, no.375, figure 375.

F 83 Stele of Sannion

NM 2567.

Found at Liopesi, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.70, W 0.295.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σαννίων (*IG II² 12582*).

Sannion.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial. Sannion, a boy, wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm. He holds a bird in right hand and is also accompanied by a small dog.

Bibliography: Fragiadakis 1986: no.57; *CAT* 0.883.

F 84 Stele of Siga and Syros

NM 1123.

Found in the Piraeus(?).

Dimensions: H 0.40, W 0.27.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σίγα. Σύρωσ (*IG II² 12600*).

Siga. Syros.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial. The figures are incised into the stele. Siga is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and a himation that is drawn over the back of her head. She grasps her himation with her left hand. Siga shakes hands with Syros. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body.

Bibliography: Scholl 1996: no.167; Bergemann 1997: no.38 and 170; Bäbler 1998: no.94.

F 85 Stele of Syra

NM Theseion 151.

Found at Trachones, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.76, W 0.30.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σύρα (*IG II² 12687*).

Syra.

Relief: A man shakes hands with Syra, who is seated to the right. The two were likely husband and wife.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.399d; Bäbler 1998: no.95.

F 86 Stele of *Isotelês* Philippos, Eutychis and Dionysios

Eleusis Museum (inv. no. unknown).

Found at Eleusis(?).

Dimensions: H 0.78, W 0.345.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Εὐτυχίς. Φίλιππος.
Διονύσιος
Φιλίππου
ἰσοτελής (*IG II² 7868*).

Eutychis Philippos
Dionysios
Son of Philippos
Isotelês

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and relief is within a sunken panel. Eutychis is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a chiton and himation and her feet rest on a footstool. Dionysios, a small boy in a himation,

reaches for Eutyichis. Eutyichis shakes hands with Philippos, who wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.885; Bergemann 1997: no.30, plate 10,1,b; Beaumont 2012: 200; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.503; Mack 2015: 57 n123.

F 87 Stele of Theodote daughter of Isotelês Nikostratos

NM 3648.

Found at Koukouvaones, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.42.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Θεοδότη Νικοστρά[του]

[ι]σοτελοῦς. Καλλ — — (*IG II²* 7869).

Theodote daughter of Nikostratos

Isotelês. Kall --.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. The figures are fragmentarily preserved. There is a standing woman – Theodote? – and a seated woman – Kall--? – the two likely daughter and mother.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.360d; Ginestí-Rosell 2012 no.508.

F 88 Stele of worthy Artemisia

NM 759.

Found on Salamis.

Dimensions: H 1.31, W 0.48.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Ἀρτεμισία χρηστή (*IG II²* 10842).

Worthy Artemisia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a finial with anthemion. Two rosettes separate the inscription and the relief, which is in a sunken panel. An elderly man stands to the left, wearing his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. Next to him stands a woman wearing both a sleeved and a sleeveless chiton and a himation. Artemisia is seated to the right, wearing a short-sleeved chiton and a himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.360.

F 89 Stele of worthy, just Soteris (Figure 4.23)

Piraeus Museum 1547.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.93, W 0.48.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Σωτηρίς χρηστή δικαία (*IG II²* 12749).

Worthy, just Soteris.

Relief: The stele is on the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. To the left, overlapping the anta and slightly behind seated Soteris, is a servant girl wearing a long-sleeved chiton. Soteris is seated on stool and wears a chiton and himation. Her feet rest on a footstool and she wears sandals. She shakes hands with another woman, who wears a sleeved chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.362b.

F 90 Stele of worthy Pithane (Figure 4.24)

Piraeus Museum 263.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.435, W 0.385.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Πιθάνη (*IG II² 12451 – CAT 1.352* has as ΠΙΘΑΝΗ ΧΡΗΣΤΗ).

Worthy Pithane.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Two rosettes separate the inscription and the relief. Pithane is seated on a high-backed chair and holds a spindle in her left hand. The figure is only preserved to the waist, where the stele is broken.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.352; Bergemann 1997: no.744.

F 91 Stele of worthy nurse Pyraichme

NM 3935.

Found in Petralona.

Dimensions: H 0.735, W 0.305.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: ΠΥΡΑΙΧ[ΜΗ] ΤΙΤΘΗ ΧΡΗΣΤΗ (*SEG* 21.1064).

Worthy nurse Pyraichme.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion and the relief is within a shallow sunken panel. Pyraichme is seated on a high-backed chair facing to the left. She wears a long-sleeved chiton and himation and holds a skyphos. There is a chous by her feet.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.376; Scholl 1996: no.230, plate 230,2; Bäbler 1998: no.128; Wrenhaven 2012: 95-95, fig.9.

F 92 Stele of worthy nurse Synete

NM 4983, in Rhamnous since 1985.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Πυνέτη τίθη χρηστή (*IG II² 12559 – CAT 2.359d* has as ΣΥΝΕΤΗ).

Worthy nurse Synete.

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The figures are incised. A man stands to the left wearing his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with Synete, who is seated on a chair with no back. She wears a sleeved and mantle and her feet are placed on a footstool.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.359d; Bäbler 1998: no.136; MacLachlan 2012: 76.

F 93 Stele of midwife Phanostrate (Figure 4.25)

NM 993.

Found at Menidi, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.62, W 0.39.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Φανο[στράτη — — —, — — —]

Με[λιτέως γυνή]?

Φανοστράτη.

μαῖα καὶ ἰατρὸς Φανοστράτη ἐνθάδε κεῖται

[ο]ύθενι λυπη<ρ>ά, πᾶσιν δὲ θανοῦσα ποθεινή (*IG II² 6873*).

Phanostrate [-of-]

Of Melite
Antiphile Phanostrate
Midwife and doctor Phanostrate lies here,
She caused pain to no-one and, having died is missed by all
(translation from *AIO*).

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The relief is within a sunken panel. Antiphile stands to the left. She wears a belted chiton and a himation that covered the back of her head. Antiphile shakes hands with Phanostrate, who is seated on a high-backed chair with her feet on a footstool. She wears a belted chiton and a himation. The two women are accompanied by three children.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: 57, 130-131 no.53 pl.25; *CAT* 2.890; Scholl 1996: no.132; Bergemann 1997: nr.200; Cohen 2000: 45; Kosmopoulou 2001: 316, M1, figure 5; Laes 2011; Beaumont 2012: 47, 102, figure 3.39, 200; Kennedy 2014: 141-143; Carroll 2018: 36.

F 94 Stele of a nurse

NM 2076.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.41, W 0.235.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Τεῖρθη (*IG II²* 12814).

Nurse.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semi-circular finial. The nurse is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and mantle. She shakes hands with an elderly man. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. The stele is broken at the figures knees.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.337d; Scholl 1996: no. 194; Bäbler 1998: no.139.

F 95 Stele of a nurse

NM 1027.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.95, W 0.40.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: Τίρθη (*IG II²* 12813).

Nurse.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. The nurse is seated on a high-backed chair facing to the right. She wears both a sleeved and sleeveless chiton and a himation. Her feet are placed on a footstool.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.354; Scholl 1996: no.153, plate 19,1; Bäbler 1998: no.138; Osborne 2011: 74.

F 96 Stele of [Aristoph]anes of Amphipolis

Agora I 5066

Found in the Agora, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.226, W 0.103.

Date: 350-300 BC

Inscription: [---]ανης Ονησ[-3-4-] Αμφιπολ[ιτης] (*SEG* 17.108).

[Aristoph]anes son of Ones[---] of Amphipol[is].

Relief: The stele is on the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Only the head of [Aristoph]anes is preserved.

Bibliography: Bradeen 1974: no.408; *FRA* 517 + 521; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.156; Grossman 2013: no. 116, plate 33.

F 97 Stele of Menes of Argos (Figure 4.26)

Kerameikos Museum P 671.

Found near Hagia Triada, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.90, W 0.44.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μένης Καλλίου Ἀργεῖος χαῖρε (*IG II²* 8370).

Menes son of Kallias of Argos, farewell.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a panel. Menes is horseback, the horse rearing up in mid-gallop. Menes wears a short, belted chiton and chlamys. In his left hand he holds the horse's reins and in his right he holds a lance.

Bibliography: Riemann 1940: 28-29, no.26; *CAT* 1.429; *FRA* 1212 + 1217; Scholl 1996: no. 331, plate 37,3; Bergemann 1997: Grabbezirk A19a; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.27.

F 98 Stele of Hermogenes, Rode and Epigenes of Gerenaios (Figure 4.27)

NM 1025.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἑρμογένης

[[Ρόδη]]

[Ε]ρμογένους.

Ἐπιγένης Ἑρμογένους.

Γηρη-

γαῖ[ος] (*IG II²* 11335).

Hermogenes

Rode

wife of Hermogenes

Epigenes son of Hermogenes

Of Gerenaios.

Relief: The relief is within a sunken panel. It is a banquet scene. Rode is seated on the end of a couch. She wears a chiton and a himation that covers the back of her head. Her feet are on a footstool. Hermogenes is reclining on the couch. He wears his himation only over his lower body. He holds a cup in his right hand. In front of the couple is a table bearing food.

Bibliography: *FRA* 1446 + 1447 + 1448; Closterman 2015: 3, 5 figure 1.4, 11.

F 99 Stele of Timagora of Delphi

NM 940.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.71, W 0.35.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Τιμαγόρα Δημοκρίτου Δελφίς (*IG II²* 8478).

Timagora daughter of Demokritos of Delphi.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Timagora is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears both sleeved and

sleeveless chiton and a himation. Her feet rest on a footstool. Timagora shakes hands with another woman – her mother? – the two watched by Timagora’s father, Demokritos, who stands between them. Timagora’s mother wears a chiton and belted peplos, with her himation covering the back of her head. Demokritos wears a himation over his left arm and lower body.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.463; *FRA* 1477 + 1481; Scholl 1996: no.121, plate 16,4; Bergemann 1997: no.232.

F 100 Stele of Korallion of Herakleia (Figure 4.28)

Kerameikos Museum P 688 I 246.

From burial precinct II, for the family of Agathon and Sosikrates of Herakleia (see *IG II²* 8551).

Dimensions: H 1.65, W 1.00.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Κοράλλιον Ἀγάθωνος γυνή (*IG II²* 11891).

Korallion wife of Agathon.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Korallion is seated on stool to the left. She wears both sleeved and sleeveless chiton and a himation drawn over the back of her head. Her feet rest on a footstool and she wears sandals. Korallion shakes hands with Agathon, an elderly man who wears a himation over his left arm and lower body. Behind the couple are two more figures. Only the head of the female figure is visible. She has short hair and raises her left hand to her cheek in a mourning gesture. She is perhaps a servant girl. The elderly man is perhaps Agathon’s brother Sosikrates mentioned in *IG II²* 8551.

Bibliography: Diepolder 1931:49f plate 45,2; Garland 1982: A2; *CAT* 4.415; *FRA* 1682 + 1685 + 2199; Bergemann 1997: no. 270, plate 1,3; Spathari 2009: 40, figure 34; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 421; Shepherd 2013: 552.

F 101 Stele of Dromon of Herakleia

NM 1127.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.42, W 0.27.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Δρόμων Ἡρακλεώτης (*IG II²* 8636).

Dromon of Herakleia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semin-circular finial upon which an anthemion is carved. The figures are incised. Dromon is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. His himation covers his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with a standing woman, presumably his wife, who wears a chiton and mantle.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.433a; *FRA* 1881; Scholl 1996: no.196; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.423.

F 102 Stele of Eutychides of Kios (Figure 4.29)

NM 3785.

Found at Koropi, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.83, W 0.46.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Εὐτυχίδης Διφίλου Κιανός (*IG II²* 9022).

Eutychides son of Diphilos of Kios.

Relief: Two male figures, one presumably Eutychides, recline on couches. Their lower bodies are covered by himatia. A naked servant boy stands at the foot of the couch carrying a pitcher.

Bibliography: *FRA* 2861 + 2866; Scholl 1996: no.228; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.385; Closterman 2015: 8, 9.

F 103 Lekythos of Amphinoe of Thebes and Amphigenes of the deme of Erchia

Paris, Rodin Museum 38.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 1.00.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀμφινὴ	Ἀμφιγένης
Μνησιθέο	Ἐρχιεύς
Θηβί[α]	(Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.99).
Amphinoe	Amphigenes
Daughter of Mnesitheos	of deme of Erchia
Of Thebes.	

Relief: Amphinoe is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. She wears a sleeved chiton and a himation. She shakes hands with Amphigenes, an elderly man wearing a himation over his left arm and lower body. The two are probably wife and husband, though one appears to be a metic and the other a citizen.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.421b; *FRA* 2386 + 2388; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.99.

F 104 Stele of Dionysios of Ikaria (Figure 4.30)

NM 806.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.03, W 0.59.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Διονύσιος Ἰκάριος (*IG* II² 8935).
Dionysios of Ikaria.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pointed finial upon which two goats are depicted butting head over a kantharos. The stele is broken below two rosettes, where originally there was perhaps a sunken panel relief.

Bibliography: *FRA* 2608; Kaltsas 2002: 201-202, no.401, figure 401; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no. 269.

F 105 Monument of Nikeratos and Polyxenos of Istros (Kallithea Monument) (Figure 4.31)

Piraeus Museum 2413-2529.

Found at Kallithea.

Dimensions: Reconstructed H 8.30.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Νικήρατος Πολυίδο Ἰστριανός,
Πολύξενος Νικηράτο (*SEG* 24.258).
Nikeraros son of Polyxenos of Istros
Polyxenos son of Nikeratos.

Relief: The monument consists of a naiskos housing three figures mounted on a podium decorated with friezes. All three figures are missing their heads. To the left is Nikeratos wearing a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. In the centre is Polyxenos, a naked youth. On the right is a small naked servant boy. He

carries Polyxenos' matle over his left shoulder. The frieze directly below the naiskos depicts animals. The second frieze, separated from the first by the inscription, depicts amazons.

Bibliography: Garland 1982: L2; Garland 1987: 62, figure 11; *FRA* 2628 + 2630 + 2631; Ridgway 2001: 31-33; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.223; Shepherd 2013: 552.

F 106 Stele of Phaineas of Corinth

Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 210a (IN 2460).

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.89, W 0.57.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Φαινέας Δόρκωνος Κορίνθιος (Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no. 16).

Phaineas son of Dorkon of Corinth.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a shallow sunken panel. Phaineas is seated on a high-backed chair. His mantle covers his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with a young woman – his daughter? – who wears a sleeved chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.423b; *FRA* 2965 + 3002; Scholl 1996: no.418; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.16.

F 107 Trapeza of nurse Phanion of Corinth

EM 10506.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.46, W 0.65, D 0.40.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Φάνιον Κορινθία τίτθ[η] (*IG* II² 9079).

Phanion of Corinth a nurse.

Relief: The relief is within a shallow sunken panel on a face of the trapeza. Phanion is seated on a stool to the left. She wears chitons and a himation and may have held a bird. A small girl stands in front of Phanion. She is clad in chiton and knee-length tunic. Behind this girl is an older girl wearing a chiton and himation and holding a box. This second girl could be a servant girl.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.980; *FRA* 3003; Beaumont 2012: fn307.

F 108 Lekythos of Sotairos of Kyzikos

NM 2827.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.44.

Date: 350-300 BC

Inscription: Σώταιρος

Σωκλέους

Κυζικηνός (*IG* II² 9108).

Sotairos

Son of Soklees

of Kyzikos.

Relief: Sotairos is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with a standing female figure wearing a chiton and himation. A second female stands in the background between them. She also wears a chiton and himation. Sotairos is perhaps depicted with his wife and daughter.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.434a; *FRA* 2965 + 3002; Scholl 1996: 418; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.16.

F 109 Stele of Diokles of Cyprus (Figure 4.32)

Piraeus Museum 16.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.86, W 0.42.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: [Δι]οκλῆς Διοκλέους
Κύπριος (*IG II²* 9120).
[Di]okles son of Diokles
of Cyprus.

Relief: The top of the stele is broken. The relief is within a shallow sunken panel. Diokles is reclining on a couch, his lower body draped in a himation. In his right hand he is holding up an object, possibly a rhyton. In front of the couch is a small servant girl wearing a sleeveless chiton and carrying a jug in her right hand.

Bibliography: *FRA* 3111 + 3112; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.467; Closterman 2015: 9 fn41.

F 110 Stele of [-----]idas of Cyrene

NM inv. no. unknown.

Found in Athens(?).

Dimensions: H 0.50, W 0.43.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: . . 5 . . ἰδας [Κυ]ρηναῖος (*IG II²* 9138).
[-----]idas of Cyrene.

Relief: The top of the stele is broken. The relief is within a sunken panel. [-----]idas, a warrior, strides to the right as if going into battle.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.461; *FRA* 3156; Scholl 1996: no. 257; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.499.

F 111 Stele of Phylako of Cyrene

Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 209 (IN 1874).

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.57, W 0.41.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Φιλακῶ Κυρηναία (*IG II²* 9137).
Phylako of Cyrene.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a finial with a winged siren and framed by antae. Only the head of a standing bearded male figure and the upper body of Phylako, who is seated, survive. She wears a chiton and a mantle that she has drawn over the back of her head. The two were probably husband and wife.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.424b; *FRA* 3153; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.496.

F 112 Stele of Onesimos, Protonoe, Nikostrate and Eukoline of Lesbos (Figure 4.33)

Kerameikos Museum P 388.

Found in the Dipylon Cemetery, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.36, W 0.80.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ὀνήσιμος Ὀνήτορος Λ<έ>σβιος.

Πρωτονόη : Νικοστράτη : Εὐκολίνη (*IG II²* 9203).

Onesimos son of Onetor of Lesbos.

Protonoe, Nikostrate, Eukoline.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Protonoe stands to the left. She wears a chiton and himation. She reaches her left hand out to touch Eukoline's cheek and with her right hand holds that girl's arm. Eukoline wears a chiton and peplos with straps across her chest. In her right arm she holds a bird. A small dog jumps up at her. Behind Protonoe and Eukoline stand Nikostrate and Onesimos. Nikostrate wears a chiton and peplos and a himation covers the back of her head. Onesimos wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. Onesimos and Protonoe are perhaps husband and wife, Eukoline their daughter and the primary deceased. Nikostrate is another relative.
Bibliography: Diepolder 1931: 47 n.1; Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 105, figure 18; *CAT* 4.420; *FRA* 3322 + 3323; Bergemann 1997: no.271, plate 50, 3.4, 58,1.2, 76,1.2, 117.1; Beaumont 2012: 33-34; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.263.

F 113 Stele of Sosias of Lycia

Athens Third Ephoria M 25238.

Found at Kallithea.

Dimensions: H 0.50, W 0.30.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Σωσίας Λύκιος (*SEG* 34.287).

Sosias of Lycia.

Relief: The relief is within a sunken panel. Sosias and another male figure are depicted.

Bibliography: *CAT* 338; *FRA* 3383; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.446.

F 114 Stele of Lamynth[ios] and Euboulide[s] of Miletus

NM 906.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.85, W 0.38.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Λαμύνθ[ιος]

Μιλήσι[ος].

Εὐβουλίδη[ς]

Λαμυνθίο[υ].

Ἄδα Λαμυνθίου

γυνή (*IG II²* 9738).

Lamynth[ios] of Miletus

Euboulide[s] son of Lamynthios.

Ada wife of Lamynthios.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Lamynth[ios] is seated on a high-backed chair to the left. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with Euboulide[s], his son. Euboulide[s] is a youth and wears his himation the same as his father.
Bibliography: *CAT* 2.423; *FRA* 3771 + 4544 + 5033; Scholl 1996: no.106, plate 24,1; Bergemann 1997: no.28; Beaumont 2012: fn309; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.350.

F 115 Stele of Simon of Miletus and Aphrodisia of Samos

NM 1175.

Found near Church of Hagios Phillipos, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.75, W 0.89-0.99.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Σίμων Θεοδώρου Μιλήσιος.

Ἀφροδισία Σαμία (*IG II² 9870*).

Simon son of Theodoros of Miletus.

Aphrodisia of Samos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Below are two rosettes and then the outline of a house that must have originally framed a painted scene.

Bibliography: *FRA* 5426 + 6539; Scholl 1996 no.181; Ginestí -Rosell 2012: no.358.

F 116 Stele of Antiphilos of Olynthus

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found north of the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.63, W 0.32.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀντίφιλος

Ὀλύνθιος (*IG II² 10017*).

Antiphilos

of Olynthus.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semi-circular finial. Antiphilos, naked, leans against a loutrophoros-amphora over which he has draped his mantle.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.456; *FRA* 5882; Scholl 1996: no.330; Bergemann 1997: plate 116,1; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.174.

F 117 Stele of a man from Olynthus

Present whereabouts unknown.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.40, W 0.40.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ΟΛΥ [ΝΘΙΟΣ (*CAT* 1.436).

Olynthus.

Relief: The relief is within a sunken panel. The young man is frontal facing. He wears a himation over his left shoulder and arm and then down to his knees. In his right hand he holds an aryballos.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.436; Scholl 1996: no.331, plate 37,3.

F 118 Stele of Eirene and Xenophantos of Oropos

NM 2552.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.70, W 0.27.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Εἰρήνη. Ἡραΐς. Ξενοφάντος

<Ξενο>φάντου Ὀρώπιος (*IG II² 10516*).

Eirene. Herais daughter of Xenophantos of Oropos. Xenophantos.

Relief: The relief is within a shallow sunken panel. Eirene is seated to the left and shaken hands with Xenophantos.

Bibliography: *CAT* 285; *FRA* 7342 + 7348; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.94, fig.74.

F 119 Stele of Epicharides and Erato of Plataea (Figure 4.34)

NM 2559.

Found near Gates of Diochares, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.09, W 0.73.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἐπιχαρίδης Πλατα[ιεύς]. Ἐρατὼ Ἐπιχαρίδου Πλαταιείως
(*IG II²* 10090).

Epicharides of Plata[ea]. Erato daughter of Ephicharides of Plataea.

Relief: The stele is of the naiskos type, crowned by a pediment and framed by antae. Epicharides, an elderly man, stands to left. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. He shakes hands with Erato, his daughter, who is seated on a stool. She wears a belted chiton and has her mantle drawn up over the back of her head. She wears sandals and her feet rest on a footstool. Another woman stands behind Erato. She wears a sleeved chiton and peplos. She is not named in the inscription, nor is her relationship to Erato and Epicharides.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.427a; *FRA* 6089 + 6090; Bergemann 1997: no.322, plate 25,1-4, 99,4; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.82.

F 120 Stele of Plangon and Tolmides of Plataea

NM 749.

Found at Oropos.

Dimensions: H 0.75, W 0.50.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Πλανγὼν Τολμίδου Πλαταιική.

Τολμίδης Πλαταεύς (*IG II²* 10096).

Plangon daughter Tolmides of Plataea.

Tolmides of Plataea.

Relief: Tolmides, an elderly man, stands to the right. His himation only leaves a little of his chest naked. He holds his cheek with his left hand in a gesture of mourning. Plangon reclines on a couch, suggests she died in childbirth. She wears a chiton and himation. Plangon is supported by two other women, probably her mother, wearing a chiton and himation, and a servant girl, wearing a short-sleeved chiton and tunic and a sakkos on her head.

Bibliography: Johansen 1951: 51, figure 26; Bradeen 1974: no.649; Garland 1985: 70, figure 3; *CAT* 4.470; *FRA* 6120 + 6134; Scholl 1996: no.67, plate 42,1; Bergemann 1997: no.125; Oakley 2003: 186, figure 28; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.101; Oakley 2012: 480-481, figure 24.1.

F 121 Stele of Alexandros of Samos

Kerameikos Museum P 1137, I 183.

Found on Western Road, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.18, W 0.294.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀλέξανδρος Σάμιος (*SEG* 22.188).

Alexandros of Samos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by anthemion and the relief is within a sunken panel. Alexandros, a naked youth, leans against a loutrophoros-amphora to the left. He brings his left hand to his cheek in a gesture of mourning. He is accompanied by his parents. His mother, wearing chiton and himation, reaches out his right hand to Alexandros. She is followed by Alexandros' elderly father, wearing his himation

over his left shoulder and arm and lower body and supporting himself with a stick. He too raises his right hand to his cheek in a gesture of mourning.
Bibliography: *CAT* 3.455; Cargill 1995: 110; *FRA* 6533; Scholl 1996: no.61, plate 36,1; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.281.

F 122 Stele of Apollodoros of Sidon

Louvre.

Found near Dipylon Cemetery, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.72, W 0.39.

Inscription: Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀγαθοκλέους Σιδώνιος (*IG II²* 10265a).
Apollodoros of Sidon.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment and the relief is within a sunken panel. Apollodoros is seated on a high-backed chair to the right. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and lower body. His feet rest on a footstool. He places his hand on the shoulder of his young daughter, who is playing with a small dog. In front of her is a huge amphora. To the other side of the vessel stands a naked boy holding a strigil.

Bibliography: *CAT* 283; Harland 2009: 108; Demetriou 2012: 208; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.487.

F 123 Stele of Theoitēs, Nikarete and Teleson of Tegea

Piraeus Museum 1222.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.54, W 0.28.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: πάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμος ἐ-

στὶ κοινὸς τὸ ἀποθανεῖν :

ἐνθάδε κεῖται Θεοίτης παῖς

Τελέσωνος Τεγεάτας Τεγε-

άτο : καὶ μητρὸς Νικαρέτης

χρηστῆς γε γυναικός : χαίρε-

[τ]ε οἱ παρι<ό>ντες, ἐγὼ δὲ γε τὰ-
μὰ φυ<λά>ττω (*IG II²* 10435).

It is the common law of all man to die:

Here lies Theoitēs, child of Teleson of Tegea and of mother Nikarete,
An excellent woman. Greetings passers-by,

I take care of what belongs to me.

Relief: The stele is broken and only the bottom of the relief surviving, preserving the naked feet of a male figure and the bottom of a woman's chiton.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: no.44, plate 21; *CAT* 2.458; *FRA* 7090 + 7092 + 7093; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.37.

F 124 Stele of Stephanos of Phokis

Piraeus Museum 1447.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.425, W 0.29.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Στέφανος Εὐχαρίδου Φωκεύς (*IG II²* 10496).
Stephanos son of Eucharides of Phokis.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial with a loutrophoros-amphora carved on it. The relief is within a sunken panel. Stephanos, a naked youth, stands scraping himself with a strigil. He is accompanied by a small servant boy. The stele is broken at Stephanos' knees and the servant boy's shoulders.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.944; *FRA* 7266 + 7275; Scholl 1996: no.299; Ginestí-Rosell 2012: no.349.

F 125 Stele of Artimas and Manyka

Paris, Rodin Museum 33.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.48, W 0.193.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀρτίμας. Μανόκα (*IG II²* 10848/9).
Artimas. Manyka.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Artimas stands to the left. He wears his himation over both his shoulders and his lower body. He shakes hands with Manyka, who is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and mantle. A small girl stands between the two and reaches for Manyka. The stele is broken at the figures ankles.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.941; Bergemann 1997: no.202, plate 9,2a; Bäbler 1998: no.45.

F 126 Stele of worthy Artimas

NM 1719.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.50, W 0.33.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀρτίμας χρηστός (*IG II²* 10847).
Worthy Artimas.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion and the relief is within a sunken panel, although only the heads of the figures, Artimas to the right and a seated woman to the left, survive.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 124, no.5, 131; *CAT* 2.463a; Scholl 1996: no.185; Bäbler 1998: no.44.

F 127 Stele of worthy Aphrodisia

Copenhagen, National Museum ABb 118.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.52, W 0.25.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΑ ΧΡΗΣΤΗ (*CAT* 2.970).
Worthy Aphrodisia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded but pointed finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Aphrodisia is seated on a chair to the left. She wears a chiton and mantle and her feet are on a footstool. Aphrodisia shakes hands with a bearded man. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and arm and lower body. A child stands between the two of them.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.970.

F 128 Stele of worthy Gnome

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found at Laurion, Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.40, W 0.36.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ἐνθάδε κεῖται Γνώμη χρηστή (*IG II² 11025*).

Here lies worthy Gnome.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a semi-circular finial and the relief is within a sunken panel. Gnome is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and a himation that covers the back of her head. She shakes hands with a bearded man. He wears his himation over his left shoulder and lower body. The stele is broken at the figures waists.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 137, no.16; *CAT* 2.440a; Scholl 1996: no.425; Posamentir 2006: no.68.

F 129 Stele of worthy Doris (Figure 4.35)

NM 1704.

Found at the Royal Stables, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.77, W 0.32.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Δωρίς χρηστή (*IG II² 11226*).

Worthy Doris.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. Below are two rosettes, underneath which is the relief within a sunken panel. Doris is seated on a high-backed chair. She wears a chiton and himation. She shakes hands with a male figure but only his head is preserved.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.419a; Scholl 1996: no.184.

F 130 Stele of Thous

NM 890.

Found at Laurion, Attica.

Dimensions: H 1.15, W 0.50.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Θούς.

AI (*IG II² 11679/80*).

Thous.

Ai.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. A servant boy stands to the left wearing an exomis. Thous is seated on a stool and wears a mantle covering his all but some of his chest and right arm. His feet are on a footstool. He shakes hands with a woman wearing a chiton, belted peplos and a mantle drawn over the back of her head. A servant girl follows the woman.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 127, no.46, 131; *CAT* 3.922; Scholl 1996: no.98; Bäbler 1998: no.38; Saprykin and Fedoseev 2013: 425.

F 131 Stele of Hegeso daughter of Persis

NM 2082.

Once in Finlay's house on Hadrian Street, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.27, W 0.23.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἥγησὼ Πέρσιδος (*IG II² 11568*).

Hegeso daughter of Persis.

Relief: The stele has a pointed finial. The relief is in a sunken panel. Hegeso stands wearing chiton and mantle. She shakes hands with Persis, her mother, who is seated and wears chiton and mantle.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.426b; Scholl 1996: no.196; Bäbler 1998: no.48; Foley 2003: 136 fn18.

F 132 Stele of worthy Karion (Figure 4.36)

EM 6068.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.15, W 0.18.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Καρίω[ν]
χρησ[τός] (*IG II² 11822*).
Worthy Karion.

Relief: The stele is very fragmentary. Only Karion's upper body survives. He appears to be striding out whilst carrying something – a sack or animal have been proposed. Thought to have been carved by the same sculptor as **F 141**.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.462; Scholl 1996; no.23; Bäbler 1998: no.21.

F 133 Stele of Malthake daughter of Magadis

PM 21.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.70, W 0.33.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μαθάκη :
Μαγάδιδος
χρηστή (*IG II² 12026*).
Worthy Malthake, daughter of Magadis.

Relief: Stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is in a sunken panel. If Clairmont (*CAT* 2.457) is right, Malthake is the figure attending to the female figure reclining on a couch and is to be considered a nurse or midwife. Both women wear chitons and himatia.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.457; Scholl 1996: no.319, plate 42,3; Bäbler 1998: no.27; Beaumont 2012: 46-47, figure 3.1.

F 134 Stele of Malthake and worthy Nikippe

NM 1019.

Found here Hagia Triada, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.14, W 0.475.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μαθάκη. Νικήππη χρησ[τή] (*IG II² 12024*).
Malthake. Worthy Nikippe.

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The relief is in a sunken panel. Malthake is seated and wears chiton and himation. She shakes hands with Nikippe, her daughter, also wearing chiton and himation. A third female figure, presumably another relative, stands between them.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.407a; Scholl 1996 no.147.

F 135 Stele of Mania and worthy Getas

Present whereabouts unknown.

Once in a private house in Athens.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μανία. Γέτας χρηστός (*IG II² 12035a*).

Mania. Worthy Getas.

Relief: Getas is seated and shakes hands with Mania. They were perhaps husband and wife, but the stele is very damaged and much of the former detail is lost.

Bibliography: *CAT* 215.

F 136 Stele of Hieroklea daughter of Manos

The French School at Athens S.5.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.528, W 0.265.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ΙΕΡΟΚΛΕΑ ΜΑΝΟΥ (*CAT* 2.489).

Hierokleia daughter of Manos.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a rounded finial. The relief is in a sunken panel. Hierokleia stands wearing a sleeved chiton. She shakes hands with another female figure, possibly her mother, who wears a sleeved chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.489; Scholl 1996: no.39.

F 137 Lekythos of Sikelia

Agora I 6603.

Found in the Agora, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.15, 0.19.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ΣΙΚΕΛΙΑ (*SEG* 21.1068).

Sikelia.

Relief: Only the part of the body of the Lekythos on which the figures were carved survives. Sikelia is seated on a couch and leans against a pillow. She wears a sleeved chiton and mantle. Another woman stands close to Sikelia and wears chiton and himation. The two may have been sisters.

Bibliography: Merritt 1963: 51; Bradeen 1974: no.975; *CAT* 2.493; Grossman 2013: no. 170, plate 53.

F 138 Stele of Dexandrides and his son Kallistratos, an *isotelês*

Leiden, Rijksmuseum 1878.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 1.045, W 0.645.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Δεξανδρίδης Νειανδρέως : Καλλίστρατος Δεξανδρίδο[υ].

ἰσοτελής (*IG II² 7864* – Clairmont has ἰσοτελής twice).

Dexandrides, son of Neiandres. Kallistratos, son of Dexandrides, *isotelês*.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Dexandrides is seated and wears a mantle over his shoulders, left upper arm, back and lower body. He shakes hands with his son Kallistratos, who wears a himation over his left shoulder and lower body and holds a strigil.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.461; Bergmann 1997: no.491, plate 85, 2.4; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.502; Mack 2015: 57 n123.

F 139 Stele of Nurse Melitta, daughter of *isotelês* Apollodoros

British Museum 1909.2-21.1

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.94, W 0.91.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ἀπολλοδώρου

ἰσοτελοῦ θυγάτηρ

Μέλιττα.

τίτθῃ.

ἐνθάδε τὴν χρηστὴν τίτθην κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτ-

ει | Ἴπποστράτης· καὶ νῦν ποθεῖ σε. | καὶ ζῶσαν σ' ἐφίλ-

σων, τίτθῃ, καὶ νῦν σ' ἔτι τιμῶ | οὔσαν καὶ κατὰ γῆς

καὶ τιμήσω σε ἄχρι ἂν ζῶ· | οἶδα δὲ σοὶ ὅτι καὶ κατὰ γ-

ῆς, εἴπερ χρηστοῖς γέρας ἐστίν, | πρώτει σοὶ τιμ-

αί, τίτθῃ, παρὰ Φερσεφόνει Πλούτωνί τε κεῖνται (*IG* II² 7873).

Isotelês Apollodoros' daughter,

Melitta.

Nurse.

Here the earth conceals the loyal nurse of Hippostrate; she now longs for you.

While you lived I loved you, nurse, and still now I honour you

Even as you are under the earth, and I will honour you as long as I live.

I know that for your part, even beneath the earth,

If there is a reward for the good,

Honours lie in store for you first, in the realm of Persephone and Pluto

(Translation from MacLachlan 2012: 55-56).

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is in a sunken panel. Nurse Melitta is seated and wears a short-sleeved chiton and himation. Her feet rest on a footstool. She held something in her right hand, possible a bird. In front of Melitta stands a girl wearing a sleeveless chiton and mantle. She also held a possible bird in her right hand. The stele originally honoured nurse Melitta, daughter of *isotelês* Apollodoros, in the fourth century BC, but was reused in the second century to honour a girl called Melitta.

Bibliography: Clairmont 1970: no. 25, plate 12; *CAT* 1.969; Scholl 1996: no.442; Bergemann 1997: no.419; Beaumont 2012: 56-57, figure 3.10, Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.506; Mack 2015: 57 fn123; MacLachlan 2012: 55-56.

F 140 Stele of worthy Dexippos and worthy Diaulos

Agora I 3501.

Found in the agora.

Dimensions: H 0.88, W 0.31.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Δέξιππος, Δίαυλος

χρηστοί (*IG* II² 11060).

Dexippos, Diaulos, worthy ones.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial. The relief is in a sunken panel.

Dexippos is seated on a chair. He wears a himation and rests his feet on a footstool.

Diaulos stands facing Dexippos and supports himself with a stick.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.492; Scholl 1996: no.9; Bergemann 1997: no.187; Grossman 2013: no.73, plate 22.

F 141 Stele of worthy [Ka]llias

EM 339.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.28, W 0.21.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: [Ka]λλίας
[χρη]στός (*IG II² 11762*).
Worthy [Ka]llias.

Relief: The stele is fragmentary and only [Ka]llias' upper body survives. Thought to have been carved by the same sculptor as **F 132**.

Bibliography: *CAT* 1.463.

F 142 Stele of worthy Mikias

Agora I 1653.

Found in the agora.

Dimensions: H 0.265, W 0.275.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μικίας χρηστ[ός] (*IG II² 12133*).
Worthy Mikias.

Relief: The relief is in a sunken panel. A woman is seated and wears chiton and himation. She shakes hands with a younger woman who also wears a chiton and himation. Behind the younger woman stands Mikias, a elderly bearded man wearing a himation. The women may have been Mikias' wife and daughter.

Bibliography: Bradeen 1974: no.918; *CAT* 3.482; Scholl 1996: no.7; Grossman 2013: no.28.

F 143 Stele of Moschos, Herakleides and Worthy Biounis

Mora, Dalecarlia, Sweden, the Collection of Anders Zorn (1860-1920).

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.46, W 0.33.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: ΜΟΣΧΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΕΣ ΙΩΝΟΣΥΠΙ [
ΣΤΗΛΙΩΤΕΙΔΑ ΟΝΕΜΩΝΗ
ΒΙΟΥΝ [Ι] Σ ΧΡΗΣΤΗ (*Clairmont 4.446*).
Moschos, Herakleides, Ionosup[-]
Stelioteida Onemone
Worthy Bioun[i]s.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is in a sunken panel. Moschos, a bearded elderly man, is seated on a chair. He wears a himation. He shakes hands with a young woman, possibly his daughter, who wears chiton, peplos and himation. Moschos' daughter is followed by a servant-girl wearing an long-sleeved chiton and carrying a small box. Herakleides stands between Moschos and his daughter and was possibly Moschos' brother.

Bibliography: *CAT* 4.446.

F 144 Stele of worthy Phengos

Present whereabouts unknown.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.51, W 0.25.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Φένγος
χρηστή (*IG II² 12885*).
Worthy Phengos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The relief is in a sunken panel. Phengos is seated on a chair and wears a chiton and himation. She shakes hands with a man who was likely her husband.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.490b.

F 145 Stele of worthy (Ch)rysis

Tatoi Royal Greek Collection.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.32, W 0.30.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Ψυσις χρηστή,
Ἀρχεστράτης
θυγάτηρ (*IG II² 12575*).
Worthy (Ch)rysis,
Daughter of Archestrates.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial. The relief is in a sunken panel. (Ch)rysis stands alone, her body completely enveloped in her mantle. The metronymic suggests she could have been the daughter of a hetaira and perhaps a hetaira herself.

Bibliography *CAT* 1.416; Foley 2003: 136 fn18.

F 146 Stele of a worthy nurse

Agora I 6508.

Found in the agora.

Dimensions: H 0.305, W 0.295.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Τίτθη χρηστή (*Kosmopoulou* 2001: 310, N9)
Worthy nurse.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. The nurse is seated on a chair and wears a chiton and himation. She reaches out her right arm to the girl who stands in front of her. The girl wears a chiton.

Bibliography: Bradeen 1974: no.1048; Scholl 1996: no.11; *CAT* 1.949;
Kosmopoulou 2001: 310, N9; Beaumont 2012: fn307; Grossman 2013: no.8, plate 3.

F 147 Stele of a worthy nurse (Figure 4.37)

NM 1020.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Τίτθη
χρηστή (*IG II² 12815*).
Worthy nurse.

Relief: The relief is in a sunken panel. The nurse is seated at the end of a couch. She wears a chiton and himation. A man, likely her husband, reclines on the couch, his lower body covered by a himation. There is a table in front of the couch.
Bibliography: Scholl 1996 no.148; Kosmopoulou 2001: 311, N12; Closterman 2015: p3-4 figure 1.3.

F 148 Stele of nurse Choirine

NM 1021.

Found near the church of Hagios Loukas in Patissia.

Dimensions: H 1.28, W 0.42.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Χοιρίνη
τίτθῃ (IG II² 13065).
Choirine, nurse.

Relief: The stele is crowned by an anthemion. The relief is in a sunken panel. Nurse Choirine is seated and wears a chiton and mantle. She shakes hands with a woman wearing a sleeved chiton and mantle, the mantle drawn over the back of her head. She is accompanied by an elderly man wearing a mantle. The couple may have been choirine's employers or owners.

Bibliography: *CAT* 3.429a; Scholl 1996: no.149; Bäbler 1998: no.143; Kosmopoulou 2001: 309, N8; MacLachlan 2012: 76.

F 149 Lekythos of Moschion, son of Stratokleies, and his nurse

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found near Homonia Square, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.61.

Date: 350-300 BC.

Inscription: Μοσχίων Στρατοκλείους. Τίτθῃ (IG II² 12177).
Moschion son Stratokleies. Nurse.

Relief: The neck and foot of the lekythos are missing. A squire wearing an exomis holds a shield and sword. Moschion wears a knee-length chiton, cuirass, a chlamys, and an Attic helmet, and holds a spear in his left hand. Moschion shakes hands with his nurse, an elderly woman who wears a chiton and himation.

Bibliography: *CAT* 2.936; Bäbler 1998: 133.

F 150 Pair of Scythian Archer Statues (Figure 4.38)

NM 823-824.

Found in the Dipylon cemetery, Athens.

Dimensions: 823 H 0.74, 824 H 0.70.

No Inscription.

Statues: Both statues are kneeling and wear long trousers, short, belted mantles with long sleeves. The heads of both statues are missing but the remains of Scythian caps can be seen on both statues. Each of the Scythians carries a gorytos. The statues belong to a *peribolos* in the Kerameikos.

Bibliography: Kurtz and Boardman 1971: 133; Garland 1982: A4; *CAT* 20a-b; Bergemann 1997: A4.

F 151 Stele of Nikarete daughter of Telexene of Thespieae

Halle, Robertunum 596.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.20, W 0.28.

Date: First half of the fourth century BC.

Inscription: Νικαρέτη Τηλεξένης Θεσπική.

Τηλεξένη Θεσπική (Peek II 68).

Nikarete daughter of Telexene of Thespieae.

Telexene of Thespieae.

Relief: The stele is fragmentary and is crowned by a triangular finial. The figures were painted. Telexene was seated and Nikarete stood. The metronymic suggests mother and daughter may have been hetairai.

Bibliography: *CAT* 153; *FRA* 2340 + 2343; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.74.

F 152 Stele of Leon of Sinope

NM 720.

Found in Attica.

Dimensions: H 0.53, W 0.38.

Date: First half of the fourth century BC.

Inscription: Λέων

Σινωπέυς (*IG* II² 10334/5)

Leon of Sinope.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a horizontal moulding, with the inscription directly below it, followed by two rosettes. The relief is in a sunken panel. The head upper body of a lion is preserved.

Bibliography: Vermeule 1972: 55; *CAT* 1; *FRA* 6835; Scholl 1996: no.77; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.418.

F 153 Stele of Panphile of Sinope

NM 1917.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.68, W 0.28.

Date: First half of the fourth century BC.

Inscription: [Πα]νφίλη Πανφίλου

[Σ]ινωπέως (*IG* II² 10345).

[Pa]nphile daughter of Panphilos of Sinope.

Relief: The relief is in a sunken panel. Panphile is seated. In front of her stands a servant-girl holding a box.

Bibliography: *CAT* 284; *FRA* 6855 + 6866; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no. 400.

F 154 Stele of Konna of Herakleia

NM 2760.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.63, W 0.33.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Κόννα Ἄττου Ἡρακλεώτου

θυγάτηρ (*IG* II² 8699)

Konna daughter of Attos of Herakleia.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a rounded finial. The lower half of the stele is missing. Only the upper bodies of a seated female figure, Konna, and a standing male figure, Attos, survive.

Bibliography: Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.430.

F 155 Stele of Lykinos of Herakleia

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found in Karava, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.24, W 0.26.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Λυκῖνος Ἡρακλεώτης (*IG II² 8717*).

Lykinos of Herakleia.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. A female figure is seated on a chair and wears chiton and himation. She shakes hands with Lykinos who wears a himation. She was probably Lykinos' wife.

Bibliography: *CAT* 107; Ginesti-Rosell 2012 no.428.

F 156 Lekythos of Archo, Hediste and Kritias of Hephaistia

NM Apothiki 9.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.42.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Ἀρχὼ : Δημητρίο.

Κριτίας

ἐξ Ἡφαιστίας.

Ἡδίστη Κριτίου : θυγάτηρ

ἐξ Ἡφαιστίας (*IG II² 8826*).

Archo daughter of Demetrios.

Kritias from Hephaistia.

Hediste daughter of Kritias from Hephaistia.

Relief: Only the body of the lekythos is preserved. Archo is not depicted. Kritias is seated on a chair and supports himself with a stick. He shakes hands with his daughter Hediste.

Bibliography: *CAT* 280; *FRA* 2299 + 2300.

F 157 Stele of Korypho of Thespieae

Eleusis Museum.

Found at Eleusis.

Dimensions: H 0.64, W 0.40.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: ΚΟΡΥΦΩ ΘΕΣΠΙΑΚΑ

Korypho of Thespieae (Clairmont *CAT* 437).

Relief: The stele is crowned by anthemion. The relief is in a sunken panel but only the heads of the figures survive. Korypho is seated and there is a standing male figure. They were probably husband and wife.

Bibliography: *CAT* 347; *FRA* 2339.

F 158 Stele of a woman from Calchedonia and Philostratos

NM 2726.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 1.18, W 0.36.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Κ[.]#⁷ — —

Καλχ[ηδ]ον[ία].

duae rosae

Φιλόστρατος. (*IG* II² 8951).

Κ[-----] of Calchedonia

Philostratos.

Relief: The top of the stele is missing. The woman from Calchedonia is seated and shakes hands with Philostratos.

Bibliography: *CAT* 281; *FRA* 2657; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.378.

F 159 Stele of [----]kritos of Corinth

PM (inv. no. unknown).

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: . c.5 . κρίτου Κορινθί[α]. (*IG* II² 9081)

----kritos of Corinth.

Relief: A standing male figure and a seated female figure shake hands.

Bibliography: *CAT* 371 (supplementary volume); *FRA* 3008.

F 160 Stele of Pythokrate of Laodicea

NM 2095.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Πυθοκράτη

Ῥα ου

Λαοδ[ικέ]ω[ς] (*IG* II² 9187a)

Pythokrate daughter of Ra----os of Laodicea.

Relief: Pythokrate is seated and shakes hands with a standing male figure, possibly her husband.

Bibliography: *CAT* 367 (supplementary volume); *FRA* 3287 + 3290.

F 161 Stele for one or two persons from Macedonia

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found at Laurion.

Dimensions: H 0.24, W 0.28.

Inscription: — — γυ . . . Μακεδὼν Ἀγρ[ιεύς] (*IG* II² 9273).

Gy... of Macedonia Agr[ianes].

Relief: The stele is very fragmentary and only the head of a female figure survives.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 128, no.52, 135; *CAT* 233; Ginesti-Rosell 2012 no.154.

F 162 Stele of Aristomache and Diogeites, wife and daughter of *proxenos* of Megara

NM 1852.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.89, W 0.41.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Ἀριστομάχη Πολυκρατίς
Διογείτου Διογείτου
Μεγαρέως Μεγαρέως
προξένου προξένου
γυνή. θυγάτηρ (*IG II² 9304*).

Aristomache, wife of Diogeites *proxenos* of Megara.

Polykratis, daughter of Diogeites *proxenos* of Megara.

Relief: The stele is crowned by anthemion. Aristomache is seated and shakes hands with Polykraris.

Bibliography: *CAT* 282; *FRA* 3587 + 3592 + 3639; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.56; Mack 2015: 57 fn123.

F 163 Stele of two men from Megara

Agora I 2473.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: —έας : Μεγαρέες : Ὀνόμαστος (*IG I² 934*).

--eas of Megara. Onomastos.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. One man is seated and the other is standing. The two were possibly brothers.

Bibliography: *CAT* 181; *FRA* 3637 + 3655; Grossman 2013: no.77, plate 23.

F 164 Stele of [----]on, Eutyichis and worthy Tibeios from Rhodes

Present whereabouts unknown.

Probably from the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.30, W 0.35.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: in lapide summo:

— — ων : Ῥόδ[ιος].

supra anaglyphum:

Εὐτυχίς. Τίβειος

χρηστός.

----on of Rhodes.

Eutyichis. Worthy Tibeios.

Relief: The stele is fragmentary. The relief is in a sunken panel. Eutyichis stands while the [----]on is seated. Tibeios stands behind him. Clairmont takes [----]on and Eutyichis to be husband and wife and Tibeios their son, but this does not explain the use of the adjective *chrestos*. Perhaps they were husband, wife and slave, or perhaps the name Tibeios does not relate to the standing male figure.

Bibliography: *CAT* 111; *FRA* 6240; Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.289.

F 165 Stele of Aigyp(tia)

Present whereabouts unknown.

Provenance unknown, but once on the Athenian art market.

Dimensions: H 0.53, W 0.21.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: ΑΙΓΥΠΙ[ΤΙΑ] (Clairmont 121).

Aigyp[tia].

Relief: The stele is a fragmentary naiskos-type stele. Only the figure of a servant-girl holding a box survives. Aigyp(tia) was presumably seated in the missing portion of the stele.

Bibliography: Fragiadakis 1986: 14, 4; *CAT* 121.

F 166 Stele of Theoxene

NM inv. no. unknown.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.47, W 0.43.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Θεοξέν[η] (*IG II²* 11646a).

Theoxen[e].

Relief: The stele is crowned by a rounded finial. Only the heads of two female figures, one standing and one sitting, survive, one of who must be Theoxene.

Bibliography: *CAT* 266.

F 167 Lekythos of worthy nurse Theoxene

NM 1845.

Said to be from Mesogaia.

Dimensions: H 0.40.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Θεοξένη τίτθη χρηστή (*IG II²* 11647).

Worthy nurse Theoxene.

Relief: Only the body of the lekythos survives. Theoxene is seated and shakes hands with a bearded male figure. He could be her husband or perhaps her owner or employer as is suggested for nurse Choirine (**F 148**).

Bibliography: *CAT* 306; Bäbler 1998: 132; MacLachlan 2012: 76; Sommerstein 2014: 128.

F 168 Stele of Thraitta

Present whereabouts unknown.

Possibly from Markopoulos.

Dimensions: H 0.28, W 0.275.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Θραϊττα (*MDAI* 67 (1942) 125,270).

Thraitta.

Relief: The stele is very fragmentary. Thraitta is seated and possibly holds a distaff.

Bibliography: *CAT* 268.

F 169 Stele of Timon, Thraitta and Herpyllis

NM 2630 (now in the Benaki Museum)

Probably found in Keratea, Athens.

Dimensions: H 1.20, W 0.77.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Τίμων. Θραΐτα. Ἑρπυλλίς (*IG II² 12808*).

Timon. Thraitta. Herpyllis.

Relief: The stele is a naiskos-type stele. Herpyllis is seated and faces Timon.

Between them in the background are Thraitta and a servant-girl holding a box.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 137, no.21 and 139, no.49; *CAT* 330; Bäbler 1998: 118.

F 170 Stele of Aspasia and Mania

Present whereabouts unknown.

Possibly from Gaitana to north-west of Athens.

Dimensions unknown.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Ἀσπασία Μανίας (*IG II² 10892*).

Aspasia daughter of Mania.

Relief: The stele is crowned by a pediment. Two female figures, one standing and one sitting, are depicted. They are mother and daughter Mania and Aspasia.

Bibliography: *CAT* 216; Odgen 1996: 95-96; Foley 2003: 136 fn18; McClure 2003: 77.

F 171 Stele of Skiapos

Present whereabouts unknown.

Found at Laurion.

Dimensions: H 0.20, W 0.25.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Σκιάπος (*IG II² 12618*).

Skiapos.

Relief: Skiapos is shown in battle, his sword drawn fighting against an opponent, probably a reflection of how he died.

Bibliography: Lauffer 1979: 127, no.40, 135; *CAT* 327; Bäbler 1998: 10.

F 172 Stele of Isotelês Sparton

NM 3518.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.50, W 0.48.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Σπάρτων
ἰσοτελής (*IG II² 7877*).

Sparton, *isotelês*.

Relief: The relief is in a sunken panel. Sparton is shown reclining on a couch, his lower body draped in a mantle, accompanied by his wife who sits at the foot of the couch. She has her mantle pulled over the back of her head. In front of the couch is a table with food.

Bibliography: Ginesti-Rosell 2012: no.505; Closterman 2015: p3, figure 1.2, p11.

F 173 Stele of worthy Melita

PM 1260.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.83, W 0.33.

Date: Fourth century BC.

Inscription: Μελίτα χρηστή (*IG II² 12066*).

Worthy Melita.

Relief: The stele is crowned with a semicircular finial. Melita was painted on to the stele rather than carved and little survives to describe how she was depicted.

Bibliography: *CAT* 115.

Appendix II: Votive Reliefs Depicting Slaves

VR 1 Asklepios and Worshippers

NM 1407.

Found at Asklepieion, Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.21, W 0.30.

Date: 400-350 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The top left corner of the relief is missing. To the right is a large snake. In front of the snake stands Asklepios. A family of worshippers approach him from the left. A boy – a slave? – leads a ram to an altar in front of Asklepios. A male worshipper, a female worshipper, and their child follow the boy with the ram. Behind them follows a possible servant girl. Her head occupied the missing top left corner of the relief and so it is not possible to say if she was characterised as a slave by carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Kaltsas 2002: 210, no.426, fig.426.

VR 2 Worshippers

NM 1336.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.68, W 0.33.

Date: c.384/3 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only a portion of the left side of the relief survives, showing a female worshipper in a long chiton followed by smaller female worshipper carrying a child (a servant girl?).

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 107-108, no.48, plate XII.

VR 3 Worshippers

British Museum 715.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.42, W 0.25.

Date: c.375/4 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only a portion of the left side of the relief survives, showing a male worshipper wearing a himation, followed by a female worshipper in long chiton and himation. Behind her, overlapping the anta, is a servant girl wearing a long chiton and himation and carrying a *kiste* on her head. In front of the adults are a girl and boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 148-150, no.82, plate XVII.

VR 4 Worshippers

AM 2489 + 2521.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.26, W 0.25, Th 0.02.

Date: c.355/4 BC

No Inscription.

Relief: Only a portion of the right side of the relief survives, showing a male worshipper (only his head and shoulders preserved), followed by a female

worshipper in himation (preserved to hips). Behind her and overlapping the anta is a servant girl (also preserved to hips) carrying a *kiste* on her head.
Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 194-195, no.112, plate XXIV.

VR 5 Zeus Mellichios / Philios and Worshippers (Figure 5.2)

NM 1408.

Found either in Athens or the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.25, W 0.40, Th unknown

Date: c.350 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Zeus Mellichios (or Philios) sits on a throne on the left side of the relief. A female worshipper kneels before him. Following behind her are another woman, a boy at her side, a girl behind him and behind her another boy – a slave? – who brings a ram for sacrifice and carries a basket. At the back of the group, overlapping the anta, is a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 225-226, no.134, plate XXX; Kaltsas 2002: 220, no.457, fig.457.

VR 6 Worshippers

NM 1384.

Found at Rhamnous.

Dimensions: H 0.53, W 0.50, Th unknown.

Date: c.350 BC.

Inscription: Βοίδιον Ἴπποκράτης Εὐαγγλος Αἰσχύλος (IG II² 4426).

Boidion, Hippokrates, Evanglos, Aischylos.

Relief: Only the right portion of the relief survives, preserving the worshippers. A deity or deities were presumably depicted in the missing left portion. The first worshipper to approach the missing deity / deities is a boy – a slave boy? – carrying a basket bearing offerings. He is followed by a male worshipper, a female worshipper, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. Three children cluster around the servant girl's legs. In the background is a rectangular block on a tall pedestal, perhaps referencing the relief itself.

Bibliography: Kaltsas 2002: 227, no.476, fig.476.

VR 7 Worshippers

Agora S 1099.

Found on north slope of Areopagus southwest of Eleusinion.

Dimensions: P.H 0.255, P.W 0.34, Th 0.155.

Date: c.350 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only a portion of the right side of the relief survives, preserving the upper bodies, but not the heads, of three worshippers. The first worshipper appears to be a man, followed by two women, perhaps his wife and daughter. In front of the women is a small male figure – a slave boy? – leaning forward to control a now missing animal.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 116, no.144, plate 42.

VR 8 Worshippers

Agora S 321.

Found between Altar of the Twelve Gods and Temple of Ares, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.31, P.W 0.275, Th 0.095.

Date: c.350 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom right corner of the relief is preserved. Three adult worshippers face left. All are missing their heads. The first is worshipper is male, followed by two female worshippers, the second of these women being shorter, suggesting she was a slave. A child stands in front of each of the adult figures. The slave woman was perhaps the family's nurse.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 119, no.153, plate 45.

VR 9 Hero, Goddess and Worshippers

NM 1410.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.27, W 0.34, Th unknown.

Date: c.337/6 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A hero wearing a short, belted chiton and chlamys holds the reins of a horse and a phiale, into which a goddess pours wine from an oinochoe. The goddess wears a long chiton and shorter himation. Behind her are five worshippers; a man, a woman and, overlapping the anta, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. In front of the adult figures are a girl and a boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 254-256, no.146, plate XXXIV.

VR 10 Athena and Worshippers

AM 2515, 2413 + 3003.

Found on Acropolis, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.55, W 0.39, Th 0.13.

Date: c.332 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief survives in three joining fragments, the middle of the relief missing. Athena stands to the right wearing chiton, Athenian helmet and aegis. She cradles her spear in her left arm. Her right arm is bent at the elbow but the hand is missing. In front of Athena is altar. On the left side of the relief is preserved the heads of a youth and a girl. Slightly overlapping the left anta is a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 291-293, no.170, plate XXXIX.

VR 11 Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (Figure 5.3)

NM 1331.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.65, W 0.99, Th 0.13.

Date: c.332 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief is made up of three fragments. Hygieia stands behind Asklepios who stands to the left of a small square altar in the centre of the relief. A boy – a slave? – is behind the altar, bringing a bull – not preserved – for sacrifice. On the right side of the altar is a line of worshippers: two men in himatia, a woman in a long

chiton and himation – heads of all three figures missing – and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 306-309, no.181, plate XL; Kaltsas 2002: 224, no.468.

VR 12 Banquet Scene

Cassel C77

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.45, W 0.63, Th 0.085.

Date: c.332 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A nude youth stands in front of the right anta and probably held an oinochoe now missing. Two gods recline on a couch and a goddess in long chiton and himation sits on a stool by their feet. In front of the gods is a table laden with fruit. Seven worshippers are arranged in two lines behind the goddess. Two men, a woman, a servant girl overlapping the anta and carrying a *kiste* on her head form one line. In front of them are three children – a boy, a girl and another boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 316-319, no.185, plate XLI.

VR 13 Banquet Scene

NM (inv. no. unknown).

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: unknown.

Date: c.332 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only a portion of the left side of the relief is preserved. A seated goddess wearing a himation is preserved from the chest down. Behind her are six worshippers in two lines. In the back line are a man, two women and lastly, overlapping the anta, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. In the front line are a boy and a girl.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 335-336, no.195, plate XLIII.

VR 14 Artemis and Worshippers (Figure 5.4)

Brauron Museum 1151.

Found at Brauron.

Dimensions: H 0.57, W unknown, Th 0.12.

Date: c.332/0 BC.

Inscription: ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ ΕΥΞΑΜΕΝΗ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΙΚΗ
ΑΝΤΙΦΑΤΟΥΣ ΘΟΡΑΙΕΩΣ ΓΥΝΗ (*SEG* 52.170).

Aristonike, wife of Antiphates of the deme of Thorai, prayed and dedicated [this] to Artemis.

Relief: Artemis stands to the right of the relief, a deer standing behind her. Before Artemis is a small square altar. On the other side of the altar a boy – a slave? – leads a bull to be sacrificed. A further 13 worshippers follow in two lines. In one line are a man, two women, a man, a woman, two men, a woman holding a child – a servant girl? – and finally a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. Three children – two girls and a boy – form the second line in front of the adults.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 352-355, no.207, plate XLVI; Ridgway 1997: 201; van Straten 2000: 217; Platt 2015: 491-492, fig. 33.1.

VR 15 Artemis, Leto, Apollo and Worshippers

Brauron Museum.

Found at Brauron.

Dimensions: H 0.69, W 1.15, Th 0.135.

Date: c.332/1 BC.

Inscription: ΠΕΡΣΙΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ.

Persis dedicated [this] to Artemis.

Relief: To the right of a small square altar stands Artemis holding a bundle of torches. Behind her sits Leto, behind whom stands Apollo. Behind the altar stands a youth bringing a bull for sacrifice. On the left of the altar are eight worshippers; a man, two women, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two girls and two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 360-363, no.211, plate XLVII.

VR 16 Banquet Scene

AM 3013.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.46, W 0.55, Th 0.13.

Date: c.332/0 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief survives in two parts. A god reclining on a couch in the middle of the relief is largely missing. To the right of the couch are six worshippers; a girl, a man, two women, and two boys. To the left of the couch, a boy leads a ram to sacrifice, followed by eight worshippers: a man, a woman, a man, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and four children – all appear to be boys – in front of the adults.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 371-374, no.219A-B, plate XLIX.

VR 17 Worshippers

NM inv. no. unknown.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions unknown (too fragmentary).

Date: c.332/0 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only part of the left anta, the head a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and the head of a female worshipper survive.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 375, no.220, plate XLIX.

VR 18 Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers (Figure 5.5)

NM 1333.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.83, W 1.30, Th unknown.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: To the left Asklepios, only his legs preserved, is seated. Next to him stands Hygieia, supporting her resting her left hand on a tree. A boy leads a ram to an altar in front of the two deities. Six worshippers follow behind him; a man, a woman, a man, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adult worshippers, a girl and a boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 393-396, no.232, plate LI; Kaltsas 2002: 226: no.475, fig.475.

VR 19 Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers

Berlin Staatliche Museum C.685.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.365, W 0.535, Th 0.11.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: On the left side of the relief Hygieia leans against the back of a throne.

Asklepios sits on the throne, a snake coiled underneath it. Seven worshippers approach the two deities; a man, a woman and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, four children – a boy, a girl and two more boys – in front of the adults.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 397-400, no.234, plate LII.

VR 20 Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers

NM 1345.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.49, W 0.62, Th unknown.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Asklepios and Hygieia stand on the left side of the relief, approached by eight worshippers; the first of unknown sex, followed by three men, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, a woman, and two boys in front of the woman.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 409-412, no.241, plate LIII; Kaltsas 2002: 212, no.432, fig.432.

VR 21 Banquet Scene

Private Collection.

Found at Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.26, W unknown, Th unknown.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: To the right a nude youth stands bearing an *oinochoe*. A god reclines on a couch, a goddess sat by his feet. Table laden with fruits is positioned in front of them, a snake coiled underneath it. Behind the goddess is an altar to which a boy brings a ram for sacrifice. An adult male worshipper and a servant boy dressed in a knee-length chiton follow the boy with the ram. There is a horse's head above the worshippers.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 447-449, no.266, plate LVII.

VR 22 Asklepios, Hygieia, Epione and Worshippers

NM 1377.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: Temple H 0.66, W 0.95, Th 0.23 / Plaque H 0.50, W 0.95, Th 0.105.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: On the left of the relief Asklepios and Hygieia stand while Epione sits on a stool, under which is a goose. A nude boy leads a pig for sacrifice, followed by 11 more worshippers; a man, a woman, a man, two women, two men, a woman, a

servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, a boy and a girl. The scene is framed in a temple. On the left wall of this temple structure stands Hekate and on the right wall is herm. The left wall is detached from the rest of the structure.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 456-460, no.270A-B (A = left wall), plate LVIII; Kaltsas 2002: 215, no.442, fig.442.

VR 23 Worshippers

Derby County Museum and Art Gallery.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.38, W 0.25, Th 0.12.

Date: c.330 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the right side of the relief survives, preserving a female worshipper and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 461-462, no.271, plate LVIII.

VR 24 Worshippers

Ashmolean M.88.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.59, W 0.62, Th 0.11.

Date: c.330 BC

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the right portion of the relief survives, in which the worshippers are preserved. They process towards the missing deity in the following order; a boy carrying a basket, a woman, a man, four women, a boy clinging to the second woman, and a servant girl – who stands overlapping the anta - carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 464-466, no.274, plate LIX.

VR 25 Worshippers

AM 2411 + 2561.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.43, W 0.48, Th 0.14.

Date: c.330/28 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the right side of the relief survives, preserving worshippers; a woman, a man, a woman, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 483-484, no.289, plate LXI.

VR 26 Demeter and Worshippers

Eleusis Museum 16.

Found at Eleusis (?).

Dimensions: H 0.33, W unknown, Th 0.06.

Date: c.329/8 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Demeter is seated on a rock in the right half of the relief. Her head is missing. She is approached by five worshippers; two men, a woman, a man, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 486-488, no.291, plate LXII.

VR 27 Banquet Scene

NM 3873.

Found on Vyronos Street, Makriyanni, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.335, W 0.375, Th unknown.

Date: 325-300 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Overlapping the right anta is a nude youth holding a bowl. A god reclines on a couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits on the foot of the couch. There is a table in front of the couch with a snake coiled under it. Behind the goddess a boy leads a pig to an altar, followed by six other worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adult worshippers, three children, one chasing a goose. Above the worshippers is a horse's head.

Bibliography: Kaltsas 2002: 231, no.487, fig.487; Dillon 2003: 35.

VR 28 Worshippers

NM 2401.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.37, W unknown, Th unknown.

Date: c.323/2 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the lower right portion of the relief survives, preserving the worshippers. A boy leads a ram to an altar. He is followed by seven more worshippers; a man, a woman, a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 564-567, no.338, plate LXXI.

VR 29 Goddess and Worshippers

Ashmolean M.203.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.66, W 0.47, Th 0.17.

Date: c.323/2 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief survives. At the right, broken edge of the relief, the arm of a goddess survives. She may have been part of a banquet scene. The rest of the surviving portion of the relief a boy leading a pig and eight other worshippers are preserved; a man, two women, a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, a boy and a girl.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 576-578, no.345, plate LXXII.

VR 30 Banquet Scene

NM 2927.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.30, W 0.20, Th unknown.

Date: c.323/2 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief survives, preserving only the seated goddess and worshippers. Processing behind the goddess are boy leading a pig, a man, two women, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two girls.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 584-586, no.350, plate LXXIII.

VR 31 Banquet Scene

NM 1537.

Found at Varvakeion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.23, W 0.17, Th unknown.

Date: c.323/2 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief survives. The right half that must have depicted a reclining god is missing. At the right, broken edge of the relief stands a naked youth with a volute krater. Behind him are five worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, a boy and a girl. Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 590-591, no.353, plate LXXIII.

VR 32 Artemis and Worshippers

Brauron Museum inv. no. unknown.

Found at Brauron.

Dimensions: H 0.655, W 0.85, Th 0.13.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Artemis is sat to the left, a deer at her side. She is approached a boy leading another deer. Another nine worshippers follow the boy; a boy, a woman, four men, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* between the third and four man, and, in front of the adults, a girl and a boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 509-512, no.309, plate LXV.

VR 33 Worshippers

Eleusis Museum (inv. no. unknown).

Found at Eleusis (?).

Dimensions: H 0.36, W 0.32, Th 0.115.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the lower right portion of the relief survives. Six worshippers survive; three men, a girl in front of the first, a woman, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. The heads of the all the adult worshippers, excluding the servant girl who is shorter than the others, are missing.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 536-538, no.322, plate LXVIII.

VR 34 Zeus and Worshippers

NM 2681.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.34, W 0.44, Th unknown.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The left edge of the relief is damaged and so Zeus is only partially preserved. He is seated on a throne and holds a sceptre. A boy leading a ram and six other worshippers approach the enthroned deity. Following the boy are three men, a woman, a child in front of her, and lastly, overlapping the anta, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 540-543, no.324, plate LXVIII.

VR 35 Worshippers, possible banquet scene

AM 2451.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: A: H 0.31, W 0.39, Th 0.11; B: H 0.31, W 0.39, Th 0.11.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief survives in two pieces, right (A) and left (B). A – a boy leading a ram approaches an altar followed by six other worshippers; a man, two women, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on head, *kiste* now missing, and, in front of the adults, two boys. B – only the legs of a couch and, to the left of it, the legs of a male worshipper survive.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 543-545, no.325A-B, plate LXVIII.

VR 36 Worshippers

NM 1429.

Found at Asklepieion, Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.555, W 0.50, Th 0.13.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the right portion of the relief depicting worshippers survives. A boy leads an ox to an altar followed by nine more worshippers in three lines. At the back is a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head. In the line in front of her are a man, a woman and three men. In front of them are a girl and two women.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 546-549, no.326, plate LXIX; Kaltsas 2002: 214, no.437, fig.437.

VR 37 Asklepios and Worshippers

Cassel C.75

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.285, W 0.33, Th 0.09.

Date: c.318/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Asklepios sits on a stool facing to the left. Five worshippers approach him from behind; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, a boy and a girl.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 552-554, no.329, plate LXIX.

VR 38 Demeter, Kore and Worshippers

NM 1016.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.36, W 0.52, Th unknown.

Date: c.313-306 BC.

No inscription.

Relief: Demeter is seated on a throne to the left. Kore stands before her holding a burning torch in each hand. The two goddesses are approached by a boy leading a pig to an altar and seven more worshippers; a woman, a man, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two girls and two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 614-617, no.369, plate LXXVIII.

VR 39 Banquet Scene

Louvre 747.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.38, W 0.53, Th unknown.

Date: c.313-306 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A nude youth stands to the right of the couch holding an *oinochoe*. A god reclines on the couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch, a table bearing fruits in front of her. Seven worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, two women, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of adults, a boy and two girls. Above the worshippers' heads is a horse's head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 637-640, no.387, plate LXXX.

VR 40 Banquet Scene

Monasteraki Museum inv. no. unknown.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.34, W 0.20, Th 0.095.

Date: c.313-306 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief survives, preserving a goddess seated on the end of a couch and the worshippers. A boy leading a pig approaches the goddess from behind, followed by six more worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, a boy, a girl, and a boy. Above the worshippers is a horse's head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 642-644, no.389, plate LXXXI.

VR 41 Banquet Scene

NM 1539.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.23, W 0.33, Th unknown.

Date: c.308/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A nude youth stands overlapping the right anta. A god holding up a rhyton reclines on a couch. A goddess sits by his feet, a table with fruits in front of the pair. Behind the goddess a boy leads a pig to an altar, followed by four worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the woman, a boy.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 664-666, no.399, plate LXXXII.

VR 42 Worshippers

AM 4738.

Found at Asklepieion, Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.335, W 0.36, Th 0.11.

Date: 308/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief survives in two halves. Worshippers approach an altar from either side. On the left (A); boy leading a pig, worshipper of unknown sex, a man, and another worshipper of unknown sex. On the right (B); a boy leading a pig, two men, a woman, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 677-679, no.407A-B, plate LXXXIV.

VR 43 Zeus Meilichios and Worshippers

PM 3.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions: H 0.24, W 0.36, Th unknown.

Date: c.308/7 BC.

Inscription: — — τοβόλη Δι̅ Μιλίχιω[ι] (*IG II² 4569*).

[--]tobole [dedicated this to] Zeus Meilichios.

Relief: Zeus Mellichios sits on a throne to the left. A boy leads a pig to a altar in front of Zeus and is followed by six more worshippers; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, three children.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 681-684, no.410, plate LXXXV; Parker 2005: 47.

VR 44 Banquet Scene

NM 1511

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.29, W 0.45, Th unknown.

Date: c.308/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The relief is damaged at the top right hand side where the head of a reclining god should be. A goddess sits at the end of the couch on which he reclines, a table in front of the pair. A nude youth stands behind the goddess with a krater. Six worshippers follow him; two men, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adult worshippers, two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 690-692, no.414, plate LXXXV.

VR 45 Banquet Scene

Berlin Staatliche Museum K94.

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.155, W 0.23, Th 0.045.

Date: c.308/7 BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A god reclines on a couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch. There is a table in front of them. Three worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, a woman and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 702-704, no.420, plate LXXXVI.

VR 46 Banquet Scene

NM 3527.

Found on west side of the Acropolis.

Dimensions: H 0.35, W 0.61, Th unknown.

Date: Late fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: To the right a god or hero reclines on a couch. A goddess is seated at the foot of the couch. A table laden with food is situated in front of the deities. Worshippers approach behind the goddess. First a boy – a slave boy? – carrying a basket of offerings, followed by two women, a man, and two children.

Bibliography: Thönges-Stringaris 1965: 78-79, no.69, plate 10.1; Kaltsas 2002: 231, no.486.

VR 47 Worshippers

Agora S456.

Found in modern wall over Odeion, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.19, P.W 0.22, Th 0.077.

Date: Late fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom right corner of the relief survives, preserving, apart from their heads, four worshippers approaching an altar. The first two worshippers are male, followed by a smaller female figure, possibly a servant girl who possibly originally balanced a *kiste* on her head. The last figure is a female worshipper.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 116-117, no.145, plate 42.

VR 48 Worshippers

Agora S538.

Found in modern wall over Odeion, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.185, P.W 0.19, Th 0.072.

Date: Late fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom left corner of the relief survives. Only worshippers are preserved. A boy – a slave boy? – leads an animal to be sacrificed. He is followed by a male worshipper, a female worshipper, and a likely servant girl who may have originally carried a *kiste* on her head. In front of the adults are three children of unknown sex.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 117, no.146, plate 43.

VR 49 Worshippers

Agora S750.

Found in modern wall north of South Stoa, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.24, P.W 0.235, Th 0.08.

Date: Late fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom left corner of the relief survives, preserving six worshippers. The first worshippers, to the right, is male, followed by a female worshipper and a second shorter, frontal facing female worshipper, presumably a slave.

Accompanying the adults are three children.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 120, no.157, plate 46.

VR 50 Worshippers

Agora S 958.

Found in footing trench for east wall of Middle Drain southeast of the Tholos, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.17, P.W 0.127, Th 0.082.

Date: Late fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bodies of two adult worshippers and head and upper body of a child survive. They face right, suggesting they were depicted in the left half of the relief. Both adult worshippers are female, the second slightly shorter and frontal facing, suggesting she was a slave, perhaps a nurse.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 120, no.159, plate 46.

VR 51 Banquet Scene

Cassel (inv. no. unknown).

Found in Athens.

Dimensions: H 0.33, W 0.47, Th unknown.

Date: End of fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A nude youth stands to the right of a couch. A god reclines on the couch and holds up a rhyton. A goddess sits at the foot of the couch, a table in front of her. Five worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 718-720, no.426, plate LXXXVIII.

VR 52 Banquet Scene

Current location unknown.

Found on road between Keratea and Laurion.

Dimensions: H 0.42, W 0.51, Th unknown.

Date: End of fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: A god reclines on a couch and raises a rhyton. A goddess sits by his feet. There is a table in front of them. Five worshippers approach behind the goddess; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two children.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 743-745, no.441, plate XC.

VR 53 Banquet Scene

Rodin Museum 5.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: H 0.285, W 0.346, Th 0.085.

Date: End of fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief is preserved. The reclining god occupied the right portion of the relief and so is not preserved. A goddess sitting at the foot of the couch is preserved. A nude youth stands behind her with a krater. Five worshippers follow him; a man, a woman, a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, and, in front of the adults, two boys.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 782-783, no.467, plate XCIV.

VR 54 Worshippers

AM 2408.

Found in Athens (?).

Dimensions: H 0.21, W 0.17, Th 0.075.

Date: End of fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the lower right portion of the relief survives, preserving some worshippers; two women, a boy in front of the second, and a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head.

Bibliography: Mitropoulou 1968: 796-797, no.475, plate XCV.

VR 55 Asklepios, Hygieia and Worshippers

Agora S 800.

Found on north slope of Areopagus.

Dimensions: H 0.33, W 0.22, Th 0.08.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the left portion of the relief survives. Asklepios stands on the left, his elbow overlapping the anta. In front of him is a small, rectangular altar. Hygieia stands behind the altar. To the right of the altar, a boy – a slave boy? – brings a pig to be sacrificed. He was presumably followed by other worshippers depicted in the now missing right portion of the relief.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 39-40, no.18, plate 5.

VR 56 Worshippers

Agora S 2415.

Found east of Library of Pantainos, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.265, W 0.34, Th 0.135.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom right corner of the relief survives. To the left is an altar, behind and to the right of which are three worshippers, a man, a woman, and a person of unknown sex. Only their legs are preserved. In front of these worshippers is a boy – a slave boy? – bringing a pig to the altar for sacrifice.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 116, no.142, plate 42.

VR 57 Deity and Worshippers

Agora S 1680.

Found in the area of the Agora known as Heliaia.

Dimensions: P.H 0.37, W 0.225, Th 0.135.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom middle section of the relief survives. An altar is preserved, with some drapery belonging to the deity to the left. To the right are preserved a male worshipper and a boy – slave boy? – bringing a pig to sacrifice.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 116, no.143, plate 42.

VR 58 Worshippers

Agora S 2631.

Found near Library of Pantainos and Panathenaic Way, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.215, P.W 0.235, Th 0.085.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only some of the left side of the relief is preserved. Five figures are preserved facing to the right. The first is a slave boy probably leading an animal to an altar. Behind the slave boy are a male worshipper, a female worshipper, a smaller female worshipper – their daughter? – and a damaged female figure who may be considered a nurse and, therefore, possible slave.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 117, no.147, plate 43.

VR 59 Worshippers

Agora S 2775.

Found in southeast corner of Agora square.

Dimensions: P.H 0.275, P.W 0.155, Th 0.085.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only some portion of the right side of the relief survives. Three figures approach an altar from the right. The first a slave boy probably attending to a now missing sacrificial animal, followed by a male worshipper and a boy worshipper. The head of the male figure is missing.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 117, no.148, plate 43.

VR 60 Worshippers

Agora S 1502.

Found in removal of Byzantine walls on road between Gymnasium and Byzantine houses in Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.23, P.W. 0.175, Th 0.076.

Date: Fourth Century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only some middle section of the relief is preserved. It depicted a female worshipper and slave boy at an altar. The heads of both figures are missing.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 118, no.149, plate 44.

VR 61 Worshippers

Agora S 2052.

Found in a Turkish pit east of southeastern corner of Temple of Triptolemos, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.45, P.W 0.40, Th 0.19.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only part of the relief survives and is badly damaged. Five worshippers are preserved. The first two are so damaged they cannot be identified as male or female. The third figure is a female worshipper. She is completely covered by a himation. She is followed by a servant girl carrying a *kiste* on her head, though the *kiste* is now missing. The fifth figure, a child, stands in front of the servant girl.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 119, no.155, plate 45.

VR 62 Worshippers

Agora S 2603.

Found near Eleusinion, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.20, P.W 0.22, Th 0.085.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bottom right corner of the relief survives. Only the lower legs of a female worshipper and a child stood in front of her survive. That the female worshipper is frontal facing has lead Carol Lawton (2017: 119) to suggest she was probably a slave, perhaps the child's nurse.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 119-120, no.156, plate 46.

VR 63 Worshippers

Agora S 2898.

Found on north slope of Areopagus west of Eleusinion, Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.27, P.W 0.255, Th 0.11.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bodies of three adult worshippers and a child survive. They face right and so must have occupied the left half of the relief. The first worshipper is male, followed by a female worshipper, and a smaller servant girl who probably carrying a *kiste* on her head that is now missing. The child stands in front of the male worshipper.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 122, no.166, plate 48.

VR 64 Worshippers

Agora S 2664.

Found in Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.17, P.W 0.205, Th 0.07.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: The bodies of three worshippers, facing right, are preserved. They are a male and female worshipper followed by a smaller female worshipper, perhaps their slave.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 122, no.167, plate 48.

VR 65 Worshippers

Agora S3555.

Found in Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.255, P.W 0.22, Th 0.13.

Date: Fourth century BC.

No Inscription.

Relief: Only the bodies of three adult worshippers and a child survive. They face left and so likely occupied the right side of the relief. The first worshipper is presumed male, a child at his side. The next worshipper is unsexed but other compositions suggest the worshipper is female. The last figure is a smaller, female figure, presumably a slave.

Bibliography: Lawton 2017: 122, no.168, plate 49.

Appendix III: Decree Reliefs

DR 1 Athens and Miletos

EM 6801 + 6802 + 5329 + 5330 + 6801a.

Found on South Slope.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 1.47, P.W 0.67 (top) / 0.72 (bottom), Th 0.12 (top) / 0.125 (bottom).

Date: 450/49 BC or 426/5 BC.

Inscription: *IG I*² 22, *IG I*³ 21.

Relief: Only the feet of two figures wearing long garments are preserved, perhaps Athena and Artemis.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 294, no.A1, pl.1.1; Lawton *ADR* 112-113, no.63, pl.33.

DR 2 The Sons of Iphiades

EM 6820 + 6820a.

Found between the Theatre of Herodes Atticus and on the Acropolis.

Dimensions: P.H 0.225, P.W 0.24, Th 0.06.

Date: 440s BC or 420s BC.

Inscription: *IG I*² 143, *IG I*³ 28.

Relief: Only the corner of the relief survives. Nothing is known of the figures.

Bibliography: Lawton *ADR* 113, no.64, pl.33.

DR 3 Apollonophanes of Kolophon

EM 6615 + 6593.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions: P.H 0.41, P.W 0.36, Th 0.12

Date: c.427/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG I* 36 + 74, *IG I*² 59, *IG I*³ 65.

Relief: Apollonophanes stands to the left wearing a himation. Athena on the right is preserved only from the chest down. She wears a peplos and rests her left hand on her shield whilst crowning Apollonophanes with her right. A snake is coiled by her side.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 265, no.A2, pl.1.2; Lawton *ADR* 113-114, no.65, pl.34.

DR 4 Athens and Methone

EM 6596.

Found in Theatre of Dionysos.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 1.00, P.W 0.53 (top) / 0.55 (bottom), Th 0.11, P.H of relief 0.21.

Date: 424/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG I* 40, *IG I*³ 61.

Relief: Athena, seated on a rock to the right, engages in *dexiosis* with Artemis on the left. Athena wears a sleeved chiton, mantle, and aegis. Her head is missing. Artemis wears a short, belted chiton, though her upper body is missing. She is followed by a dog.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 265, no.A4, pl.41; Lawton *ADR* 81-82, no.2, pl.1; Blanshard 2007: 21.

DR 5 Sotimos of Herakleia

EM 6609.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.395, P.W 0.415 (top) / 0.38 (bottom), Th 0.102 (top) / 0.085 (bottom), P.H of relief 0.16.

Date: 424/3-410 BC.

Inscription: *IG I 65, IG I² 145, IG I³ 74.*

Relief: Athena is seated on a rock on the left. She is only preserved from the waist down. She holds her helmet in right hand, her shield resting beside her. Before her stands Sotimos, wearing a himation, and behind him stands Herakles. Only the legs of these figures are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 274, no.A31, pl.12.2; Lawton *ADR* 118, no.72, pl.38; Blanshard 2007: 34.

DR 6 Athens and Messana

Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden RO.III.95.

Found in Athens but exact provenance unknown.

Dimensions: P.H 0.17, P.W 0.10.

Date: 420s BC.

Inscription: *IG I³ 148.*

Relief: Only a female figure on the left is preserved, believed to be a personification of Messana. She wears a peplos and polos-like headdress and extends both her arms, presumably towards a now missing figure.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 269, no.A13, pl.7.1; Lawton *ADR* 114, no.66, pl.34; Smith 2011: 133, DR 1.

DR 7 Proxenides of Knidos (Figure 6.1)

AM 2996 + EM 2634 + 2635 + 6854a + b + 6626 + 6829 + Agora I 2806.

Found on Acropolis and in the Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.72, P.W 0.54, Th 0.085.

Date: c.420 BC.

Inscription: *IG I 73 + 89, IG I² 144 + 155, IG I³ 91.*

Relief: Aphrodite stands on the left and places her right hand on Proxenides head. The smaller figure of Proxenides wears a himation and extends his right arm in a gesture of worship towards Athena on the right. Athena wears peplos, shoulder mantle, and Attic helmet. Her right hand extends towards Proxenides and her left holds her spear. Her shield is at her side.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 266-267, no.A6, pl.2; Lawton *ADR* 115-116, no.68, pl.36.

DR 8 Athens and Argos

AM 2980 + 2431 + 2981 + EM 6588a-g.

Found on Acropolis and in Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.62, P.W 0.70, Th 0.155.

Date: 417/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG I 50, IG I² 96, IG I³ 86.*

Relief: Zeus, enthroned on the left, is draped in a himation and holds a sceptre in his left hand. His head is missing. In front of him stands Hera wearing a peplos and veil. She engaged in *dexiosis* with a third figure now missing, presumably Athena.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 267, no.A8, pl.3; Lawton *ADR* 84-85, no.5, pl.3;
Blanshard 2007: 29-30, fig.1.5.

DR 9 Athens and Samos

EM 6592 + a.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.59, P.W 0.29, Th 0.125, P.H of relief 0.12.

Date: 412/1 or 405 BC.

Inscription: *IG I* 56, *IG I*² 101, *IG I*³ 96.

Relief: Only the legs of a seated figure accompanied by a snake on the left, probably Athena, and the legs of a figure standing before her, possibly Hera, are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 267-268, no.A9, pl.4.2; Lawton *ADR* 117, no.71, pl.38;

Blanshard 2007: 29-30.

DR 10 Athens and Mytilene (?)

Paris, Louvre MA 2414.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: P.H 0.33, P.W 0.27, Th 0.9.

Date: c.410 BC.

Inscription: *IG I* 96, *IG I*² 60.

Relief: Only Athena in the left half on the relief is preserved. She wears peplos, aegis and Attic helmet and carrying her shield in her left hand and spear in her right.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 271-272, no.A21; Lawton *ADR* 116, no.69, pl.37.

DR 11 Athens and Neapolis

EM 6598 (eight fragments) + EM 6589.

Found on Acropolis and South Slope.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 1.36, W 0.58, Th 0.065, P.H of relief 0.345.

Date: 410/9 BC.

Inscription: *IG I*² 108, *IG I*³ 101.

Relief: The figure on the left is missing but appears to have engaged in *dexiosis* with Athena on the right. Athena wears a peplos and leans on her shield.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 269, no.A15, pl.5.2; Lawton *ADR* 85-86, no.7, pl.4;

Blanshard 2007: 22-23, fig.1.2.

DR 12 Athens and Kios

EM 6928

Found by the Propylaia.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.33, W 0.245, Th 0.145, P.H of relief 0.185.

Date: 406/5

Inscription: *IG II* 22, *IG I*² 124.

Relief: Athena and hero Kios engage in *dexiosis*. Athena, on the left, wears a peplos, aegis, shoulder mantle, and Attic helmet. In her left hand she carries her shield. Kios wears a himation.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 272, no.A22, pl.8; Lawton *ADR* 87, no.9, pl.5; Smith 2011: 134, DR 4.

DR 13 Epikerdes of Kyrene

EM 7010 + 7006 + Agora I 7065.

Found in Theatre of Dionysos, on Acropolis, and in Agora.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.35, P.W 0.18, Th 0.14, P.H of relief 0.20.

Date: 405/4 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 85, *IG* II.5 85, *IG* II² 174, *IG* I³ 125.

Relief: Epikerdes of Kyrene stands on the left wearing a himation, his right hand raised in the pose of worshipper. Only the edge of the peplos of the deity on the right, presumably Athena, survives. A second deity may have been depicted.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 272, no.A24, pl.8.2; Lawton *ADR* 87, no.10, pl.6.

DR 14 [P]oly[p]os

EM 2552 + 3169 + 2792.

EM 2552 Found near the Tower of the Winds, the provenance of the other two fragments unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.42, P.W 0.59, Th 0.13, P.H of relief 0.15.

Date: 405/4 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 200, *IG* I² 126.

Relief: Two male figures stand before Athena, seated on the right. Only the feet of the two male figures are preserved, the figure to the left perhaps a hero associated with [P]oly[p]os' homeland, he possibly being from Gortyna or Gortys, the central figure being [P]oly[p]os himself. Only Athena's lower body is preserved, her shield resting beside her.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 272, no.A23, pl.12.1; Lawton *ADR* 87-88, no.11, pl.6.

DR 15 Athens and Samos (Figure 6.2)

AM 1333a-d.

Found on the Acropolis, between the Theatre of Dionysos and Odeion of Herodes Atticus, and the provenance of AM 1333d is unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 1.71, W 0.56, Th 0.12, P.H of relief 0.50.

Date: 403/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 1b, *IG* I² 126, *IG* I³ 127, *IG* II² 1.

Relief: Hera and Athena engage in *dexiosis*. Hera, on the left, wears a peplos, shoulder mantle, and stephane, and holds her sceptre in her left hand. Athena, on the right, wears a peplos, himation, aegis, and Attic helmet, a spear resting in left arm. Her shield rests on against a tree stump behind her.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 273, no.A26, pl.10.1; Lawton *ADR* 88-89, no.12, pl.7; Blanshard 2007: 19-37, fig. 1.1.

DR 16 Arist[oxen]os of Boeotia

EM 6877 + 6937.

Found near Kapnikarea and on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.28, P.W 0.30, Th 0.12, P.H of relief 0.04.

Date: 403/2 or 382/1 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 43, *IG* II.5 1d, *IG* II² 2a, *SEG* 32.38.

Relief: Only the legs of a bull are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 273, no.A25; Lawton *ADR* 120-121, no.79, pl.42.

DR 17 Athens and Eretria

EM 6885 + EM 6887

EM 6885 found on the Acropolis, the provenance of EM 6887 unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.215, P.W 0.29, Th 0.11, P.H of relief 0.135.

Date: 394/3 BC (or 404/3 BC?).

Inscription: *IG II.5 7b, IG II² 16.*

Relief: Only the feet of a seated figure, likely Athena, are preserved. The seated goddess probably faced a standing representative of Athenian ally Eretria.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 276, no.A37; Lawton *ADR* 90, no.15, pl.8.

DR 18 Dionysios I of Syracuse

EM 6899.

Found in Theatre of Dionysos.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.58, P.W 0.47, Th 0.10, P.H of relief 0.32.

Date: 394/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG II 8, IG II² 18.*

Relief: Athena engages in *dexiosis* with a female figure representing Syracuse or Sicily. Athena wears a peplos and leans on her shield, a snake coiled behind her. The female figure, perhaps Demeter or Persephone, also wears a peplos, and carries a object that is possibly a torch.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 276, no.A38, pl.11.2; Lawton *ADR* 90-91, no.16, pl.9.

DR 19 King Euagoras of Cypriot Salamis

Agora I 7121 + British Museum 1959.4-14.4 + EM 6889.

Agora I 7121 found on Hadrian Street, provenance of British museum fragment unknown, EM 7121 found between Theatre of Dionysos and Odeion of Herodes Atticus.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.29, P.W 0.235, Th 0.113, P.H of relief 0.13.

Date: c.394/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG II 10b, IG II² 20.*

Relief: Only the feet of a female figure to the right are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 276-277, no.A39, pl.9.2; Lawton *ADR* 122, no.84, pl.44; Smith 2011: 134, DR 5.

DR 20 Archippos and Hipparchos of Thasos

EM 6891-6894.

Found on the Acropolis and the South Slope.

Dimensions: P.H 0.22, P.W 0.18, Th 0.11.

Date: 389-386 BC.

Inscription: *IG II.5 11b, IG II² 24.*

Relief: Only the upper body of Athena, who stands on the right, is preserved. She wears a helmet and likely crowned either Archippos or Hipparchos, both now missing.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 278, no.A44; Lawton *ADR* 123, no.86, pl.45.

DR 21 Athens and Klazomenai

EM 6917.

Found near the Asklepieion.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.45, W. 0.50, Th 0.085, P.H of relief 0.13.

Date: 387/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG II.5 14b, IG II² 28.*

Relief: Two rams stand facing each other, rams being a motif on Klazomenian coins during much of the fourth century BC.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 277, no.A41; Lawton *ADR* 91, no.17, pl.9.

DR 22 Hebryzelmis, King of Thracian Odrysai

EM 6941.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.71, P.W 0.405, Th 0.11, P.H of relief 0.255.

Date: 386/5 BC.

Inscription: *IG II.5 14c, IG II² 31.*

Relief: A female figure, preserved only from the chest down, wears a belted peplos or chiton and a veil or shoulder mantle. A horse stands either side of her.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 277, no.A42, pl.15.1; Lawton *ADR* 91, no.18, pl.10;

Hagemajer Allen 2003: 232-234; Smith 2011: 134, DR 6.

DR 23 Athens and Chios

EM 6907a-e.

EM 6907a-d found on the Acropolis, EM 6907e of unknown provenance.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H. 0.50, P.W 0.22, Th 0.14, P.H of relief 0.34.

Date: 384/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG II 15, IG II.5 15c, IG II² 34.*

Relief: Frontal facing female figure wearing a peplos or chiton and a himation. To the right is the foot of a second figure, now missing.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 278, no.A43, pl.14.2; Lawton *ADR* 91-92, no.19, pl.10.

DR 24 Athens and Olynthus

EM 7030.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.24, P.W 0.20, Th 0.10, P.H of relief 0.06.

Date: 384/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG II 105, IG II² 36.*

Relief: Only the feet of the two figures are preserved, perhaps Athena and Apollo.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 278, no.A45; Lawton *ADR* 124, no.88, pl.46.

DR 25 Sons of Leomestor and Diagoras of Abydos, five men in total (Figure 6.3)

AM 1330.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions: P.H 0.51, W 0.435, Th 0.12.

Date: 380s BC.

Inscription: *IG II.5 73d, IG II² 49.*

Relief: The son of either Leomestor or Diagoras, wearing a himation, stands before Athena, seated on the right. She wears peplos, aegis, and himation and rests her left arm on her shield and holds her spear in her right hand. Her Corinthian helmet lies on the ground and an eagle sits on her knee.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 271, no.A18; Lawton *ADR* 123-124, no.87, pl.46.

DR 26 Komaios of Abdera

EM 7051.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.56, W 0.515 (top) / 0.525 (bottom), Th 0.095, P.H of relief 0.155.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: *IG II.5 85b, IG II² 77.*

Relief: Only the feet of Komaios, son of Theodoros, of Abdera and fringes of Athena's peplos are preserved. A shield accompanies Athena. It is likely Athena crowned Komaios as she crowns others in their reliefs.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 279, no.A48; Lawton *ADR* 126, no.95, pl.50.

DR 27 Son of [---]psikles (proxenos)

EM 6983.

Found in the Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.35, P.W 0.175, P.Th 0.10, H of relief 0.025.

Date: 400-375 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 73f, *IG* II² 86.

Relief: Only the feet / drapery of one figure standing to the right are preserved.

Bibliography: Lawton *ADR* 126, no.94, pl.49.

DR 28 Man from Naukratis

EM 2806.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: P.H 0.21, P.W 0.24, Th 0.13.

Date: 400-350 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II² 163.

Relief: A bull on the left and a ram on the right face each other.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 284, no.A64, pl.51.2; Lawton *ADR* 132, no.114, pl.60.

DR 29 Athens and Siphnos

Agora I 5410.

Found in the Agora, near south end of Stoa of Attalos.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.267, P.W 0.168, Th 0.073, P.H of relief 0.06.

Date: 400-350 BC.

Inscription: *SEG* 17.19.

Relief: Only the legs of a seated female figure are preserved on the left, possible Athena. She wears himation and peplos.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 284, no.A66; Lawton *ADR* 128, no.99, pl.52.

DR 30 Athens and Korkyra

NM 1467.

Found on the South Slope.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 1.01, W 0.445 (top) / 0.46 (bottom), Th 0.12 (top) / 0.14 (bottom), H of relief 0.40.

Date: 375/4 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 49b, *IG* II² 97.

Relief: On the left is seated Zeus, draped in a himation. Hera stands before him wearing a peplos and mantle. Behind Hera stands Athena, wearing a himation and Corinthian helmet. Spear was painted into her left hand and likely a shield was painted at her right side.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 280, no.A51, pl.16.2; Lawton *ADR* 126-127, no.96, pl.50; Kaltsas 2002: 238, no.503, fig.503; Smith 2011: 134-135, DR 10.

DR 31 Alketas of Syracuse (Figure 6.4)

AM 1349.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions: P.H 0.51, P.W 0.335, Th 0.08.

Date: 373/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 50b, *IG* II² 101.

Relief: A horse stands alone facing to the left. An olive crown is inscribed below the horse. The horse may reference an equestrian victory by Alketas.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 280, no.A52; Lawton *ADR* 93, no.21, pl.11.

DR 32 Menelaos of Pelagonia

EM 7024.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.51, W 0.42, Th 0.12, P.H of relief 0.12.

Date: 363/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 55, *IG* II² 110.

Relief: Only the legs of, from left to right, Menelaos, Demos or a patron deity, and Athena are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 281, no.A56, pl.17.1; Lawton *ADR* 93-94, no.23, pl.12; Smith 2011: 135, DR 14.

DR 33 Athens, Arkadia, Achaia, Elis, and Phleious

NM 1481 + EM 857.

NM 1481 found on the South Slope and EM 857 found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.47, W 0.49, Th 0.145, P.H of relief 0.215.

Date: 362/1 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 112, *IG* II.5 57b, *IG* II² 112.

Relief: Athena stands on the left, her head missing, wearing a peplos and carrying a spear, her shield by her side. In front of Athena stands a female figure, her head also missing, identified either as a personification of the Peloponnese or Hera. She wears a peplos and mantle and holds on sceptre. On the right is Zeus, seated on a throne, holding a possible thunderbolt in his left hand and a possible sceptre in his right. Both his hands are damaged and his head his missing.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 282, no.A58, pl.17.2; Lawton *ADR* 94, no.24, pl.13; Kaltsas 2002: 235, no.493, fig.493; Smith 2011: 135, DR 15.

DR 34 Athens and Thessaly

EM 7137.

Found on the South Slope.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.66, W 0.41, Th 0.115, P.H of relief 0.08.

Date: 361/0 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 59b, *IG* II² 116.

Relief: A horse stands alone facing to the right.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 282-283, no.A59, pl.20.2; Lawton *ADR* 94-95, no.25, pl.13.

DR 35 Athens, Thrace, Paionia, and Illyria (Figure 6.5)

EM 6966a-c.

EM 6966a found on the Acropolis, the other two fragments found between the Theatre of Dionysos and Odeion of Herodes Atticus.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.40, P.W 0.28, Th 0.11, P.H of relief 0.13.

Date: 356/5 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II² 127.

Relief: Only the hind legs of a rearing horse are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 284, no.A67, pl.20.1; Lawton *ADR* 95, no.27, pl.14.

DR 36 Athens and Neapolis

NM 1480.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.505, P.W 0.335, Th 0.10, H of relief 0.32.

Date: 356/5 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 66, *IG* II² 128.

Relief: Athena, left, and smaller figure of the Parthenos of Neapolis engage in *dexiosis*. Athena wears a peplos and helmet, her left hand resting on her shield. The Parthenos wears a polos and peplos and resembles Archaic statuary.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 284-285, no.A68, pl.22.1; Lawton *ADR* 95-96, no.28, pl.15; Kaltsas 2002: 237, no.498, fig.498.

DR 37 Sochares of Apollonia

Palermo, Museo Nazionale NI 1549 + EM 5415.

NI 1549 found in Ilissos area, provenance of EM 5415 unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.76, P.W 0.44, Th 0.07, P.H of relief 0.36.

Date: 355/4 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 70, *IG* II² 130 + *SEG* 19.49.

Relief: The figure of Sochares is presumed to have stood in the left of the relief but is now missing. Athena appears to have crowned him, her right arm extended for the purpose. She wears peplos, aegis and helmet. Behind Athena stands Leto wearing peplos and mantle. On right of the relief Apollo is seated, his legs draped with a himation.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 285, no.A69, pl.22.2; Lawton *ADR* 96, no.29, pl.15.

DR 38 Philiskos of Sestos

NM 1474.

Found near the Lysikrates Monument.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.915, W 0.352 (top) / 0.36 (bottom), Th 0.09 (top) / 0.095 (bottom), P.H of relief 0.25.

Date: 355/4 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II² 133.

Relief: An unknown rider is mounted on a rearing horse, his chlamys flapping behind him. In front of the rider, in the centre of the relief, stands Athena wearing peplos and helmet, with a shield and snake beside her. She holds a Nike in her right hand who in turn holds a crown towards Philiskos who stands before them on the right. Philiskos wears a himation and raised his hand in a gesture of worship.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 285-286, no.A70, pl.23.1; Lawton *ADR* 96-97, no.30, pl.16; Kaltsas 2002: 236-7, no.497, fig.497.

DR 39 Athens and Aphytis

EM 6954.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: P.H 0.22, W 0.34, Th 0.11.

Date: 375-350 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 59, *IG* II² 55.

Relief: A frontal facing female figure preserved from the waist down wears either a peplos or chiton and himation and holds a phiale in her right hand.
References: Meyer *GUR* 278, no.A46; Lawton *ADR* 129-130, no.104, pl.55; Smith 2011: 135-136, DR 16.

DR 40 Moschos of Naukratis

EM 6971.

Found on the Acropolis, east of the Parthenon.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.44, P.W 0.23, Th 0.115, H of relief 0.32.

Date: 354/3 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 71, *IG* II.5 71, *IG* II² 135.

Relief: A bull is depicted facing to the right, though only its hind legs are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 286, no.A71, pl.20.3; Lawton *ADR* 97, no.32, pl.17.

DR 41 Grant of Proxeny

EM 2791.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.29, P.W 0.27, P.Th 0.12, P.H of relief 0.215.

Date: mid-fourth century BC

Inscription: *IG* II² 160.

Relief: A male figure identified as Demos by a label stands to the right. Only his legs are preserved. He wears a himation and leans on a stick. In front of him stands a male figure, again only his legs survive, who was probably the man made a proxenos, whose name may be restored as Andron. A third figure stood on the left of Andron, perhaps Athena or Boule, but they do not survive.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 307, no.A146, pl.40.2; Lawton 1995: 133, no.117, pl.61; Smith 2011: 136, DR 20.

DR 42 Spartokos II, Pairisades I, and Apollonios of the Crimean Bosporos

NM 1471a-b.

Found in the Piraeus.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 2.17, W 0.615, Th 0.165, H of relief 0.69.

Date: 347/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II² 212.

Relief: Spartokos and Pairisades are seated together on claw-footed throne. Both are bearded, have long hair, and wear himations. Apollonios stands to the right of their throne and also wears a himation.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 290, no.A88, pl.28.1; Lawton *ADR* 98-99, no.35, pl.18; Kaltsas 2002: 235, no.494, fig.494; Hagemajer Allen 2003: 235-236; Smith 2011: 139, DR 38.

DR 43 Damoxenos of Taras

EM 6994 + 6995.

Found between Theatre of Dionysos and Odeion of Herodes Atticus.

Dimensions: P.H 0.205, P.W 0.175, P.Th 0.07.

Date: pre-343/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II² 248.

Relief: Only the lower edges of the relief survive.

Bibliography: Lawton *ADR* 134, no.121, pl.64.

DR 44 Arybbas the Molossian

NM 2948 + EM 13291.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 2.43, W 0.58 (top) / 0.65 (bottom), Th 0.215 (top) / 0.26 (bottom), P.H of upper relief 0.355, H of lower relief 0.25.

Date: c.340s BC.

Inscription: *IG II* 115, *IG II*² 226.

Upper Relief: Quadriga carrying two figures moving towards the right. The charioteer wears a belted chiton, while Arybbas wears a long chiton. Two horses and the legs of a third are preserved.

Lower Relief: Quadriga moving towards the left. Winged Nike is charioteer.

Arybbas, mounted on horseback, follows the Quadriga.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 291, no.A90, 299, A118, pl.29.1, 2; Lawton *ADR* 134-135, no.122, pl.65; Kaltsas 2002: 239, no.504, fig.504; Hagemajer Allen 2003: 229-230.

DR 45 Phokinos, Nikandros, and Dexi[ppos]

Avignon, Musée Calvet 28.

Provenance unknown.

Dimensions: P.H 0.41, W 0.41, Th 0.07.

Date: 340/39 BC.

Inscription: *IG II*² 231.

Relief: Phokinos, Nikandros, and Dexi[ppos] line up on the left wearing hoplite corselets, short tunics, helmets. All three have their right hands raised in a gesture of worship towards Athena, who stands to the right. She wears a peplos and a Corinthian helmet, her left hand resting on her shield and her right extended holding a crown to crown the first of the three warriors.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 291, no.A91, pl.27.2; Lawton *ADR* 99, no.36, pl.19.

DR 46 Man from Kroton

NM 2985.

Found at south wing of Propylaia.

Dimensions: P.H 0.60, W 0.54, Th 0.23.

Date: 350-325 BC.

Inscription: *IG II*² 406.

Relief: On right stands Athena wearing peplos and helmet, her shield at her side. In her right hand she holds a winged Nike. In her of her is a coiled snake. On the left stands a bearded male figure wearing a himation and leaning on a stick. He is identified as either Demos or Asklepios.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 296-297, no.A109, pl.32.1; Lawton 1995: 139, no.132, pl.70; Smith 2011: 137, DR 27.

DR 47 Alkimachos (of Pella?)

EM 7063.

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.31, P.W 0.21, Th 0.14, P.H of relief 0.125.

Date: 337/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG II* 123, *IG II*² 239.

Relief: Only the feet of a seated figure, possible Athena, are preserved.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 293, no.A96; Lawton *ADR* 99, no.37, pl.19.

DR 48 Euenor of Akarnania

EM 7064 + 7186.

Found on the Acropolis, west of the Parthenon.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.708, W 0.364, Th 0.15, P.H of relief 0.11.

Date: 337/6 BC.

Inscription: *IG II* 125, *IG II*² 242 + 373.

Relief: Only the legs of a female figure presumed to be Athena survive. She wears a belted peplos.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 293, no.A98, pl.50.1; Lawton *ADR* 100-101, no.39, pl.20.

DR 49 Archippos (of Thasos?)

EM 7237a-b.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.45, P.W 0.265, Th 0.135, P.H of relief 0.05.

Date: 333/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG II* 230, *IG II*² 336.

Relief: Only the feet of two figures, who may have been Zeus and Hera, survive.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 294, no.A101; Lawton *ADR* 101-102, no.41, pl.21.

DR 50 Man from Chios

EM 7160.

Found on the Acropolis, in the sanctuary of Brauronian Artemis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.26, P.W 0.15, Th 0.115, P.H of relief 0.11.

Date: 333/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG II*² 339a.

Relief: On the left is a sphinx, on the right a Chian amphora.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 294, no.A100; Lawton *ADR* 102, no.42, pl.22.

DR 51 Man from Plataea

EM 7167 + 7168

Found on the Acropolis.

Dimensions: EM 7168: P.H 0.215, P.W 0.18, P.Th 0.08, P.H of relief 0.10.

EM 7167: P.H 0.42, P.W 0.145, P.Th 0.36.

Date: 332/1 BC.

Inscription: *IG II* 173, *IG II*² 345.

Relief: Only the legs of a male figure, on the left, and a female figure, on the right, are preserved, likely the man from Plataea and Athena.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 294, no.A102; Lawton *ADR* 103, no.44, pl.23.

DR 52 Amphis of Andros

EM 7155 + 5119.

Found near Asklepieion and in Varvakeion.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.575, P.W 0.36, Th 0.13, P.H of relief 0.17.

Date: 332/1 BC.

Inscription: *IG II*.5 173b, *IG II*² 347.

Relief: Only the legs of two male figures, both wearing himatia, are preserved. The smaller figure on the left is likely Amphis, the figure on the right perhaps Demos.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 294-295, no.A103, pl.50.2; Lawton *ADR* 103, no.45, pl.24

DR 53 Rheboulas the Odrysian

NM 1476.

Found between the Theatre of Dionysos and the Odeion of Herodes Atticus.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.50, W 0.465, Th 0.14, P.H of relief 0.365.

Date: 331/30 BC.

Inscription: On the left only the legs of two horses are preserved. Rheboulas, wearing a himation and carrying a phiale, is a frontal facing figure. On his right stands Athena, wearing a belted peplos, aegis, and Attic helmet. Her left hand rests on her shield, her right hand is missing but may have held a crown or spear.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 295, no.A105, pl.33.2; Lawton *ADR* 103-104, no.46, pl.24.

DR 54 Megalopolitans

EM 7029 + a.

Found on the Acropolis, EM 7029a found east of Erechtheion.

Dimensions: P.H 0.23, P.W 0.21, Th 0.11.

Date: 350-325 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II.5 103b, *IG* II² 161.

Relief: On the right Athena is preserved from the waist up. She wears a peplos, aegis and Attic helmet.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 299, no.A120, pl.48.4; Lawton *ADR* 143, no.144, pl.76.

DR 55 Asklepiodoros (of Phokis?)

EM 2811 + 7180.

Found on Acropolis between Parthenon and Propylaia.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.62, W 0.48, Th 0.175, P.H of relief 0.35.

Date: 323/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 182, *IG* II² 367.

Relief: Athena wears a peplos and holds a crown in both hands. In front of Athena stands the female personification of the Boule, who crowns Asklepiodoros.

Asklepiodoros is a frontal facing figure wearing a himation. On his right stands the male personification of Demos, wearing a himation, who also crowns Asklepiodoros.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 300-301, no.A125, pl.35.2; Lawton *ADR* 105-106, no.49, pl.26; Smith 2011: 140-141, DR 47.

DR 56 Several Bosporans

EM 7333 + 7332 + 12572 + Agora I 4935a-f + Agora I 2752.

Found on North Slope and Agora.

Dimensions: P.H 0.18, P.W 0.135, P.Th 0.105.

Date: 323/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG* II 290, *IG* II² 369 + 414b + 414c, *SEG* 21.298.

Relief: Only the foot of one figure survives.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 301, no.A126; Lawton *ADR* 106, no.50, pl.26.

DR 57 Sostr[atos]

EM 7221.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.39, P.W 0.32, Th 0.145, P.H of relief 0.315.

Date: 325-300.

Inscription: *IG II.5 200, IG II² 419.*

Relief: Herakles, wearing a lionskin, leans on his club. In front of him stands Athena, who faces away from Herakles, presumably towards Sostr[atos], now missing.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 297-298, no.A114, pl.36.2; Lawton *ADR* 150, no.158, pl.83.

DR 58 Euphron of Sikyon

NM 1482.

Found near Stoa of Attalos.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 2.35, W 0.66, Th 0.30, P.H of relief 0.60.

Date: 318/17 BC.

Inscription: *IG II² 448.*

Relief: On the left stands Athena wearing chiton, peplos, mantle, aegis and helmet. A spear was painted into her left hand. Next to Athena stand Demos – or Zeus Soter – who raised his right, presumably to crown Euphron of Sikyon. Euphron wears a short chiton and mantle, a sword strapped across his chest. Behind Euphron a groom reins in the honorand's horse.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 303, no.A134, pl.39.1; Lawton 1995: 107-108, no.54, pl.28; Lawton 2003: 127-128; Kaltsas 2002: 236, no.495, fig.495; Smith 2011: 141, DR 48.

DR 59 Nikon of Abydos

EM 482.

Found on Acropolis.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.41, P.W 0.35 (top) / 0.36 (bottom), Th 0.08, P.H of relief 0.035.

Date: 303/2 BC.

Inscription: *IG II² 493.*

Relief: Only the naked feet of one figure survive to the right, but traces of another can be seen at the break in the centre of the relief.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 308, no.A151; Lawton 1995: 108-109, no.56, pl.29.

DR 60 Antiphates (a public slave)

EM 7303.

Found near Stoa of Attalos.

Dimensions (of stele): P.H 0.28, P.W 0.26, Th 0.09, P.H of relief 0.035.

Date: 302/1 BC.

Inscription: *IG II² 502.*

Relief: Only the feet of three figures survive – Antiphates himself and deities, heroes or personifications honouring him.

Bibliography: Meyer *GUR* 308, no.A152; Lawton 1995: 109, no.57, pl.30.

Bibliography

Ancient Sources

Aristotle. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 21*. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd. 1944. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0058> (Last accessed 24/07/2015).

Demosthenes. *Demosthenes*. Translated by A.T. Murray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd. 1939. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0076> (Last accessed 27/08/2015).

Euripides. *The Plays of Euripides, Volume II*. Translated by E. P. Coleridge. London: George Bell and Sons. 1891. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0108> (Last accessed 24/07/2015).

Homer. *The Iliad*. Translation by A.T. Murray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1924. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0134> (Last accessed 23/07/2015).

Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translation by A.T. Murray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0136> (Last accessed 12/02/2019).

Hyperides. *Minor Attic Orators in Two Volumes, 2*. Translated by J.O. Burt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1962. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0140%3Aspeech%3D3%3Asection%3D1> (Last accessed 27/08/2015).

Isocrates. *Isocrates*. Translated by G. Norlin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1980. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0144%3Aspeech%3D19%3Asection%3D5> (Last accessed 27/08/2015).

Livy. *History of Rome*. Translated by Rev. Canon Roberts. New York: E.P. Dutton. 1912. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0144> (Last accessed 12/02/2019).

Plato. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*. Translated by Paul Shorey. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1969. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0168%3Abook%3D1%3Asection%3D327a> (Last accessed 25/09/2018).

Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War*. Translated by J. M. Dent. London / New York: E. P. Dutton. 1910. Available at:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0200:book=3:chapter=91&highlight=melians> (Last accessed 28/09/2015).

Xenophon. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Translated by C. Marchant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. 1984. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0158> (Last accessed 25/09/2018).

Modern Sources

Adcock, F., and Mosley, D.J. 1975. *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Akrigg, B. 2007. The Nature and Implications of Athens' Changed Social Structure and Economy. In R. Osborne (ed.) *Debating the Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics*, 27-43: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akrigg, B. 2011. Demography and Classical Athens. In C. Holleran and A. Pudsey (eds) *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World: New Insights and Approaches*, 37-59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akrigg, B. 2015. Metics in Athens. . In C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, 155-173. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aleshire, S.B. 1989. *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, their Dedications and the Inventories*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Arrington, N. 2015. *Ashes, Images and Memories: The Presence of the War Dead in Fifth Century Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baba, K. 1984. On Kerameikos Inv. I 388 (SEG XXII, 79): A Note of the Formation of the Athenian Metic Status. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 79: 1-5.

Bäbler, B. 1998. *Fleißige Thrakerinnen und Wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im Klassischen Athen und ihre Archäologische Hinterlassenschaft*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Beaumont, L.A. 2012. *Childhood in Ancient Athens: Iconography and Social History*. London: Routledge.

Bergemann, J. 1997. *Demos und Thanatos: Untersuchungen zum Wertesystem der Polis im Spiegel der Attischen Grabreliefs des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. und zur Funktion der Gleichzeitigen Grabbauten*. Munich: Biering and Brinkmann.

Blanshard, A.J.L. 2004. Depicting Democracy: An Exploration of Art and Text in the Law of Eukrates. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 124: 1-15.

- Bradeen, D.W. 1974. *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XVII: Inscriptions The Funerary Monuments*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Braund, D. 2011. The Slave Supply in Classical Greece. In K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (eds) *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Volume I: The Ancient Mediterranean*, 112-133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Budde, L. and R.V. Nicholls. 1964. *A Catalogue of the Greek and Roman Sculpture in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burford, A. 1972. *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Burton, D. 2003. Public Memorials, Private Virtues: Women on Classical Athenian Grave Monuments. *Mortality* 8 (1): 20-35.
- Bush, M. 1996. Introduction. In M.L. Bush (ed.) *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage*, 1-17. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Cargill, J. 1981. *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* Berkeley: University of California.
- Carroll, M. 2018. *Infancy and Earliest Childhood in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clairmont, C.W. 1970. *Gravestone and Epigram: Greek Memorials from the Archaic and Classical Period*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Clairmont, C.W. 1993. *Classical Attic Tombstones*. Introductory Volume, Volumes I-VI, Plate Volume. Kilchberg: Akanthus.
- Clinton, K. 2005. *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Two Goddesses and the Public Documents of the Deme*. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Closterman, W.E. 2007. Family Ideology and Family History: The Function of Funerary Markers in Classical Attic Peribolos Tombs. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (4): 633-652.
- Closterman, W.E. 2015. Family Meals: Banquet Imagery on Classical Athenian Funerary Reliefs. In K.F. Daly and L.A. Riccardi (eds) *Cities Called Athens: Studies Honoring John Mck. Camp II*, 1-22. Lanham, MD: Bucknell University Press.
- Cohen, A. 2011. Picturing Greek Families. In B. Rawson (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, 465-487. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cohen, B. 2000. Introduction. In B. Cohen (ed.) *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, 3-20. Leiden: Brill.

- Cohen, E.E. 2000. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, E.E. 2002. An unprofitable masculinity. In P. Cartledge, E.E. Cohen and L. Foxhall (eds) *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*, 100-112. London: Routledge.
- Dansen, V. 2011. Childbirth and Infancy in Greek and Roman Antiquity. In B. Rawson (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, 291-314. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Davis, G. 1985. The Significance of the Handshake Motif in Classical Funerary Art. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89 (4): 627-640.
- Deacy, S. 2010. "Famous Athens, Divine Polis": The Religious System at Athens. In D. Ogden (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion*, 221-235. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Demand, N. 1998. Women and Slaves as Hippocratic Patients. In S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds) *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, 69-84. London: Routledge.
- Demetriou, D. 2012. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diepolder, H. 1931. *Die attischen Grabreliefs. Des 5. und 4. Jahrhundert V Chr.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Bechgesellschaft.
- Dillon, M. 2002. *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London: Routledge.
- DuBois, P. 2010. *Slavery: Antiquity and Its Legacy*. London: I.B. Tauris
- Eidinow, E. 2015. Ancient Greek Religion. . In C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, 54-79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engen, D.T. 2010. *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415-307 B.C.E.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Evans, N. 2010. *Civic Rites: Democracy and Religion in Ancient Athens*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Faraguna, M. 2012. Società, amministrazione, diritto : lo statuto giuridico di tombe e *periboloi* nell'Atene classica. *Symposion* 11: 165-185.
- Faraone, C. 2008. Family and Household Religion in Ancient Greece. In J. Bodel and S.M. Olyan (eds) *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity: Contextual and Comparative Approaches*, 210-18. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Felton, D. 2010. The Dead. In D. Ogden (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Religion*, 86-99. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Fildes, V. 1988. *Wet Nursing: A History from Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Finley, M.I. 1979. The Fifth-Century Athenian Empire: A Balance Sheet. In P.D.A. Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker (eds) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, 103-126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, N. 1995. Hybris, Status and Slavery. In A. Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, 44-84. London: Routledge.
- Fisher, N. 2008. 'Independent' Slaves in Classical Athens and the Ideology of Slavery. In C. Katasari and E. Dal Lago (eds) *From Captivity to Freedom: Themes in Ancient and Modern Slavery*, 123-136. Leicester: University of Leicester.
- Flower, M.A. 2009. Athenian Religion and the Peloponnesian War. In O. Palagia (ed.) *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, 1-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, H. 2003. Mothers and Daughters. In J. Neils and J.H. Oakley (eds) *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past*, 113-137. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fragiadakis, C. 1986. *Die Attischen Sklavennamen: vor der späterarchaischen Epoche bis die römische Kaiserzeit. Eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung*. PhD thesis. Mannheim.
- Fraser, P.E. 1994. Citizens, Demesmen and Metics in Athens and Elsewhere. In M.H. Hansen (ed.) *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, 64-90. Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.
- Fröhlich, P. 2016. La Citoyenneté Grecque Entre Aristote et les Modernes. *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 27: 91-138.
- Frost, F.J. 1994. Aspects of Athenian Citizenship. In A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds) *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, 45-56. London: The John Hopkins Press.
- Garlan, Y. Trans J. Lloyd. 1988. *Slavery in Ancient Greece*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Garland, R.S.J. 1982. A First Catalogue of Attic Peribolos Tombs. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 77: 125-176.
- Garland, R. 1985. *The Greek Way of Death*. London: Duckworth.
- Garland, R. 1987. *The Piraeus: From the Fifth to First Century BC*. London: Duckworth.

Geagan, D.J. 2011. *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XVIII: Inscriptions: The Dedicatory Monuments*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Gerolymatos, A. 1986. *Espionage and Treason: A Study of the Proxenia in Political and Military Intelligence Gathering in Classical Greece*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Ginestí-Rosell, A. 2012. *Epigrafia funerària d'estrangers a Atenes (segles VI-IV aC) / Die Grabinschriften der Ausländer in Athen (6. bis 4. Jhr. v.Chr)*. Tarragona: Institut Català D'Arqueologia Clàssica.

Gleba, M. 2008. You Are What You Wear: Scythian Costume as Identity. In M. Gleba, C. Munkholt and M.L. Nosch (eds.) *Dressing the Past*, 13-28. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Golden, M. 1988. The Effects of Slavery on Citizen Households and Children: Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Athens. *Historical Reflections* 15 (3): 455-475.

Golden, M. 1990. *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Golden, M. 2011. Other People's Children. In B. Rawson (ed.) *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, 262-275. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gottesman, A. 2014. *Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gould, J. 1980. Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100: 38-59.

Graf, F. 2004. Sacrifice, Offerings and Votives: Greece. In S.I. Johnston (ed.) *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*, 340-343. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Grossman, J.B. 2001. *Greek Funerary Sculpture: Catalogue of the Collections at the Getty Villa*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Grossman, J.B. 2013. *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XXXV: Funerary Sculpture*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Haake, M. 2013. Illustrating, Documenting, Making-believe: The Use of *Psephismata* in Hellenistic Biographies of Philosophers. In P. Liddel and P. Low (eds) *Inscriptions and Theirs Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, 79-124. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Hagemajer Allen, K. 2003a. Becoming the "Other": Attitudes and Practices at Attic Cemeteries. In C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.) *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, 207-236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hagemajer Allen, K. 2003b. Intercultural Exchanges in Fourth Century Attic Decrees. *Classical Antiquity* 22 (2): 199-246.
- Hansen, M.H. 1985. *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century BC*. Herning: Systime.
- Hansen, M.H. 1996. City-Ethnics as Evidence for Polis Identity. In M.H. Hansen K. Raaflaub (eds) *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 169-196. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harris, E.M. 2002a. Workshop, Marketplace and Household: The Nature of Technical Specialization in Classical Athens and its Influence on Economy and Society. In P. Cartledge, E.E. Cohen and L. Foxhall (eds) *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece*, 67-99. London: Routledge.
- Harris, E.M. 2002b. Did Solon Abolish Debt-Bondage? *Classical Quarterly* 52 (2): 415-430.
- Harris, E.M. 2006. *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens: Essays on Law, Society and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, E.M. 2012. Homer, Hesiod, and the Origins of Greek Slavery. *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 114 (2): 345-366.
- Harris, E.M. 2012/2013. Review: Politics and the Street in Democratic Athens by A. Gottesman. *Classics Ireland* 19-20: 156-160.
- Hedrick Jr., C.W. 1999. Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit. *Hesperia* 68 (3): 387-439.
- Henry, A.S. 1977. *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees*. Leiden: Brill.
- Henry, A.S. 2002. The Athenian State Secretariat and Provisions for Publishing and Erecting Decrees. *Hesperia* 71 (1): 91-118.
- Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, G. 1990. Patterns of Name Diffusion Within the Greek World and Beyond. *Classical Quarterly* 40 (2): 349-363.
- Hochscheid, H. 2015. *Networks of Stone: Sculpture and Society in Archaic and Classical Athens*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Humphreys, S.C. 1993. *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies*. Second Edition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Hunt, P. 2011. Slaves in Greek Literary Culture. In K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (eds) *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Volume I: The Ancient Mediterranean*, 22-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, V. 2000. Introduction: Status Distinctions in Athenian Law. In V. Hunter and J. Edmondson (eds) *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens*, 1-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hurwit, J.M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanchik, A.I. 2005. Who were the 'Scythian' archers on Archaic Attic Vases? In D. Braund (ed.) *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (sixth century BC – first century AD)*, 100-113. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Ivantchik, A.I. 2006. 'Scythian' Archers on Archaic Attic Vases: Problems of Interpretation. *Ancient Civilisations from Scythia to Siberia* 12 (3-4): 197-271.
- Johansen, K.F. 1951. *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Jones, N.F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joshel, S.R., and S. Murnaghan. 1998. Introduction: Differential Equations. In S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds) *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, 1-21. London: Routledge.
- Kamen, D. 2013. *Status in Classical Athens*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Keesling, C.M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesling, K. 2005. Patrons of Athenia Votive Monuments of the Archaic and Classical Periods. *Hesperia* 74: 395-426.
- Kennedy, R.F. 2014. *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender Ethnicity and Citizenship in the Classical City*. London: Routledge.
- Kindt, J. 2009. Polis Religion – A Critical Appreciation. *Kernos* 22: 9-34.
- Kindt, J. 2015. Personal Religion: A Productive Category for the Study of Ancient Greek Religion? *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 135: 35-50.
- Klees, H. 1998. *Sklavenleben im klassischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Knigge, U. Trans J. Binder. 1991. *The Athenian Kerameikos: History, Monuments, Excavations*. Athens: Krene Editions.

- Kosmopoulou, A. 2001. 'Working Women': Female Professionals on Classical Attic Gravestones. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 96: 281-319.
- Kurtz, D.C., and J. Boardman. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Kyrtatas, D.J. 2011. Slavery and the Economy in the Greek World. In K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (eds) *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Volume I: The Ancient Mediterranean*, 91-111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laes, C. 2011. Midwives in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 176: 154-162.
- Lape, S. 2010. *Race and Citizenship Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lauffer, S. 1979. *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*. Second Edition. Wiesbaden.
- Lawton, C. 1993. Representations of Athenian Democracy in Attic Document Reliefs. In J. Ober and C.W. Hedrick (eds) *The Birth of Democracy: An Exhibition Celebrating the 2500th Anniversary of Democracy*, 12-16. Washington, D.C: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Lawton, C. 1995. *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lawton, C.L. 2003. Athenian Anti-Macedonian Sentiment and Democratic Ideology in Attic Document Reliefs in the Second Half of the Fourth Century BC. In O. Palagia and S.V. Tracy (eds) *The Macedonians in Athens, 322-229 BC*, 317-327. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Lawton, C. 2009. Attic Votive Reliefs and the Peloponnesian War. In O. Palagia (ed.) *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, 66-93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawton, C. 2017. *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XXXVIII: The Votive Reliefs*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Lewis, D.M. 2011. Near Eastern Slaves in Classical Attica and the Slave Trade with Persian Territories. *Classical Quarterly* 61 (1): 91-113.
- Lewis, D.M. 2018. *Greek Slave Systems in their Eastern Mediterranean Context, c.800-146 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liddel, P. 2003. The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees from the 5th Century BC to the 3rd Century AD. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 143: 79-93.

- Liston, M.A. and S. Rotroff. 2013. Babies in the Well: Archaeological Evidence for Newborn Disposal in Hellenistic Greece. In J. Evans Grubbs, T. Parkin and R. Bell (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, 62-82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löhr, C. 2000. *Griechische Familienweihungen: Untersuchungen einer Repräsentationsform von ihre Anfängen bis zum Ende des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.* Rahden: Leidorf.
- Low, P. 2007. *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece: Morality and Power.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacLachlan, B. 2012. *Women in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook.* London: Continuum.
- Manville, P.B. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Martin, T.R. 1996. *Ancient Greece: From Prehistoric to Hellenistic Times.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Maurizio, L. 1998. The Panathenaic Procession: Athens' Participatory Democracy on Display. In D. Boedeker and K.A. Raafuab (eds) *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, 297-313. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McClure, L. 2003. *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus.* London: Routledge.
- Meyer, E.A. 1993. Epitaphs and Citizenship in Classical Athens. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 113: 99-121.
- Meyer, M. 1989. *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs.* Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Miller, J. 2016. Euergetism, Agonism, and Democracy: The Hortatory Intention in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Athenian Honorific Decrees. *Hesperia* 85 (2): 385-435.
- Miller, M.C. 1991. Foreigners at the Greek Symposium. In W.J. Slater (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context*, 59-81. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Miller, M.C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Millett, P. 1998. Encounters in the Agora. In P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden (eds) *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, 203-228. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mirhady, D.C. 2000. The Athenian Rationale for Torture. In V. Hunter and J. Edmondson (eds) *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens*, 53-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitropoulou, E. 1968. *Attic Votive Reliefs of the Fourth Century BC*. PhD thesis.
- Mitropoulou, E. 1977. *Corpus I: Attic Votive Reliefs of the 6th and 5th Centuries BC*. Athens: Pyli.
- Morris, I. 1994. Everyman's Grave. In A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds) *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, 67-101. London: The John Hopkins Press.
- Morris, I. 1998. Remaining Invisible: The Archaeology of the Excluded in Classical Athens. In S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds) *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, 193-220. London: Routledge.
- Morris, I. 2011. Archaeology and Greek Slavery. In K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (eds) *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Volume I: The Ancient Mediterranean*, 176-193. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neer, R.T. 2012. *Art and Archaeology of the Greek World, c.2500-150 BCE*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Nielsen, T.H., Bjertrup, L., Hansen, M.H., Rubinstein, L., and Vertergaard, T. 1989. Athenian Grave Monuments and Social Class. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30: 411-420.
- Niku, M. 2004. When and Why did the Athenian μετοικία System Disappear? The Evidence of Inscriptions. *Arctos* 38: 75-94.
- Oakley, J.H. 2003. Death and the Child. In J. Neils and J.H. Oakley (eds) *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past*, 163-194. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Oakley, J.H. 2004. *Picturing Death in Classical Athens: The Evidence of the White Lekythoi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oakley, J.H. 2013. Children in Archaic and Classical Greek Art: A Survey. In J.E. Grubbs and T. Parkin (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, 147-171. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oliver, G.J. 2000a. An Introduction to the Epigraphy of Death: Funerary Inscriptions as Evidence. In G.J. Oliver (ed.) *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, 1-23. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press.
- Oliver, G.J. 2000b. Athenian Funerary Monuments: Style, Grandeur and Cost. In G.J. Oliver (ed.) *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, 59-80. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press.

- Osborne, M.J. 1981-1983. *Naturalization in Athens, Volume I-IV*. Brussel: Paleis Der Academiën – Hertogsstraat, I.
- Osborne, M.J., and S.G. Byrne. 1996. *The Foreign Residents of Athens: An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica*. Lovanii: Studia Hellenistica.
- Osborne, R. 1997. Law, the Democratic Citizen and the Representation of Women in Classical Athens. *Past and Present* 155: 3-33.
- Osborne, R. 2011. *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, R. 2015. Public and Private. In R.Raja, and J. Rüpke (eds) *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*, 71-80. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Patterson, C. 1981. *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451-50 BC*. Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer Company Publishers, Inc.
- Patterson, C. 2000. The Hospitality of Athenian Justice: The Metic in Court. In V. Hunter and J. Edmondson (eds) *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens*, 93-112. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, C. 2006. 'Citizen Cemeteries' in Classical Athens? *Classical Quarterly* 56 (1): 48-56.
- Patterson, C. 2007. Other Sorts: Slaves, Foreigners and Women in Periclean Athens. In L.J. Samons II (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*, 153-178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pedley, J. 2005. *Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Planeaux, C. 2000. The Date of Bendis' Entry into Attica. *The Classical Journal* 96 (2): 165-192.
- Platt, V. 2015. Epiphany. In E. Eidinow and J. Kindt (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*, 491-504. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pomeroy, S.B., S.M. Burstein, W. Donlan, and J. Tolbert Roberts. 2008. *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Posamentir, R. 2006. *Bemalte Attische Grabstelen Klassischer Zeit*. Munich: Biering and Brinkmann.
- Purvis, A. 2003. *Singular Dedications: Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*. London: Routledge.

- Rabinowitz, N.S. 1998. Slaves with Slaves: Women and Class in Euripidean tragedy. In S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds) *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, 56-68. London: Routledge.
- Randall, R.H. 1953. The Erechtheum Workmen. *American Journal of Archaeology* 57 (3): 199-210.
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: The Archaeological Institute of America.
- Reeder, E.D. 1995. Women and Men in Classical Greece. In E.D. Reeder (ed.) *Pandora: Women in Classical Greece*, 20-31. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2010. *A History of the Classical Greek World, 478-323 BC*. Second edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1977. *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1981. *Fifth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1997. *Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Riemann, H. 1940. *Kerameikos: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen II: Die Skulpturen vom 5. Jahrhundert bis in Römische Zeit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Rihll, T. 1996. The Origin and Establishment of Greek Slavery. In M.L. Bush (ed.) *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage*, 89-111. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Rosenzweig, R. 2004. *Worshipping Aphrodite: Art and Cult in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rubinstein, L. 2004. Ionia. In M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 1053-1107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sargent, R.L. 1924. *The Size of the Slave Population at Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Before Christ*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Scholl, A. 1996. *Die Attischen Bildfeldstelen des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den kleinformatigen Grabreliefs im spätklassischen Athen*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Sears, M.A. 2015. Athens. In J. Valeva, E. Nankov and D. Graninger (eds) *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, 308-319. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shapiro, H.A. 1983. Amazons, Thracians and Scythians. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 24 (2): 105-114.

Shapiro, H.A. 2003. Fathers and Sons, Men and Boys. In J. Neils and J.H. Oakley (eds) *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past*, 85-111. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shear, J.L. 2007. Cultural Change, Space and the Politics of Commemoration in Athens. In R. Osborne (ed.) *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy and Politics, 430-380 BC*, 91-115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shepherd, G. 2013. Ancient Identities: Age, Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Greek Burials. In S. Tarlow and L.N. Stutz (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial, 543-557*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shörner, G. and H.R. Goette. 2004. *Die Pan-Grotte von Vari*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Shulze, H. 1998. *Ammen und Pädagogen: Sklavinnen und Sklaven als Erzieher in der antiken Kunst und Gesellschaft*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Sickinger, J. 1999. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Small, D.B. 1995. Monuments, Laws and Analysis: Combining Archaeology and Text in Ancient Athens. In D.B. Small (ed.) *Methods in the Mediterranean: Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology*, 143-174. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, A.C. 2011. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. Leiden: Brill.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995a. 'Reading' Greek Death: *To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1995b. Male and Female, Public and Private, Ancient and Modern. In E.D. Reeder (ed.) *Pandora: Women in Classical Greece*, 111-119. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2000a. What is *Polis* Religion? In R. Buxton (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, 13-37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2000b. Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion. In R. Buxton (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, 38-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stamatopoulou, M. 2010. 'Totenmahl' Reliefs of the 4th-2nd Centuries BC and the Archaeology of Feasting in a Funerary Context. In O. Hekster and S.T.A.M. Mols (eds) *Cultural Messages in the Graeco-Roman World. Acta of the BABESCH 80th Anniversary Workshop Radboud University Nijmegen, September 8th 2006*, 11-22. Leuven and Walpole, MA: Peeters.

- Stears, K. 1995. Dead Women's Society: Constructing Female Gender in Classical Athenian Funerary Sculpture. In N. Spencer (ed.) *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology: 'Bridging the Great Divide,'* 109-131. London: Routledge.
- Stears, K. 2000. The Times They Are A'Changing: The Developments in Fifth Century Funerary Sculpture. In G.J. Oliver (ed.) *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, 25-58. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press.
- Stewart, A. 1995. Imag(in)ing the Other: Amazons and Ethnicity in Fifth Century Athens. *Poetics Today* 16 (4): 571-597.
- Stroud, R.S. 1974. An Athenian Law on Silver Coinage. *Hesperia* 42 (2): 157-188.
- Taylor, C. 2015. Social Networks and Social Mobility in Fourth Century Athens. In C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, 35-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, C., and K. Vlassopoulos. 2015. Introduction: An Agenda for the Study of Greek History. In C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, 1-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thönges-Stringaris, R. 1965. Das griechische Totenmahl. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Athenische Abteilung*. Band 80: 1-99.
- Thür, G. 1977. *Bewiesführung vor den Schwurgerichtshöfen Athens: die Proklesis zur Basanos*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tsiafakis, D. 2000. The Allure and Repulsion of Thracians in the Art of Classical Athens. In B. Cohen (ed.) *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, 364-389. Leiden: Brill.
- van Straten, F.T. 1981. Gifts for the Gods. In H.S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope, and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, 65-151. Leiden: Brill.
- van Straten, F. 2000. Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries. In R. Buxton (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, 191-223. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vermeule, C. 1972. Greek Funerary Animals, 450-300 BC. *American Journal of Archaeology* 76 (1): 49-59.
- Vestergaard, T. 2000. Milesian Immigrants in Late Hellenistic and Roman Athens. In G.J. Oliver (ed.) *The Epigraphy of Death: Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*, 82-109. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2007. Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and the Democracy in Classical Athens. *Classical Quarterly* 57 (1): 33-52.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2009. Slavery, Freedom and Citizenship in Classical Athens: Beyond a Legalistic Approach. *European Review of History* 16 (3): 347-363.

- Vlassopoulos, K. 2010. Athenian Slave Names and Athenian Social History. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175: 113-144.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2015. Plotting Strategies, Networks and Communities in Classical Athens: The Evidence of Slave Names. . In C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos (eds) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, 101-127. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walbank, M.B. 1978. *Athenian Proxemies of the Fifth Century BC*. Toronto: Samuel-Stevens Publishers Ltd.
- Warre Cornish, F. 1898. *A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. London: Murray.
- Watson, J. 2010. The Origin of the Metic Status. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 56: 259-278.
- Westermann, W.L. 1955. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: American Philisophical Society.
- Whitehead, D. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society (Supplementary Volume no. 4).
- Whitehead, D. 1983. Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Φιλοτιμια in Democratic Athens. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34: 55-74.
- Wiedemann, T. 1981. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. London: Croom Helm.
- Wijma, S.M. 2014. *Embracing the Immigrant: The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion (5th-4th century BC)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Wilson, P. 2007. Pronomos and Potamon: Two Pipers and Two Epigrams. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 127: 141-149.
- Wrenhaven, K. 2012. *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of the Slave in Ancient Greece*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2005. *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*. Leiden: Brill.