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PORT DE MUNICHIE

Ce Port est de forme ovale, il a un mille de circuit;
Une ligne qui le sépare en deux dans sa longueur, est
Sud un quart à l'Est 5 degrés à l'Est et Nord un
quart à l'Ouest 5 degrés à l'Ouest.
On voit sur la côte que j'ai marqué du chiffre 1 de
petites digues formées de pierres larges d'environ 3
pieds et distante l'une de l'autre de 2
de la fond du Port du Pirée est au Sud Sud Est
de l'embouchure de celui de Munichie, cette embou-
chure a 2 brasse de profondeur.

PORT DU PIRE

2 et 2 Tours ruinées
3. Debris du Phare du Pirée : la côte prise sur ce
Phare nous observons, qu'une des 2 Tours nous
rencontre Sud Sud Ouest, et l'autre Nord Nord Est.
L'épaulon marque 4, nous restent Est Nord Est, l'autre
eau au nord marque 6, est juste à l'Est, ces deux
épaulons étaient entre eux Sud quart de Sud Est,
Nord quart de Nord Ouest.

Des trois Ports construits dans le Pirée.
Le plus grand marqué 6 à 600 pas de circuit, il a

Carle des Port de Pirée

La Roy Arch. del.
Port Phalere

Ce Port a 300 Pas géométrique de circuit sa profondeur est à l'entrée de son bassin de 4 brasors, de 2 au centre et d'une au fond.

Une ligne qui passe par le milieu du Port et par son embouchure a sa direction Nord Ouest quart d'Ouest, Sud Est quart d'Est.

Nous posons la boussole sur l'extrémité d'une petite digue marquée a, et nous trouvons que la Citadelle d'Athènes nous restoit Nord Est quart d'Est 2 degrés Nord Est, le Cap Colias Sud Est quart de Sud 2 degrés Sud, la Pointe de l'Isle d'Égine Sud Sud Ouest.
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THE BOOKS the Latsis Group has taught us to expect at the end of every year combine the pleasure of receiving a gift with our amazed discovery of a new dimension in the world of art.

The initiative to publish this new archaeology book, this time on the Museum of Piraeus, seeks to fill an information void in the depiction of the life and art of a progressive urban community, which set the material foundations for the Athens of Pericles, while constituting its democratic conscience. The Museum of Piraeus is, however, a very successful choice from another perspective. The variety and excellent quality of the exhibits, as well as the immediacy of their relationship with the life of the ancient city, offer a wonderful introduction to the beautiful world of humanity’s youth, to the world that was Classical Greece.

The academic community, antiquaries, and the general public, will, I am sure, welcome this new acquisition with great pleasure.

Warm congratulations are due to the Latsis Group—to Marianna Latsis and Evangelos Chronis—and naturally, to George Steinhauer, the Director of the Second Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, as well as to his staff.

EVANGELOS VENIZELOS
Minister of Culture
The museum buildings and the ancient theatre of Zea
MANY PEOPLE ARE UNFAMILIAR with the Archaeological Museum of Piraeus and its treasure of precious exhibits.

By selecting this museum as the subject of the annual publication sponsored by the Latsis Group and EFG Eurobank Ergasias, we believe we are providing a rare opportunity for the public to become familiar with the masterpieces preserved in the museum. Moreover, we are closely and inextricably linked to Piraeus, because the founder of the Latsis Group, my father Yiannis Latsis, embarked upon his entrepreneurial activities from this city’s beautiful and historic port.

The Apollo, which is the museum’s most outstanding work, illustrates the high art of the archaic period in all its glory. A gift from the soil of Piraeus to the city’s inhabitants, and to all those moved by ancient glory.

I must single out the archaeologist George Steinhauer, and express my personal thanks to him, as well as to his collaborators at the Archaeological Museum of Piraeus, for the scholarly work they accomplish behind the scenes, bringing to the fore our extremely important national riches. I would also like to extend my warm thanks to all those who laboured to produce this book.

This publication is dedicated to those Greeks, who grew up in the embrace of the city of Piraeus, and who contributed to the development and international promotion of Greece and its treasures.

MARIANNA LATSIS
AT THE BEGINNING OF A BOOK, one usually explains why and how it was written. As regards the first, I have little to say. Because, although I could be accused of partiality due to my love of Piraeus and its antiquities, the discrepancy between the museum’s real significance and its nonexistent promotion offers in and of itself a very powerful objective argument for this publication. There is more to say regarding the proposed approach to the world of the Archaeological Museum of Piraeus. Such a book necessarily has a dual purpose: it is an art book and, simultaneously, an introduction to the ancient city. In its pages, the historian looks to reconstruct through excavation finds from sanctuaries, houses, and graveyards the features and the life of a city that constituted the manifestation, both in form and function, of the idea and the practice of Athenian democracy. And indeed here, among the exhibits of the Museum, the dominant monuments are not those of a state authority but rather those demonstrating the urban pride of a population of merchants, sailors, and artisans; this portrait of the city is accompanied by that of the rural surroundings, an integral part of the ancient city, and hence its necessary complement, provided by a large number of exhibits from the surrounding municipalities, especially those on the coast and on the island of Salamis.

Beyond the depiction—and the mythological transcendence—of daily life, one finds the vessel representations, the series of funerary reliefs, and statue types offer direct access into the soul of the whole population, as well as an illustration of the dramatic change in the perception of the divine and the human, which took place in Greece during that unique moment of antiquity. More serious, undoubtedly, was the challenge posed by the archaeological portion of the book, the need to compose a consistent text—rid of the descriptive logic of a scholarly catalogue—from that entire microcosm of beautiful items that—like poetry (are they not actually short poems?)—provide beauty and, thus, turn our day-to-day world into a more serene, simple and noble place, similar to the world of classical art; such a synthesis would offer a gradus ad Parnassum through a tour of the Museum halls.

A book that balances between such high goals, between the need for scholarly accuracy and an exalted “poetic” approach is frequently in danger of pleasing no one. Even then, however, the material itself remains, a unique, remarkably well presented, and mostly unfamiliar treasure of rare objects, among them a metrologic relief, a bronze battering ram, and the musical instruments from the “poet’s tomb”. These small and large works of art reach their high point in the Hellenistic figurine of a “crouching Aphrodite”, the collection of exceptional quality funerary monuments, and the unique bronze statues of the 1959 find, which for the first time are
fully documented through photographs; the collection also includes monuments that bring to life the climate of worship or the funereal display, such as the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods, or the funerary monument of Kallithea.

Lately, much has been said—and written—about the crisis in classical education and the risk to the future of humanism. It would be a great success if this book—apart from the pleasure it will undoubtedly provide—assisted the reader in realizing that these museum objects do not simply constitute an integral part of our tradition or education, but also the prerequisite for our very survival.

Here, I would like to thank every one who contributed to the book. The Latsis Group and EFG Eurobank Ergasias for deciding to dedicate a book to the Museum of Piraeus, and especially Marianna Latsis, whose constant and consistent dedication to culture made this work possible. Special thanks to Latsis Group Managing Director Evangelos Chronis, for the interest he demonstrated from the very beginning, not only in the book, but the Museum as well. The artefact photographs, this volume’s essential element, are the work of the exceptional photographers, Socrates Mavrommatis and Yannis Patrikianos. Without the help of Eirini Louvrou who provided the necessary guiding thread amidst the difficult paths of contemporary editorial practice, and the taste and experience of Lika Florou, we would have lost a great deal of the aesthetic joy the book bestows even before it is opened, and consequently of its success.

GEORGE STEINHAUER
Curator of Antiquities, Attica
Entrance of the original building of the Museum of Piraeus.
THE HISTORY OF THE MUSEUM

THE CORE OF THE ANTIQUITIES COLLECTION of the Archaeological Museum of Piraeus consists of the funerary monuments, primarily stelae, found in situ in the ancient city’s northern cemetery, which had been collected by the antiquary Ioannis Meletopoulos in his garden on Thivon Street, as well as the chance finds that surfaced during the city’s construction and development projects. Conversely, the most remarkable finds uncovered during excavations carried out by the special superintendent and Lyceum director Iakovos Dragatsis on behalf of the Archaeological Society, ended up in the National Archaeological Museum. The antiquities, as was then customary in all Greek towns, were first collected in the Gymnasium school on Korai Square, where the first exhibition of the Archaeological Collection of Piraeus was organized.

The creation of a local museum dates no further back than 1935. The delay here—as in many other sectors—may be explained by the town’s location adjacent to Athens. The original museum, which today functions as a storage facility, was constructed on the state-appropriated land of the ancient theatre of Zea, contiguous to the theatre and on the ruins of a (possibly early Christian) basilica, mentioned by the earliest explorers of Piraeus. It is a small building consisting of three successive halls; its principal feature is the eclectic façade on Philellinon Street, with its recessed entrance stairs, framed by a pair of marble lions from a funerary enclosure in the Tambouria quarter. Since 1960, when the Archaeological Service was reorganized after the tribulations of the war (see V. H. Petrakos, History of the Archaeological Service—in Greek), the Museum of Piraeus, as the central Museum of the Ephorate of Attica, collected the finds of excavations, which took place in the area encompassing the Municipality of Piraeus, the island of Salamis, and the Attica Basin (excluding the Municipality of Athens), especially Moschato, Kallithea and the coastal areas (Glyfada, Voula, Vari). However, until at least 1966, any specific items that were considered outstanding continued to be transferred to the National Archaeological Museum. At the same time, private collections were donated, the Nomidis - Valsamakis Collection for example, and, in particular, the Geroulanos Collection, containing the finds from the family’s Trachones estate, which provided a large part of the vessels in the museum.

The most important excavation finds to enrich the museum collection were, prior to WWII, a series of Neo-Attic plaques found in a Roman shipwreck in the port, and the excavation finds of Ioannis Threpsiadis at the Munychia Sanctuary. In the post-war period, the 1959 discovery of the great bronze statues, resulted in a great deal of publicity for Piraeus’ antiquities, simultaneously bolstering the demand of the people of Piraeus for the creation of a new and larger Museum, something accomplished in 1966, through a decision of Minister of the Presidency Evangelos Savvopoulos, a Piraeus native. So too was Andreas Andrianopoulos, the Minister of Culture to whom we owe the return to Piraeus of the bronze statues, discovered in 1959, which had been transferred for conservation to the National Archaeological Museum and remained there on display.
The exhibits, enriched by the finds from the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods in Moschato and the funerary monument of Kallithea, was the work of successive curators—Euthemios Mastrokostas, Olga Alexandri, and Vassileios Petrakos. The contributions of the archaeologist Georgios Despinis and the sculptor Stelios Triantis were notable. The new Museum was inaugurated in 1981. On the occasion of Stelios Triantis’ restoration of the Kallithea monument in 1998, the old exhibition was renewed and expanded through the addition of two more halls; the first is dedicated to objects that demonstrate ancient Piraeus’s role as a naval base and mercantile centre, the second to antique pottery and objects from private life. Today, the Museum of Piraeus constitutes a small but exceptionally interesting collection of artefacts invaluable for illustrating the life of the ancient city as well as for comprehending the evolution of ancient art.
A JOURNEY THROUGH THE HISTORY
AND THE MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT PIRAEUS

THE FOLLOWING SHORT INTRODUCTION to the history and topography of ancient Piraeus might also be useful as a guide to more effectively restore the imaginary space-time of the exhibitions.

A rocky promontory, which may have originally been an island, at the swampy estuary of the Kifissos river, cut off from the coast of Phaleron Bay, stretching from Kollas at Ai-Giorgis in Palaio Phaleron to the rock of Eetionia at Drapetsana, Piraeus owed its—belated, dating back to just the 5th century BCE—prosperity to the farsighted spirit and strong will of Themistocles who succeeded in overcoming Athenian rural conservatism, demonstrating that the city’s future was to be found in the sea.

Themistocles recognized the unique value of the infertile promontory’s three ports, which, along with their proximity of Athens, were crucially important not only to the original settlement but to the distinctive subsequent mobility of the population of Piraeus and the city’s historical adventures. The establishment and prosperity of Piraeus in antiquity, as well as in the contemporary era, are indissolubly linked to the fortunes of Athens. With his initial decision (as early as 494 BCE) to fortify the cities, and later (in 482 BCE) to build the fleet that would save Athens, Greece, and the future of Europe at Salamis, Themistocles was rightly considered the founder of the Athenian Empire and, at the same time, the hero-founder of Piraeus. No information exists on the nature of the earlier deme (district) of Piraeus under Cleisthenes, then part of the tetrakomia (four settlements), which encompassed the nearby demes of Thymaitadai (Keratsini), Xypeté (Kaminia-Rendis-Moschato) and Phaleron, with the sanctuary of Heracles at Kaminia as its religious centre. What is certain is that it bore no relation at all to the new city that sprang up fully armed in the early 5th century BCE, like Athena from the head of Zeus.

Like its establishment, the development of Piraeus was the result of a continuous series of bold decisions and—one might say—the expression of the audacious spirit and entrepreneurship of the Athenian democracy, and the starting point for an intellectual journey far from the narrow confines of the archaic city. Thus, if—as it appears—the classical era was a purely Athenian creation, founded on naval dominance, it is certain that Piraeus—offering simultaneously a base for the fleet and the workforce to support it—constituted the requirement for the new democracy and the new era. Democracy, in its turn, set the tone of the city, its urban form, the behaviours of its inhabitants, and its history.

Nowadays, it is only possible to approach this unique adventure in human history through the ancient monuments in Piraeus and the exhibits in its museum. The city’s monuments express the material foundations and democratic principles upon which the financial capital of the
Athenian state was founded. If the first are to be sought in the excellently maintained walls that even now surround Piraeus, or in the foundations of the naval station buildings, the rational and democratic—based on citizen isonomy (equality)—organization of the city reveals the personality of Hippodamus of Miletus, philosopher and father of urban planning, who designed it and whom we can approach only through a knowledge of Piraeus, his sole preserved work.

The construction of the city of Piraeus began immediately after the Persians departed, specifically—according to the earliest finds—around 470–460 BCE. Previously, during the Persian Wars, the naval station had been fortified and organized. It was linked to Athens via the Long Walls, a project begun under Cimon in 460 BCE and completed ten years later by Pericles, with the construction of the Middle Wall; this created the conditions for an Athens impregnable by land, the ruler of a naval, by this time, empire, with Piraeus serving for over one hundred years from approximately 470 BCE until 350 BCE, with some short interruptions, as its military, trade, financial, and, in part, political centre. “Then the greatness of our city brings it about that all the good things from all over the world flow in to us”, Pericles would boast (Thucydides, B38), something which—despite his negative viewpoint—not even the Athenian Old Oligarch (Pseudo-Xenophon) could deny in his Constitution of the Athenians (2.7). The variety of goods unloaded in Piraeus, and their geographic origins as depicted by the comic Hermippus around 430 BCE (see, Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists, 1.27e-f) were worthy of any present-day consumer city: “From Cyrene come silphium and hides, from the Hellespont mackerel and every sort of preserved fish, from Italy groats and ribs of beef…pigs and cheese come from Syracuse, sails and papyrus from Egypt, frankincense from Syria, cypress wood from Crete, ivory from Libya, from Rhodes come raisins and figs, from Euboea pears and apples, from Phrygia slaves, and from Arcadia mercenaries, domestics from Pagasae, acorns and almonds from Paphlagonia, dates and wheat from Phoenicia, carpets and multi-coloured pillows from Carthage.”

The strategic significance of the new city was the reason for the very jubilant destruction of its fortifications and Long Walls by the Spartans and their oligarch allies after the end of the Peloponnesian war in 404 BCE, as well as for the swift reconstruction using Persian funds that occurred under Conon immediately after the victorious naval battle of Cnidus in 394 BCE. A great deal of information on the flourishing trade and the overall economic life of Piraeus during the 4th century BCE is provided by the court orators, primarily Demosthenes, and by various monuments. The determination and tenacious effort Athens put into maintaining its naval hegemony in the Aegean, which was not even interrupted by the defeat at Chaeronea in 338 BCE, were demonstrated by the constant expansion of the fleet and the simultaneous construction of the great Arsenal and the 378 neosoikoi (ship sheds), which during those years tightly surrounded the perimeter of the military ports of Zea and Munychia, and the military section of the commercial port. It is a tragic irony that the Arsenal was completed a few years before the destruction of the Athenian navy at the naval battle of Amorgos (322 BCE).

During the greater part of the 3rd century BCE, Piraeus, and particularly the fortress of Munychia, would constitute the bulwark of Macedonian domination in Attica and, at the same time, a link in the chain of Macedonian fortresses controlling Greece. After the 229 BCE liberation, as Athens began to limit itself to the role of a cultural capital of the Hellenistic and subsequently Roman world, the importance of Piraeus declined. From then on, the famous naval station would remain a huge empty shell (κάρυον κενόν) as the comic Hermippus described the Piraeus of the decade 404–394 BCE.

The beginning of the Roman era was marked by the long siege and destruction of Piraeus
Piraeus and the Long Walls; 1881 map by J. A. Kaupert.
(86 BCE), the consequence of Athens’ collaboration with Mithridates of Pontus. The symbols of Athenian naval power, the ship sheds and the Arsenal were torched. The city was abandoned and habitation was confined, according to Strabo, to the area around the port and the temple of Zeus Soter. The city would never again extend beyond those limits, despite restoration efforts, which took place under Pompey, Augustus, and Hadrian, as well as in the early Byzantine period.

In the post-Byzantine era, Piraeus, with the exception of the monastery of St. Spyridon, the customs building (Dogana), and one single house, all of which survived until the 1821 Greek War of Independence, was completely abandoned, its very name forgotten. The town acquired the name Porto Leone or Porto Draco from a giant funerary lion, placed at an unknown date near the entrance of the port, later moved to the inner harbour. Francesco Morosini, to whom
we owe the earliest map of the area (containing the fortification plans of Munychia), took that last monument with him when he left; it now adorns the entrance to the naval station of Venice.

The most impressive remains of the ancient city, the primary citadel of Athenian democracy, are its fortifications, Themistocles’ first concern and the object of constant attention on the part of all the great Athenian politicians during the city’s rise and fall, from Pericles to Lycurgus, Demosthenes, and the brothers, Eurycleides and Micon; after 229 BCE, the latter attempted to resurrect Athens in a different, by then Hellenistic world. Of these fortifications, the gates of Athens and Eetioneia still survive, as well as a large section of the wall along the length of the coast of Piraeus.

The first and foremost function of Piraeus as the base of the Athenian naval empire may be found in the scattered ruins of the naval station, the storerooms of the vessels, and the equip-
ment of the fleet. Only a small section remains—and may currently be visited—of the ancient naval yard, which served as the foundation of the power of Athens, and indirectly that unique moment in the history of civilization, which acquired the name of Pericles: Three ship sheds from the complex excavated by Dragatsis in 1880, preserved in the basement of an apartment house at the corner of Akti Moutsopoulou and Sirangeiou Streets in the port of Zea (just recently four more were discovered in the port of Munychia), and the entrance to the famous Arsenal of Philon.

The neosoikoi are the earliest public buildings of Piraeus. The number of the first permanent installations, constructed originally under Themistocles, gradually increased in accordance with the needs of the fleet. In 404 BCE, the ship sheds, which had cost at least 3,000 talents (Isocrates 7.66), were sold off as construction material by the Thirty Tyrants for only three talents. Immediately after the Peloponnesian war, a systematic re-building program was put into effect; as a result the naval catalogue of 330/329 BCE already recorded a total of 373 neosoikoi, 83 in Munychia, 196 in Zea, and 94 in the military section of Cantharus, the main port. Neosoikoi were essentially, monumental shelters, each divided by colonnades into two parallel compartments (5.60 m. wide and 42 m. long to the water’s edge) under a double pitched roof. Between the colonnades was a slipway, either masonry or carved stone with a wooden floor and a channel for the keel, which was used to haul in the triremes. The rear of the sheds was closed off with a continuous wall, with an entrance from the street. To avoid sabotage, the naval station was surrounded by an enclosure; its remnants were discovered behind the ship sheds in Zea as well as in Munychia.

The trireme rigging and equipment (sails, ropes, lanyards, tents to shelter crews from waves and enemy arrows), were stored in special buildings, the arsenals. The Arsenal constructed (347/6–323/2 BCE) according to the plans of the great architect Philon, was famous in antiquity—centuries after it was destroyed. In 1888, the discovery of the famous IG II2 1688 inscription with the architect’s detailed specifications permitted the building to be fully rendered on paper. The building itself was discovered exactly one hundred years later—in 1988—in the NW corner of the port of Zea. It is an oblong (130 m. x 18 m.) building with entrances at both narrow ends, separated by a double colonnade of piers into three aisles: the side aisles contained 78 compartments (34 on either side of the central corridor), which were closed off by a low railing and a door between the piers. Each compartment contained a loft with wooden shelves for the
The Cononian wall on the shore of Piraeus; DAI photography archive.

The neosoikoi of Zea; DAI photography archive.
ropes, while below, behind every pier at mid-wall level, was a chest for storing the sails—of a total of 134 triremes. The central aisle served as a corridor, so that at any moment—a superior example of democratic transparency—any citizen could inspect the contents of the naval station. The building orientation along with the special openings provided, also allowed for ventilation, and protected the fabrics from mould.

Even fewer—almost non-existent—are the remains of the buildings of the Emporion, the commercial sector of Cantharus. Here and there, one might locate in the mire, created by the rise in the sea level, some traces of the ancient wharf or the docks marked on old maps of Piraeus, while it is not easy to reproduce the arrangement of the five stoas (portico) framing it. It was only recently that—at the corner of Akti Poseidonos and Gounari Streets—part of the most famous portico, the renowned Makra Stoa was discovered; here, grain was distributed to the hoplites, and—when the harvest was poor—to all Athenians.

Of the city itself, whole city blocks are preserved where one may detect the basic network Hippodamus designed with its roads and drainage system, as well as the building elevations designed by the great philosopher and urban planner according to the model of democratic isonomy.
THE ANCIENT CITY IN THE MUSEUM

THE NARRATIVE OF RUINS, with its romantically tinged references to great eras past, remains enigmatic to the archaeologist while the philologist considers it uninteresting and soulless. The pulse of the city’s life and the spirit of its inhabitants may only be experienced through the museum exhibits.

Piraeus’ famous Agora of Hippodamus is a characteristic example. Not even a trace remains; its very location is subject to debate. The sole monument that may refer to it is a stele with the inscription ΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΗΟΡΟΣ incised in Attic script, as was the custom in the 5th century BCE. This may be one of the boundary marks that Hippodamus used to define the purpose of the sites and set the boundaries of the basic sectors and functions during the design of the city of Piraeus, which according to Aristotle (Politics) constitutes the sole known
work of this great urban planner and philosopher.

Correspondingly, the significance of the Naval Station ruins, the ship sheds, and the Arsenal, may only be understood through the Naval Catalogues, and especially through knowledge of the trireme, the classical era’s weapon of choice for naval conflict, which, beginning with the Persian Wars, dominated the Mediterranean for two centuries. The trireme, as indicated by the dimensions of the Zea neosoikoi, was an oblong (33 m. long and 3.5 m. wide, 2.10 m. above the water line) manoeuvrable wooden vessel, a light structure with a shallow keel, designed to be a three storey “rowing machine” with 170 rowers. We can acquire an understanding of these ships, lost forever in the depths of the seas, through the unique pieces exhibited in the Museum of Piraeus, among them the great eye with its balanced curves, brought to life by the iris in the centre, its paint still visible. This is one of the many inset marble eyes, found (broken or whole) in the port of Zea and the ruins of the Arsenal. The eyes, secured with a nail in the place of the pupil, decorated both sides of the bow giving the illusion of a live organism, a sea creature, with oars for fins. When ships collide, just as in the case of the shields of a phalanx or a battering ram, the purpose is to disrupt enemy cohesion, to breach the ship or the castle gate. The “spearhead” of the trireme, and therefore its raison d’être, was a powerful wooden construction, the extension, in a matter of speaking, of the keel, fitted—sheathed—with a curved bronze battering ram, an exceptionally precious piece of equipment, which, should the ship be destroyed, the trireme’s captain was obligated to collect and surrender. In the 6th century BCE, this ram, shaped like

Trireme eye.
Bronze trireme battering ram.
a boar’s head, concentrated the terrifying power the attacking ship emanated, when, like a monster brought to life, it tore through the waves. The classical ram, on the contrary, like the siege ram, had a functional wedge-shape, reinforced by three powerful horizontal projections, so that, viewed from the side, it called to mind the trident, the weapon of the ruler of the sea. The specimen exhibited in the Museum of Piraeus is one of the very few preserved to this day. Its strong compact form (just 0.80 m. long and weighing approximately 80 kg.) indicates it probably belonged to a classical trireme. Despite the basic, identical shape, there are certain characteristic differences that differentiate it from the other preserved specimens, a much larger Hellenistic one (in the Haifa Museum) and a stylized, much smaller one in the Museum of Bremen.

The museum contains many archaic stone anchors discovered during the dredging project to deepen the Passalimani harbour; they are obviously connected to triremes moored at the Zea naval station. They are all shaped like a truncated pyramid with a horizontal through and through hole at the top and are constructed of a volcanic stone of unknown origin, possibly from neighbouring Methana. As to their use, they may have been used, according to recent suggestions, as fixed moorings to tie up ships. The ships were, one assumes, equipped with iron (or iron-plated wooden) anchors, their shape similar to contemporary anchors.

Piraeus was not only important militarily, but was an equally important commercial port. For two centuries it was, essentially, the commercial centre of the Eastern Mediterranean. The Museum of Piraeus contains, as one might expect, some very interesting archaeological evidence of economic life,
pertaining mostly to the regulation of the market by market inspectors. In the museum vestibule, one may see perhaps the only metrological relief in existence today. It was discovered built into a small church on Salamis, although it is not known whether it originated on Salamis, the shore opposite Eleusis and Megara, or Piraeus. The plaque—in contrast to the only other known similar relief in Oxford’s Ashmolean Museum—departs within a recess, allowing one to use a string to take precise measurements, the official metric units: half an orguia, equal to approximately the length of two outstretched arms (a fathom), a pechys (a cubit, approximately 0.487 m.), a spithame (a span, approximately 0.242 m.), and a pous (foot). Two measurement systems are used. The first, which is based on a standard of 0.322 m., i.e., the length of an archaic or classical foot, served to calculate the pechys, the spithame, and the orguia. The second, which is depicted by the imprint of a sole, is the length of a Hellenistic foot, 0.301 m. The gauges were tablets with a series of cavities, which had a volumetric correspondence to the various measures in use (cyathos, oxybaphon, half-cotyle, etc.), and were used to monitor the liquids sold. After inspection, the liquid was poured into the vial the customer held from the bottom. We obtain interesting information on the cost of living and the gastronomic habits of the inhabitants of Piraeus in the 1st century BCE from a market inspection inscription with a catalogue that listed the highest prices of the items offered in the ancient cookshops, which resemble contemporary diners, i.e., leg, head, brains, stomach, breast, liver, spleen, lung, and intestines. The foodstuff sold was classified into three quality categories: first came pork, since pigs were the only animals bred for consumption, followed by goat or lamb, and finally beef. Prices were given in chalcoi (1/8 obol) for half-kilogram quantities (minae), or relative to the cost of the meat. The inscription was destroyed in 86 BCE, when Sulla occupied Piraeus, and was re-inscribed in 83 BCE, by the Piraeus market inspector Aeschylus, son of Aeschylus; according to others it dates to the era of Augustus. The emperors’ special interest in the market’s operation is demonstrated by yet another inscription.

This is a market decree, in the form of a missive from the emperor Hadrian, which once again refers to price regulation, specifically to the profits of fish vendors and middlemen. The text, which was preserved, may be translated: “As regards the fishermen of Eleusis, fish sold in the Eleusis market will be exempt from tax, so that there be a sufficiency at a good price and profit margin for importa-
1st cent. BCE market regulation inscription.
tion. I desire that the excessive profit of vendors and middlemen be curbed, otherwise they should be denounced to the Herald of the Assembly of the Arios Pagos, and he then must refer the cases to the Court of the Arios Pagos that will decide on the punishment or the level of the monetary sentence. Let either the fishermen themselves sell directly, bringing their fish to Eleusis, or those who purchase directly from them (the first middlemen) because the cost increases when two middlemen intervene. This missive is to be inscribed onto a stele and placed in Piraeus before the Deigma. Greetings.”

The area before the Deigma, a type of merchandise stock market in the centre of the commercial market, where, according to the text the inscription was to be placed, was used to broadcast inscriptions that dealt with the financial life of Piraeus. It was there—next to the benches of the money-changes—that a resolution regarding the control of foreign coins circulating in the market had been posted; a copy was discovered in the Athens Agora.
THE DEEPER SPIRIT OF EACH PERIOD cannot be found in the ruins of buildings and items of everyday use, but in the multivalent language of art. Within the huge metaphor for the world that is art, the perception of man and the narrative of the divine take definite form in the plastic and visual arts, in the statues of Pheidias or the paintings of Polygnotus, as well as in the humble reliefs and vessels—monuments of devotion to deities and of respect for the dead—that fill the ancient sanctuaries and burial grounds. In these forms, we shall encounter everything our civilization has anxiously pursued since its renaissance in the study of classical antiquity: the prototype for transcending the everyday, the commonplace, ugly, bad, or temporary, the path to renew our relationship with the world of the gods and heroes, a world that surpasses us, where we find the foundation of humanity’s great values.

If in classical art the form of the god and the world is—more clearly than ever before in history—comprehended through the human body, it is evident that earlier, the immediate—pervasive in the surrounding nature—godly presence rendered a divine narrative and image superfluous. Divinity was linked to the specific location of the encounter with the god. A sanctuary was the specific, powerful point of the place, where man sensed the manifestation of the deity: the deity of the sky—called Zeus—on a mountain peak hidden by clouds, the sea deity (Poseidon) at the tip of Sounion, Artemis at the springs of Brauron. The landscape crystallized the concept of the deity. The need for a periodic rekindling of the instance of the deity’s original appearance, which came at a certain moment to astound him, led early man to demarcate within the everyday a sacred place and time, and to create a system of worship practices such as prayer, offerings, and sacrifice through which he attempted to preserve this initial bond by renewing it.
Thus, a journey through the museum’s earliest offerings, which cover place and manner of worship, constitutes an introduction to the history of ancient piety and, transmitting a sense of the religious life of the earliest inhabitants of this land, reveals their codified relation with that which transcends them in power and beauty. Although separated from the sacred sites, the offerings contained in the museum display cases retain something of the deeper essence of the relationship of the site and deity worshipped with the person, who at one time had offered them along with prayers in front of the divine image, statues to please as well as obligate. Their meaning—and power—is grounded in the magical relationship and mystical connection these imitations—the idols—establish with their prototype, as the sculptural form rendered the image independent of surrounding nature, and the associated wish independent of actual time.

A Minoan Peak Sanctuary

The Greeks owe many of their representational prototypes and devotional customs to Crete’s ancient civilization. Hence, the finds from the Minoan peak sanctuary at Kythera, excavated by John Sakellarakis in 1995, constitute a separate group among the exhibits of the Museum of Piraeus. These finds transport us to a period long-ago. Its only connection to Athens lay in the echo of the Minoan Empire provided by the myth of Theseus and the Minotaur, from whose demands the Attic hero liberated
Athens. A future discovery of an entire series of such sanctuaries delineating the spread of Minoan influence over the Aegean world cannot be excluded.

On the island of Kythera, the Cretan merchants and mariners, who possessed the rights for the economic exploitation of the island's porphyra, and possible the mineral wealth of neighbouring Laconia, while controlling the sea routes, established Kastri, one of the colonies that were the source of Minoan commercial and economic dominance. They also founded on at the top of the hill above the colony a sanctuary according to the type they were familiar with in their country. The sanctuary dates to the heyday of the Minoan period (MM III/LM I) and is the richest of the Minoan peak sanctuaries excavated to date. Especially impressive is the number—over 80—of bronze male and female figurines, in contrast to the mainly clay votive offerings of the Cretan peak sanctuaries that included a large number of animal figures. From the four known Cretan peak sanctuaries we have only 18 figurines, and the majority of the known figurines, located in the Museum of Herakleion and abroad (the latter lacking the most important identifying element, provenance) do not exceed 170. The subjects depicted are well-known. The typical figure of the worshipper, a man clad in a girdle, as well as, more rarely, a woman in a flounced skirt, praying with his or her right hand—sometimes both hands—touching the forehead, in an attitude, which simultaneously expresses the bedazzlement and the fear that overcome a mortal when faced with divinity. On rarer occasions, once or twice, there are instances of the worshipper holding one hand or both hands at the breast.
The great number of votive offerings must have been directly linked to the consolatory role of religion, as demonstrated by modern and contemporary counterparts. Offerings in the shape of various body parts, especially legs, demonstrating how devastating gout was to the civilized peoples of antiquity, as well as full-figured forms prevail. The largest however, belongs to an openwork female figure. Animals are rare. The scorpion, depicted in one bronze and many clay votive offerings, is not simply apotropaic, being at the same time a symbol of fertility and abundance. The name of the deity worshiped, da-ma-te, incised in a still undeciphered linear script at the lip of a steatite spoon, suggests she was probably identified with Demeter. Stone offerings tables are very closely linked to Minoan devotional practices; there are many beautiful clay rhyton (libation vessel) fragments, a bronze double-headed axe, and clay consecration horns.

Mycenaean Art: Nature as Ornament

The technically flawless works of Mycenaean pottery succeeded Minoan art in the Aegean world, the latter’s pulsating life submitting to the clear-headed principles of a wise decorative art. The vessel shapes are more balanced, the lively octopuses, the Argonauts, the sea-anemones, and the lilies have
evolved into elegant ornaments, harmonizing with the shape of the vessel, which they no longer seek to replace but to accentuate, expertly articulating it in conjunction with purely linear motifs. It is obvious that the stylization of the magical realm of the sea, as well as the artless, yet so robust efforts to render a chariot or a human figure, do not constitute the end product, after a centuries-long aesthetic journey, of the Minoan form, but, on the contrary, stem from its regeneration through the new, austerely structured spirit of a new people, which would find its complete expression in the following geometric period.

The Mycenaean Sanctuary

Mycenaean art appears to abandon the mountain peaks for the environment of the fortified palace. The evolution of the social environment of the sacred space expresses the same spirit. Whether on mountain tops or in the palace courtyard, which essentially was identified with the centre of the city, Cretan sanctuaries were places of worship open to the entire population. In contrast, in the world of the great Mycenaean warlord-kings, the sanctuary frequently disappears into the depths of the palace. The stark character remains: a chamber with a single bench for offerings and perhaps a small statue of the god. The art is humble, poorer than that of the Minoan priest-kings. The same goes for the materials: clay vessels and abstract figurines. One such sanctuary, dating to the LH III A/IIIB period, was excavated at Aghios Konstantinos, north of the spa city of Methana, high above the island’s east coast, occupying a site that dominates the Saronic microcosm (Aegina—Methana—Poros—Troizene).

In these sanctuaries, the statue of the deity is essentially absent. We perceive its presence and nature through the form of the votive offerings. Their uniqueness causes them to stand out: a rhyton in the shape of a swine’s head, possibly for libations, the offerings tables, the endless herds of oxen, a common—timeless—offering, referring to the actual herds the god is asked to protect, the hecatombs of sacrificed animals, but also, very probably—like the swine, and the rare rider figurines—to the very nature of the god or gods honoured here. We may be able to name and associate them with that ancient pair, lords of the earth and its fruits, nourishing Poseidon and Demeter, and possibly recognize them in the majestic couple in the chariot. Conversely, the limited presence of the familiar Mycenaean abstract idols, which we so frequently encounter in graves, is characteristic.
1, 2: Mycenaean conical rhyta from Salamis (1350–1250 BCE); decorated with stylized palm trees and papyrus plants, and a linear decoration of parallel bands.
3. Amphoriskos from Varkiza (1400–1200 BCE).
4. Stirrup jar from Salamis (1400–1250 BCE).
5. Prochous with cut-away neck and vertical curving stripes; from Salamis (1400–1350 BCE).
6–8: Mycenaean vessels decorated with a stylized Argonaut and spirals; from Salamis (6–7) and Varkiza (8).
11. Large biconal goblet with a stylized flower; from Salamis (1300–1250 BCE).
12. Two-handled "fruit bowl"; from Salamis (1150–1100 BCE).
13. Large tripod cylindrical alabastron, with metopes with lozenges on the shoulders; from Salamis (1190–1100 BCE).
14. Flask with concentric circles; from Salamis (1350–1300 BCE).
15. Semi-spherical pyxis with a stopper, decorated with a stylized rocky pattern (1350–1300 BCE); from Voula.

16. Amphora with a simple wavy line on its shoulder (1150–1100 BCE); from Salamis.

17. Large stirrup jar, decorated with bands of concentric arches; from Salamis (1190–1100 BCE).
18. Large biconal goblet; from Voula 1150–1100 BCE.
19. Stirrup jug; from Salamis (1350–1300 BCE).
22. Infant feeder, decorated with fish; from Varkiza (1190–1150 BCE).
23. Small Mycenaean prochous with the depiction of a human figure.
24: Two-handled crater with the depiction of a chariot; from Salamis (1350–1250 BCE).
25, 26: Two vessels decorated with the characteristic Mycenaean stylized porphyry shell motif, a tall-footed kylix (25) and a two-handed skyphos (26); from Varkiza (1300–1200 BCE).
27: Necklace beads: glass rosettes and lily-shaped beads; from Salamis.
28–33: Mycenaean psi- and phi-type figurines from a grave on Salamis (1300–1250 BCE).
34: Mycenaean kourotraphos figurine.
Figurines from the Mycenaean sanctuary at Aghios Konstantinos, Methana, (1400–1200 BCE); a bull, a chariot, two riders, and, below left, a psi-type female figurine.
40–42: Tall-footed kylix and two miniature votive tables with young pups around a mastoid-like cake; the meaning of the depiction is unknown.
43–45: “Plow” and bull-leaper statuettes.
46–48: “Plow” and rider statuettes.
49–52: Statuettes of chariots with two figures, possible divinities.
53. Large figurine of a bull-leaper preparing to leap, or more probably a divinity manifesting above the bull’s horns.
54–61 Dog (upper row) and bull statuettes.
61–66: Statuettes of chariots, bulls, and a small dog (bottom centre).
THE DAWN OF HELLENIC ART
Geometric and Archaic Period

THE GEOMETRIC WORLD THAT WOULD FOLLOW the dark period of Mycenaean decline is completely different. The creation of the strictly structured ruler-and-compass decorated protogeometric vessel essentially constitutes the first step in the creation of Hellenic art and the first reference to a perception of the world, new and completely different from that of the long prehistoric era. Indeed, in a period where great sculpture does not yet exist, the main means of expression is the vessel and its (abstract, or on rare occasions pictorial decoration). In the vessels of the protogeometric (10th century BCE) and the early and middle geometric period (9th and early 8th centuries BCE), decoration no longer constitutes a simple surface adornment, but is an expression of the structural principal that governs the shape of the vessel. This new—dynamic—concept of ornamentation is encapsulated in the metope and in one or two bands that articulate the gleaming black body of the vessel, thus creating a stylized reproduction of its structure—with the shape and variations of the meander serving as the basic decorative element.

Subsequently, the bands multiply, so that in the third quarter of the 8th cent. the rhythmic geometric ornamentation weaves a bright exterior coat on the vessel surface. In the precisely balanced distribution of the decorative bands, now with an abstract equine figure or even—in the large funerary vessels—a scene from the military life of the deceased, or his burial holding centre stage, the monumental conception of the vessel form as a sculptural body with clearly distinguishable structural elements remains unchanged.

The second major step in the creation of Hellenic art is the awakening of the individual conscience that characterized the early archaic period. Around 700 BCE, the austere organization of the decoration relaxes and the vessel wall dissolves in a play of light and shadings; at the same time, perceptions appear to be changing not only as regards the vessel, but also as regards man and his place in the world. The uniform coat that covered the surface of geometric vessels with systems of parallel lines and bands, now varies its colour into alternating zones of black and white, the linear outlines of the figures acquire flesh, and the stylized decorations evolve into flowers with huge fleshy leaves; birds, animals, and terrifying Oriental monsters appear for the first time before our startled eyes. The entire vessel seems to be emerging from a radial calyx. At the same time parallel to the awakening of personality in archaic lyricism, light becomes apparent; beginning with the eyes, man’s face begins to brighten. The figures participate, become part of the surface, which pulses with life and colour: hu-
man beings, animals and monsters move freely among vegetation or empty space, as if in a meadow seeking prey, an opponent, action. Only now can the first mythological depictions be born. Corinthian art which dominates 7th and early 6th cent. BCE Greece, expresses an urban, almost cosmopolitan (to the degree that such terms are permissible) world view, in contrast to the rural restraint of Attic art. The small Corinthian unguentaria (vessels for precious oils), mainly aryballi (flasks)—spherical or egg-shaped—and alabastra (perfume-oil vials), elegant oenochoai (wine jugs) and toilet boxes, which minister to the new demand for luxury, replacing the large, simple, and clean shapes of the geometric period. Through incised and multicoloured decoration that mimics metal vessels and luxurious fabrics, the vessel body seems to come to life: lines become garlands and braids, while vegetables, animals, and birds begin taking up more and more space, expressing a new, dynamic view of nature. The rare human figures also come from the Dionysian cycle. Faced with the Corinthian invasion—it would take years to assimilate and surpass—Attica’s famous ceramics tradition would undergo a temporary eclipse. For the time being, sanctuaries and graves fill up with the output of Corinthian factories and their poor, local copies. The two sides of this decay are demonstrated by two vessels from Attic graveyards. In the first, an amphora with panthers from Trachones, the daemonic figures created by the Athenian painters, mining the dynamic of the Proto-Attic tradition, which had created the poros stone pediments in the Acropolis Museum and the vessels of the Nessus Painter, begin freezing in a heraldic pose. The Corinthian style appears to survive better in the Polos Painter amphora decorated with sphinxes, abstracted and enclosed in a dense series of rosettes, giving the vessel the appearance of a richly embroidered cloth.

The geometric/archaic temple of Mount Parnis provides an idea of the appearance of the sacred site during the new period. The sanctuary, excavated in 1959 on a mountain peak military property, and hence still out of bounds, marks a return—after millennia—to the mountain summits, this time to the kingdom of the great Indo-European god of thunder. The site provides the identity of the god, as well as the inscriptions to Parnassius and Ikesios Zeus carved upon the offerings. Undoubtedly, this was the sanctuary of Zeus mentioned by Pausanias, whose writings are be viewed as the bible of contemporary Greek archaeologists.

The type of offerings now gives the impression that they express the donators, their way of life and their interests rather than the god. There are a great many weapons and tools. Actual weapons
made of bronze and especially iron. Swords, spear shafts, arrows, knives and axes that testify to a dangerous age, during which, as Thucydides noted, the whole of Greece was armed. Worship too, had taken on a different form. Communicating with the god, the mountain-top sacrifice before the cave (a refuge from bad weather) is now equivalent to an invitation to join in a common meal: the altar—a simple stone construction—is the grill, spits are turning over it, while beside them, meat is boiling in cauldrons with high round handles, which are mounted on tripods. These very items will remain in the sanctuary as offerings. It is interesting to note the way the vessels complete the picture: elegant Corinthian unguentaria that by now have absolutely no connection to the local—sub-geometric—pottery tradition, decorated with the familiar monsters, beasts and swans of the Oriental tradition of illustration, as well as with animals the hunters visiting the sanctuary would have encountered, boar and rams, or warriors and revellers. A more direct reference to the god may be an iron rod, its one end splitting to form a sheaf, possibly imitating the shape of thunder, the symbol of the god, whose name is inscribed upon it (ill. 116)
67–70: In protogeometric oenochoai (67, 68), decoration is limited to a series of concentric semi-circles or triangles that draw attention to the shoulder of the vessel. Contrariwise, in the early geometric amphora (69) circles and semi-circles were replaced by rectangular ornaments, such as the meander, making its first appearance, which stress two central points, the neck and the handle band. The protogeometric pyxis (70) is from Salamis.
71: Characteristic type of proto-geometric skyphos with a conical foot and concentric circle decoration.

72: Flask from Salamis.
73–76: Two protogeometric kalathoi (73, 74). During the early geometric period (900–850 BCE) the oval protogeometric oinochoe was replaced by a wide-based vessel (75, 76), where the row of triangles is complemented by secondary decorative bands on the shoulder and the belly of the vessel (Salamis).
77–80: Goblet (77), kylix (78) and pyxides (79, 80) from the mid-geometric period (850–800 BCE). The severe, tension-filled outline is underlined by the simple geometric motifs, such as the ordered successive zigzagging lines and meanders that depict the rhythm of the breath of the vessel itself.
81–83: The rhythmical arrangement of the vertical bands on the body of the pyxis from the transitional period (81) announced the future dominance of the metope as a decorative motif, which is frequently framed by two waterfowl (82). Contrariwise, the surface of the mid-8th cent. BCE oenochoe (83) is covered, according to the tradition of the Dipylos Painter, with a web, which constitutes a painted rendition of the sculpted fluting of the vessel.
84–86: The pyxis with the pointed base from the mid-geometric period (84) is decorated with bands of linear ornamentation. The type and function of the pyxis was taken over from approximately the mid 8th cent. BCE by the lekanis with a high rim (85, 86), which, here, retains the tradition of linear decoration.
87: Large oenochoe with a high handle, a characteristic product of workshops from the early last quarter of the 8th cent. BCE.
88: Large oenochoe from the last quarter of the 8th cent. BCE. Shoulder and neck are decorated with metopes, while the belly constitutes a secondary decorative zone.
89: Late geometric period amphoriskos.
90: The evolution of the tall-footed lekanis at the end of the 8th cent. BCE.
91: Small cylindrical pyxis that replicates a woven vessel.
92–95: Characteristic specimens of the plainer vessels of the last quarter of the 8th cent. BCE. The decoration is limited to rosettes (at the neck) and parallel bands on the vessel body.
96–98: High-handled oenochoe, goblet, kantharos with metope (quatrefoil) framed by two waterfowl (730–720 BCE).
99–101: Two trefoil-shaped oenochoai from circa 730–720 BCE. The shape and strange decoration of the second, consisting of a wheel framed by large concentric circles comes from Cyprus. The little bird at the top of the wheel is an elegant addition.
102: Proto-Attic amphora from the mid-7th cent. BCE. The metope of the neck, with the black and white rope-like decoration, the sense of corporality of the bird stepping among the plants and the traces of geometric decoration measure the type's evolution from the geometric oenochoai, similar to the one depicted opposite.
102–106: oenochoe (106) from the latter half of the 8th cent. BCE, with a symmetrical pair of horses at the neck, a bronze pony (105), clay handmade horse figurines (103,104).
107, 108: Two proto-Attic high-footed skyphoi-pyixides from a grave near Tavros (1st or 2nd quarter of the 7th cent. BCE).

109: Large late geometric piriform jar from Trachones, a characteristic example of the crisis of early 7th cent. BCE Attic pottery production.
110–115: Conical small oenochoe and spherical aryballoi of the early Corinthian period (2nd half of the 7th cent.) from the sanctuary of Zeus on the peak of Mount Parnis.
116–126: Iron objects (sword, knives, etc), offerings to Zeus from the sanctuary on Mount Parnis. The lighting representation with the votive inscription to Zeus (above) is extremely interesting.
127–145: Iron objects: spear tips, razors, sickles, and spits from the same sanctuary.
146: The handle and part of the foot of a geometric tripod from the sanctuary of Zeus on the peak Mount Parnis (restoration).
Orientalizing period Attic amphora with strong Corinthian influences. The decorative motif of two symmetrical sphinxes flanking a male figure is not a reference to the Oedipus myth.
148: Rear view of the same amphora. The motif remains the same, the sphinxes have been replaced by panthers, the male figure by a vegetal ornament (entwined lotuses).
FROM THE ARCHAIC TO THE CLASSICAL FORM

ATHENS REACTS TO THE DEGENERATION of Eastern-oriented Corinthian art by delving into the dynamic proto-Attic tradition. In the hands of Athenian artists, form acquires an internal tension and dynamism that tends to shatter the walls of the vessel. A new concept of plasticity now permits form to stand independently in a space released from the decorations and fillers with which earlier vessel painters sought to exorcise the void. At the same time, the daemonic representations develop into practically “secular” descriptions of the divine world. The new spirit is beautifully rendered in two archaic vessels of the collection, with Heracles and Dionysus, the Attic municipalities’ two beloved heroes and protagonists of archaic vessel painting. The extravagant presence of Dionysus and his companions, eternally celebrating in the vineyards, overwhelms the surface of the fragment. On the other hand, on the ancient skyphos (drinking cup), the group of Heracles subduing the bull concentrates the entire dynamic tension of the entire vessel (ill. 154). On another vessel, although the slaying of the Nemean Lion, rendered in miniature and framed by huge birds and animals, is incorporated in a purely decorative band, the depiction of that heroic feat retains a power the products of Corinthian potters were incapable of attaining (ill. 153).

The blessed life of the gods and the aristocratic ideal of the good life are amongst the most beloved subjects of the late archaic era. Thanks to the austere pattern in which the figures on the archaic three-footed pyxis (container) in the Museum are arranged, their silhouettes evenly articulating the bright ground of the vessel, the depiction, despite its minute scale, attains a monumental character. Monumental as well, are the depictions capturing—on the three feet of the pyxis—three instances in an aristocratic life, an ideal way of living that links contemporary man directly to the Homeric heroes and the gods who live at ease (θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζώντες), emphasizing valour in battle, victory in a chariot-race, and, finally, the joys of the hunt and of eros. These three elements, adapted to the new ideal of the citizen of a democracy would, from then on, serve as the leitmotif the entire journey of the art of Attic vase painting. The competitive spirit’s dominant presence characteristically defines a series of Attic lekythoi (narrow-necked flasks) where depictions of peaceful track competitions alternate with scenes animated by the spirit of deadly battle—usually in the form of the Homeric duel—or reflecting the heavy atmosphere that prevails during combat preparations, such as scenes of hoplites being armed. During the 5th century, however, the palaestra will gradually replace the battlefield, the sym-
posium the chariot race, and marriage the raw eroticism of late archaic vessels.

The end of the archaic style is accompanied by the Athenian vessel painters’ mounting interest in decorative elements; some characteristic samples are evident in the palmette wreath around the interior of a basin (ill. 161) or in the rooster tondo inside another (ill. 163). The danger that the depictions themselves might evolve into decorative shapes is apparent in a series of vessels, mostly lekythoi and kylikes, of the end of the archaic period, where the repetition of the motifs and the crowding of the forms—along with the speed of execution—frequently results in depictions where form and content are ill-defined. This is a frequent danger in depictions of the Dionysian festival where figures are frequently interwoven with ivy boughs, or the warrior’s departure in the heroic four-horse chariot, which dominated the early 5th century BCE. Even in more meticulous representations, such as a scene with a departing warrior on a lekythos from Trachones, where—thanks to the bow—Apollo, accompanied by Artemis, may be identified, the figures are not easily distinguished amid the chaos of the dense, carved surface decorations.

A different place—and a very important moment in an Athenian citizen’s daily life—is referenced in the depiction of a sacrifice, (ill. 170) on an approximately contemporary (early 5th cent.) lekythos from a tomb in Kallithea. The image contains all the freshness of the Attic outdoors. Three men crowned with wreaths are preparing to sacrifice a ram in front of a Herm column, whose base bears a depiction of the god’s beloved animal. The first two are praying, their hands raised; the first touches the god’s beard with his right hand in a pleading gesture: although he has a sacrificial knife at his waist, he is not necessarily a priest. Anyone may approach the god and communicate with him. Behind him, on the altar, the fire already blazes fiercely. The last man, his head turned to those apparently following, pushes the ram with his right hand, while holding a tray of sacrificial cakes in his left. Ivy boughs decorate the landscape. Who is the god? The depictions of sacrifices in front of Herm columns—common during the final third of the 6th cent.—have been linked to Hipparchus’ organization of the Attic road network, marking the routes with Herm columns and moralizing sayings. One cannot however, exclude a sacrifice to Dionysus, since this form was not foreign to him, even more so since here the deity appears to be clothed. The scene truly transports us to one of the rural municipalities of Attica, where Dionysus was worshipped with particular fervour. The Dionysia, celebrated in the fields every December, was one of the joyful festivals. It is depicted, especially the procession that precedes the sacrifice, straightforwardly and ribaldly by Aristophanes in the Acharnians, and on vessels that, however, usually refer primarily to the Great Dionysia of Athens. No other depiction renders the atmosphere of rural Attica with such freshness.

The new spirit of approaching the divine through sacrifice and prayer that scenes, such as the one depicted on the lekythos portraying the ram’s sacrifice, attempt to render, finds its appropriate means of expression in the—already familiar since the next to last decade of the 6th cent.—red figure technique, which opened a path towards a new, brighter perception of the human—and divine—form, as well as of life itself. The figures that were previously outlined on the clay project their luminous physicality on the black—now dematerialized—vessel walls.

The concept of the divine correspondingly deepens. On the lekythos of Apollo, the statuesque attitude of the god, who appears clad in a cithara player’s long chiton (tunic), lyre in hand, conveys the serene power of the new Apollonian religion that brought to the daemonic archaic world of Dionysian ecstasy a message of clarity, measure and harmonious order; the internal serenity and harmony of the depiction causes the entire vessel to radiate (ill. 171). In contrast, the bow and quiver of the python-slaying, punishing god hang on the wall. Similarly, the sexual drive of Zeus, father of a whole generation of demigods, is now expressed—as on the hydria (water jug) of the Museum of Piraeus—with the
calm majesty of the Poseidon of Artemision (ill. 173, 174).

Even in the most violent scenes of the period, such as the battle of Nessus and Heracles over Deianeira, the traditional portrayal of the clash of two animalistic powers has been replaced by the depiction of the Olympian superiority of the son of Zeus over the lascivious monster who, blinded by passion, has lost his balance and any ability to resist (ill. 172). The finely worked surface of the Melian relief—as this category of openwork reliefs of the early classical period is known—underlines the sense of calm majesty that—here, as in the approximately contemporary western pediment of Olympia, or in the Sophocles’ slightly later Trachinian Women—transmits the impression of the imposition of divine order over animal nature. The passions that cause the action are incorporated into a higher will: “none of these things without Zeus” (κουδέν τούτον ὃ,τι μη Ζεὺς).

A new subject matter corresponds to this new—bright—concept of the figure, closer to the spirit of the new Athenian democracy. It is not only the subject depicted that changes—i.e., the symposia of immortals and mortals, or the cultivation of the body in the palaestrae that now unseat Homeric battles—but the very way of understanding it: the symposium atmosphere no longer has anything in common with the archaic—Corinthian or Attic—orgiastic Dionysian scenes, the carousals of satyrs and Dionysian revellers. The counterpoint of whirling figures has been replaced here by the serene melody of movement. A shard bearing the representation of a banquet from Trachones, depicts the cottabus, a game involving luck and dexterity that dominated the men’s quarters. Two posts have been set up, and the first banqueter is getting ready, holding the kylix (drinking cup) upside down by the handle with one finger in order to cast a drop of wine that will judge the result, or, possibly, even his luck; more than a game of dexterity, the cottabus is a question that—whether seriously or playfully—addresses the unknown and worrisome future. Nevertheless, what fills the space is the music of the barbiton (stringed instrument) the second banqueter is playing ecstatically.

The experience of the Peloponnesian War and especially the unknown domestic dramas resulting
from the horrible plague of the years 429–27 must have marked the final decades of the 5th cent. BCE. The consciousness of death, a heavy, almost elegiac atmosphere, appears to imbue the Attic vessels’ mythological subjects and everyday scenes, in which depictions of marriage play a dominant role.

The vessels themselves, which come, almost exclusively from grave sites, such as the standard loutrophoros, and wedding cauldrons, manufactured to be used during the marital bath or as wedding gifts, now follow the newly wedded bride who has not had a chance to experience the joys of a family.

The melancholy that drifts over these introverted women, who—accompanied by Nikes—receive their wedding gifts, does not differ from that which accompanies the figures of contemporary rich style funerary monuments, such as the famous Hegeso monument in the Kerameikos cemetery. The ethereal beauty of the ensembles, among them a woman sitting with her friend, leaning back against the couch, appears to allude to another, more beautiful, more distant world.

Very often, the heroes of this beautiful world, where death is overcome, take on the name or characteristics of a mythical being. Thus, among the palace pillars, it is Paris and Helen who meet, he a traveller, she magnificently dressed like the queen she is, both enchanted by the beauty of the other. The eros crowning the youth with a wreath, binds even closer the two embracing arms; Aphrodite, however, is missing. It is Hermes, who gives the wreath to the servant-woman observing the scene; he is marriage-broker and psychopomp (soul conductor) at the same time (ill. 189–191).

Sometimes, the entire scene is nothing other than a mythological metaphor of eternal life. In a lekanis (shallow basin) from the end of the Classical period (430—420), the subject decorating the interior and exterior of the vessel refers to two episodes that dominate the last chapters of the Iliad (ill. 203–204). Achilles’ enraged withdrawal from the battle had reduced the Achaeans to a tragic state. Patroclus, fighting in Achilles’ stead, has been killed by Hector. Achilles demands new arms from his mother, the sea-goddess Thetis. Dolphin-riding Nereids deliver the weapons. The depiction—because of its symbolic connection with a belief in the immortality of the soul (marine deities, such as Thetis, know the road to immortality) was widely used during the period—is placed along the interior surface of the lekanis. The five nympha are arranged in a circle around their father, Nereus, who sits on a seahorse lost in thought, since he alone, as the prophetic Old Man of the Sea, knows Achilles’ future. Secondary to the drama of Achilles’ fate, which is set into motion here, is the conclusion of the matter (and the Iliad) in the scene that decorates the vessel exterior, where the avenging Achilles has already killed Hector and old white-haired Priam comes to his tent (indicated here by a single column) accompanied by Trojans carrying gifts to ransom the body. The depiction, however, is characterized by
a singular note of humanity. Achilles is not rendered, as was common, dining unfeelingly, with the
corpse of Hector under his pallet. As when he was mourning the dead Patroclus, he sits next to the bier
upon which he placed with his own hands the washed and perfumed body before it was transferred
to the cart. The scene is familiar to us from the Iliad (“so when the maids had bathed and anointed
the body sleek with olive oil and wrapped it round and round in a braided battle-shirt and handsome
battle-cape then Achilles lifted Hector up in his own arms and laid him down on a bier, and comrades
helped him raise the bier and body onto a sturdy wagon...” [Book 24, 688-693]). It corresponds to the
well-known depiction on the lekythos of the Eretria Painter, where Achilles is sitting next to the bier
with the body of Patroclus.

Zoomorphic rhyton from the classical period.

Eros, among all the gods, is the one who, by conquering individual fate, provides the opportunity
to conquer death itself. Winged intermediaries of passion, or—elsewhere—calm yet relentless hunters
and personifications of erotic victory, erotes dominate the small vessels, the spherical vessels known
as aryballoi, destined to contain the perfumes that accompanied the marital, as well as the funerary
bath. Erotes are seldom at rest, like, for example, the Nike feeding a goose, Aphrodite’s beloved bird,
or the Eros, who, even though seated, appears ready to spring up and fly off. Through these forms, the
erotic instinct is idealized according to the spirit of the time: Eros rejecting the Maenad has nothing
in common with the archaic satyr, nor would the modest Maenad be recognizable without a thyrsus
(Dionysian staff). With the passing of time, Eros’ very form changes. The serious youth of the early
classical period is succeeded by the familiar playful—and irresponsible—chubby child of Aphrodite
that will fill the paintings and wall paintings of the Renaissance. Moreover, its himation (mantle),
itself has an ambiguous meaning when, as in various contemporary Tanagra figurines, it covers the
head of a charming eros in the museum (ill. 187).

From the 4th cent. BCE, direct references to that circle of gods, which like Aphrodite and Dionysus,
provide individual happiness in this world and promise it for the next will prevail—an expression
of the contemporary man’s individualistic outlook, detached from the society of the city. The
Dionysus on a spherical pelike (storage jar), originally from the cemetery of Kantza, transports us to
this atmosphere of divine bliss far from the pulsating life of the earlier Dionysian depictions: the god,
seated on an ornamented couch, in the centre of the depiction, is framed by a company of statuesque
satyrs and maenads, holding Dionysian symbols and musical instruments (ill. 201–202). Accordingly,
the dance of the four girls at the base of the wedding cauldron from the Geroulanos collection (ill.
197–198) alludes to the transcendent presence of Aphrodite. The girls clad in short chitons with two
tapes crossing in front of their bare breasts, are split into two groups and dance in front of a censer, to the sound of the lute held by one of them; their dance resembles the Caryatids’ kalaisthiskos dance in honour of Artemis.

However, during the period of the Peloponnesian War, this evolution had not yet come about, and the great bonds connecting society—as well as the great moments of human life—were accomplished through a baptism in the eternity of myth and the elevation, via art, to the divine sphere. Thus, this transcendence—idealization—of the everyday that illuminates to a greater or lesser degree all classical representations of daily life, also corresponds to the mythical transferral of the historical event, now imbued with the glory of a higher reality. It is in the spirit of such an art, which, like the ancient Greek—in contrast to Roman art—ignores the here and now, elevating the event to its—beyond time and place—deeper essence, that we may understand the rare historical references to the holy olive. During, these difficult years it functions as the symbol of the inviolability of the Attic soil.

The first decorates a large sturdy amphora, with a conical foot; its many repairs indicate it was probably used for a long time. The depiction is celebratory. In the forefront, two men clad in an exomis (work tunic) fill an amphora (specifically, the one portrayed) with oil (ill. 192–196). The contents are indicated by the olive tree at the right end. The wreaths worn by the farm-workers and the presence of Athena at the right end of the depiction elevate the image above the simple context of a standard rural scene. The oil they are collecting apparently comes from one of the sacred olive trees, the moriae olives, descended from the first tree Athena gave her beloved city. It was punishable by death to harm the sacred olive tree one had the honour to protect in one’s field. This was the oil that went into the amphoras handed out as prizes during the Panathenean Games, so the festival would validate—in essence as well—the close bond between Athena and the land (the municipalities) defined by her name. The closeness of the ties between the worship of Athena and the fertility of the Attic soil is demonstrated by the depiction on the back of the amphora, where Athena is joined by the triad of fertility deities: Pluto between the two Eleusinian deities.

During the Peloponnesian War, the olive, referenced on another vessel, a small lekythos of the period, will become the symbol of Athens’ military virtue (ill. 200). Upon first viewing, the image appears strange to us. A man clad in an exomis and cap rushes with an axe to cut down a tree. This woodcutter is not as innocent as he appears at first glance. The tree is a small olive tree. The scene calls to mind images of war (as well as evoking Erysichthon, King of Thessaly, the very prototype of the sacrilegious woodcutter, who felled the trees of Demeter’s sacred grove). The woodcutter is a hoplite, the enemy fruitlessly attempting to destroy the olive tree, Athena’s gift and the symbol of Athenian endurance. The scene echoes the lines of Sophocles’ Oedipus at Colonus:

And here there grows, unpruned, untamed,
Terror to foemen’s spear,
A tree in Asian soil unnamed,
By Pelops’ Dorian isle unclaimed,
Self-nurtured year by year;
’Tis the grey-leaved olive that feeds our boys;
Nor youth nor withering age destroys
The plant that the Olive Planter tends
And the Grey-eyed Goddess herself defends.
The development over all these years of a higher sense of the human body, which we have followed through the art of vessel painting, was the prerequisite for the creation (as early as the 5th cent.) of the magnificent series of black-glazed vessels, whose outlines express a crystallized harmony—internal and external—and the balance of the classical shape. The fashion—which runs parallel to the decline of the red-figure technique—has its starting point in the replicas of the precious fruits of the art of bronzework, an art that flourished greatly in the new centres of civilization, in Southern Italy and Macedonia (the collection includes a few metal vessels—an omphalos phiale [shallow vessel], kylikes, and kantharoi [drinking vessels] from graves in Troizene). The same way the concept of great sculpture, though yet unborn, may already be discerned in non-representational geometric vessels, so too here, powerful, though invisible bonds appear to connect the shapes of the kantharoi, the hydria, even the sturdy oil lamp of the collection with the contemporary statues. The conservative series of multicoloured glass unguentaria on the other hand, follows a completely different tradition, that of Corinthian miniature vessel painting.
149: Fragment with the head of a sphinx, circa 570 BCE.
150–152: Tripod pyxis, 540–530 BCE. The decoration covering the three feet of the vessel condenses the ideal life of the Athenian citizen of the period into three scenes: a standard arming depiction with the hoplite putting on his leg-guards (150), erotic flirtation (151) and returning from the hunt, with the frontal view of a quadriga, a key symbol of the aristocracy (152); from Trachones (Geroulanos Collection).
153: Band - kylix with a depiction of Heracles and the Lion of Nemea, framed by birds, 540 BCE.
154: Skyphos with a depiction of Heracles and the Cretan Bull. The body of the bull is covered by a white glaze; 540–530 BCE.
155–160: The evolution of the lekythos from the mid 6th cent. BCE to the early 5th cent. Mythological depictions (155–157), centaurs, amazons; scenes of battle and everyday life (158, 159), a hoplite and runners. A pyxis depicting an assembly of the gods (160).
161, 162: Pinakion (fish plate); the exterior ornamented with palmettes, the interior tondo with a sphinx.
163, 164: Kylix with Dionysian scene. The interior tondo is decorated with a rooster; from Voula, late 6th–early 5th cent. BCE.
165–166: Amphoriskos with runners and a rider; 6th cent. BCE.
167–168: Black-figure lekythos on a white ground with the depiction of a chariot, circa 480 BCE.
169, 170: Black-figure, white ground lekythos with the depiction of a sacrifice in front of a Herm stele by the Theseus Painter; from Kallithea, circa 480 BCE.
171: Red-figure lekythos with a depiction of Apollo with a lyre and phiale in front of an altar; circa 460 BCE.
172: “Melian” relief. Heracles and Nessus; from the Troizene grave, 460–450 BCE.
173, 174: Red-figure hydria with a depiction of Zeus pursuing a nymph. Before the mid-5th cent. BCE.
175: Fragment of a wedding cauldron. Two women, accompanied by Nike, are carrying the marriage gifts. Circa 430 BCE, from Trachones (Geroulanos Collection).
Wedding cauldron. The bride is sitting on a couch, receiving marriage gifts. The man before her may be the groom, who is followed (below the handle) by a flying Nike bearing a torch. Attributed to the Centauromachy of Naples Painter (Beazley), 440–430 BCE, (Trachones, Geroulanos Collection).
178, 179: Loutrophoros. The bride is seated among her friends. Eros descends from above, while a woman with a loutrophoros approaches from the opposite direction. Attributed to the Painter of “bathing women” circa 420 BCE, (Trachones, Geroulanos Collection).
Large squat lekythos with a depiction of an Eros pursuing a Maenad. Attributed to the Painter of “bathing women” (Beazley), circa 420 BCE.
181: Wedding cauldron. The seated bride holds a loutrophoros. She is framed by two Erotes and the women bringing her gifts. From Ano Voula, mid-4th cent. BCE.
182–186: Squat lekythoi and pyxides with depictions of Erotes, and Nike feeding Aphrodite’s goose; final quarter of the 5th cent. BCE.
187: Eros figurine; the modest head-covering, which is appropriate for married women, in association with the rooster give the figure a rather ambiguous character. Early Hellenistic age; from a grave in Tavros.

188: Sculpted vase with the figure of Nike, kneeling to cast the knucklebones, 4th cent. BCE; From the Cave of the Nymphs on Mount Penteli.
189–191: Loutrophoros; idealized marriage scene, rendered as the meeting of Paris and Helen. Eros, seated on the entwined hands of the two lovers, lays a wreath on Paris' head. In the style of the Meidias Painter, 420–410 BCE.
192–196: Red-figure amphora depicting Alkimon (his name appears in the background) gathering the fruit of the holy olive. Back view: the Eleusinian Triad: Demeter, Persephone, Hades, attributed to the Dinos Painter (Beazley), 420–410 BCE (Trachones, Geroulanos Collection).
197, 198: Base of a wedding cauldron with bare-breasted dancers; 4th cent. BCE (Trachones, Geroulanos Collection).
199, 200: Red-figure lekythos with the depiction of a woodcutter or a hoplite cutting down a tree, 430–220 BCE.
201: Spherical pelike with Dionysian scenes. Back view: in the middle, a drunken satyr, who, having abandoned his kantharos and, by now empty amphora among the reeds, is dancing and shaking a thyrsus to the rhythm of the maenad's drum. Another maenad – satyr couple serenely observes the scene; 4th cent. BCE from Kantza (Attiki Odos excavation).
202: Front view of the spherical pelike: in the centre, an enthroned Dionysus, with Eros bringing him the libation instruments (prochous and phiale). The scene is framed by satyrs playing music (aulos, barbiton). Here, the crater illustrates the sober atmosphere required by the presence of the god, distinguish this scene from the one viewed from the back.
203–204: Lekanis. Section of the interior image: the Nereids ridding on dolphins, are bringing Achilles his weapons. They are arranged circularly, with Nereus in the centre. The exterior depicts a scene from the ransom of Hector. Circa 430 BCE, from Pigadakia, Voula.
205–210: Coloured glass vessels: alabastra, small oenochoai, and amphoriskoi from various locations; 5th cent. BCE.
216–218: Black-glazed vessels: two classical kantharoi with tall feet and a hydria from the 4th cent. BCE.
219: Bronze omphalos phiale from a classical tomb of Troizene.
OFFERINGS

IF THE HARMONIOUS SHAPE of the period’s contemporary sculptural form is reproduced on a vessel, the number and variety of figurines in the rich collections of votive offerings from the sanctuaries and graves of Attica offer an overview of the evolution of the human figure, male and female, in the journey from the archaic to the Hellenistic era, in all its typological differences.

The figures themselves are used as votive offerings in sanctuaries and as funerary offerings at the graves, expressing a respect towards a sphere that transcends humanity. Some of the most common votive offerings in Attic sanctuaries—apart from vessels—are busts and female figurines, whether standing or seated. However, since the deity actually represents man’s ideal (or the ideal man), it is difficult to judge whether these are human or divine figures, all the more so since with the disappearance of their external attributes, the divine and the human have merged completely.

First in the series of standing female figurines are the xoanon-shaped deities wearing the polos (tall headdress), characteristically called “priests”. At the same time, the elegant, coloured, cast figurines, flower in hand, which give us an idea of the multiple colours of contemporary sculpture, continue to be simply handcrafted for use in small rural sanctuaries during the entire archaic period. The series of enthroned female figures is particularly interesting, revealing the evolution of not only a certain sculptural type, but also of the concept of the seated figure during the four centuries Attic art was flourishing, from the end of the 8th to the end of the 4th century BCE. An enthroned geometric figure from Kallithea dates to an earlier period (ill. 227). We can only speculate as to what she may have been associated with. There is a characteristic emphasis on the throne, as regards its size and construction, as well as the throne’s back, which is decorated with a horse. While in other contemporary representations there is no easily discernable separation between seat and the torso of the figurine, here the figurine functions as an extension. Male figurines are much rarer, primarily young athletes, as are mythical figures, such as Europa, being abducted by Zeus in the form of a bull, a subject that flourished (ill. 242).

Part of these votive offerings come from archaic or classical sanctuaries in Piraeus and Attica. The Attic countryside is studded with small rural sanctuaries that usually consist of an altar and a “chapel”, with a vestibule and shrine guarding the likeness of the god. The identity of the deity is not always known, nor can it be easily derived from the statue since the god’s distinguishing devices or votive offerings are missing. In one such small sanctuary in Voula, a beautiful archaic head was discovered, which—as its size indicates—very probably belonged to the cult statue of a goddess (ill. 226). The grace it radiates suggests an association with Aphrodite, the central goddess of Halai Aix-
Terracotta offerings from the classical and Hellenistic periods.
onides, although one cannot exclude Demeter, the goddess-protector of agricultural production.

The appearance of the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia, the oldest and assuredly one of the most important sanctuaries of Piraeus must have been totally different. The nature of the goddess—whose temple was destroyed—and the history of the sanctuary are restored here, thanks to the finds and with the help of written sources. In contrast to the fertility gods and goddesses such as Demeter and Kore, or Dionysus who guarantee fruitfulness, Artemis—invoked near the sea coast as Munychia, or Brauronia, at the famous sanctuary at the Erasinus River estuary—has life, itself, in its early stages under her protection—whether animals or children. In particular, she watches over young girls until they grow up and marry, and provides assistance during childbirth and in the upbringing of children. Characteristic of worship in both sites—whether Munychia or Brauron—is the small calyx-shaped vessel (a krateriskos) with the depiction of girls dancing around the altar and the large quantity of children’s votive offerings, such as a swaddled infant (ill. 263). A more general reference to the nature of the goddess is provided by a deer, recurring on vessel or as figurines.

The presence of the goddess on the cape above the small port of Munychia (the current location of the Yacht Club of Greece) dates as far back as the Neolithic Era, millennia before Piraeus was ever settled; the sanctuary’s foundation is attributed to one of the mythical kings of Athens. The wealth and quality of the offerings, including exquisite shards of red-figure vessels and a very interesting collection of charming female figurine heads prove the existence of a continuous worship from the geometric to the classical and late classical periods.

The votive offerings of this essentially lost sanctuary not only reveal the nature of the deity and the history of the site but ancient man’s whole attitude towards the divine as well. Although the regularly renewed altar sacrifice is central to this relationship, the votive offering, which retains the memory of the sacrifice, is what guarantees its duration over time. Even beyond this, however, the very nature of all those votive offerings, which cover an immense range from the most insignificant implement to the most precious item, the exotic objet d’art, such as a tiny imported faience cat (ill. 266), a beautiful Attic vessel, and—a rare highlight—a statue (a gift that delights the gods) of a nude youth or an attractively dressed maiden, offers a unique portrayal of the spirit of ancient devoutness.

Matters are entirely different in the state cult, where the sacrifice ends with an agon (athletic contest), that festive public demonstration of competition among citizens for the best gift—the best results, the peerless creation—that could be offered to the god. The creation of the great works of ancient art from Pindar’s Epinikia (victory odes) to the heyday of drama is related to this. The supreme moment, however, must be the city’s dedication of the statue of the deity itself.
220–223: 6th cent. BCE terracotta female busts from graves and sanctuaries in Attica.
224–226: Terracotta female busts from the 6th and 5th cent. BCE. Head of a terracotta archaic statuette of a female deity from the sanctuary of Halai Aixonides in Voula (below).
227–230: Late geometric figurine of an enthroned goddess from Kallithea (227), archaic handmade figurines from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia (228–230).
231–234: Terracotta figurines of seated female figures from the 6th (231–233) and 5th (234) cent. BCE; from sanctuaries and graves in Attica.
235–239: Terracotta figurines of standing female figures from the 6th and 5th cent. BCE: plank-shaped figure with tall polos ("priest"), (235); two women wearing a chiton and himation draped at an angle (237, 239).
240, 241: The contrasting postures of the classical hydrophoros (240) with her severely draped peplos—reminiscent of a Doric column—and the Hellenistic Tanagra figurine elegantly wrapped in her himation (241), illustrate better than anything else how things changed during the period spanning the era of Pericles and that of Alexander.
242: Terracotta figurine depicting the abduction of Europa by Zeus in the form of a bull; early 4th cent. BCE.
243: Black-figure skyphos from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia: the seated Dionysus is framed by dancing maenads and satyrs; late 6th cent. BCE.
244–246: Proto-Attic (244: charioteer) and late archaic (245, 246: horse, aulos player) shards from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia.
247–249: Classical shards from the mid- (247: symposiast) and the end of the 5th cent. BCE (248: Eros) and a fragment of a late classical crater with the depiction of a chariot (249); from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia.
250–252 Small heads, with himatia wrapped around them, from figurines of young women offered to the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia, 4th and 3rd cent. BCE.
253–257: Small heads of young women with wreaths or fashionably coifed (Melonenfrisur), offered to the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia, 4th and 3rd cent. BCE.
258–261: Krateriskoi and krateriskoi fragments with depictions of running women as well as a shard with the hind of Artemis.

262: Fragment with engraved votive inscription "ιερόν" (sacred) from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia.
263–266: Offerings to Artemis Munychia, referring either to the goddesses’ character as kourotrophos, e.g. the figurine of a swaddled infant (263), of Papposilenus holding the infant Dionysus (264), a woman preparing to nurse (265), or to the range of her influence, such as the Egyptian faience cat (266).
THE FORM OF THE GOD

IN THE DIVINE STATUE, which clearly manifests the form of the ideal human body devoid of any narrative or chance elements, and unremarkable details, the ancient city perceived and admires its very self. It is on this that the city grounds a demand to illuminate and eternally renew life.

In an earlier period—the dark centuries of the creation of Hellenism, when the great powers that surpassed humanity and fixed its fate were generally perceived as abstract tectonic shapes—the sculptural concept of the divine was rendered by the large geometric vessel. The essence of the radiance of the ancient statue, wherein the sculptural language of the temple or the vessel found its clearest and most complete expression, is perceived in the balance—via an admirable, unique in human history, process, observed since approximately the mid-7th to the mid-5th century—of the internal tensions characterizing the archaic statue. The concepts of health, cleanliness, exhilarated happiness, and of the dawn of the world that characterize it would constitute the Greek statue’s eternal contribution to humanity. A basic element of this sculptural language is the immediacy of the beauty and the dynamism of the archetypal simple form. Its moral foundation, however, is a respect for and admiration of the human body as the culmination of creation, a point where the Bible meets ancient tradition. The climax of this art is located in the restoration of the god’s material presence in the cult statue. The archaic statues of the Museum of Piraeus cannot match the wealth of the Acropolis or Kerameikos. In the austere cylindrical torso of the Aghios Ioannis Rendis kore, one recognizes one of the earliest female form types, predominantly related to Samian sculptural tradition. A small Parian marble kouros from the Temple of Aphaia provides an early (circa 560 BCE) example of the Aegina School. We are familiar with the Aphaian pediments in the Glyptothek Museum of Munich, examples of the apogee of the school. The Museum of Piraeus owes its uniqueness to the fact that its halls contain some of the rarest examples of great bronzework, a primarily classical form of the plastic arts.

The Bronze Statues of Piraeus

History: Four bronze statues and a tragedy mask were discovered in the summer of 1959 along with three marbles (two Herm columns and a marble statuette of an Orientalizing Artemis) in the course of sewage system works at the corner of Vas. Georgiou I and Filonos streets behind the Tinanios Garden. As indicated by their placement and the location they were discovered, they were placed in safekeeping in some port storage area either for protection or to be smuggled out later, and were subsequently buried when fire destroyed the warehouse. Shortly after they were discovered, the bronzes were trans-
ferred to the National Archaeological Museum workshops for conservation work; subsequently, they remained in the Museum until February 1983, whereupon they were returned to the Museum of Piraeus. In order to better protect them from humidity and pollution, it was decided to place them inside hermetically sealed nitrogen atmosphere display cases. These are some of the very few, approximately 35, bronze statues from all periods surviving today. The Piraeus bronzes belong to the world of great art. They express in a deeper, clearer, sculptural language what the Museum’s offerings and humble funerary stelae narrate sotto voce.

The Archaic Concept of the Male Figure—the Bronze Apollo of Piraeus

The Piraeus Apollo is the sole surviving bronze kouros and possibly the earliest known cast statue. Its outer shell is very thick and sections of its clay core and iron armature were found inside the statue (ill; 173–185)

Chronologically, the Apollo is located towards the end of the hundred-year evolution that began with the daemonic representations of youth from the late 7th cent. BCE, such as Cleobis and Biton at Delphi. Coming after the robust, fit, radiant in their self-confidence, smiling figures of young aristocrats such as the Anavyssos Kouros from the great decade of archaic sculpture 530—520 BCE, it belongs to the late Archaic period, when the sculpted form of the kouros had been split into types: the athlete, the hero, and the god, thanks to fine differences in the body’s form, posture and expression.

The god is identified by the bow, which he held in his left hand, while in the right he held a—possibly gold—phiale (libation vessel), as indicated by the depictions of the god on vessels and miniature sculpture. Golden-haired Apollo was also revealed by his hair, which along with the pubes, was covered in a thin sheet of gold. On a more profound level, however, the identification with the god now originates in the expression of the figure. The vanity of the athlete and the joyous smile of the kouros have been replaced by the solemnity of a new morality, already demonstrated by the change in posture, which tends to free itself from the shape of the kouros and the tyranny of the tectonic axis. The hands are liberated from the torso and the weight is no longer evenly distributed on both feet. The shift to the extended right leg is expressed in an organic way through the distinct rendition of these marvellous legs, which now truly support the body, transforming the posture’s tension into an upward thrust of the whole sublime body. The reversal of the standard kouros outline—here by extending the right leg—that is not due—as previously surmised—to an attempt to be in balance with a statue of Artemis, aims to stress the particular side of the body where he extends the phiale, offering a libation. The god’s movement and attention are focused in the same direction, as indicated by the characteristic—unique in the archaic era—angle and turn to the right, which is underlined by the hairstyle as well as the asymmetries in both face and torso. In the form’s closure, the solemnity of the expression of the elongated, austere face, with its defined lines and high forehead, crowned according to the archaic style, by two pairs of spiral curls like an Ionian capital, we can discern the forerunner of Pheidias’ Kassel Apollo, in expression as well as stance. Pheidias, who created that unique Apollonian type, must have been aware of a similar statue.
Kore, circa 580 BCE.

Kouros from the Temple of Aphaia, circa 560 BCE.
This god would have obviously constituted the prototype for the youths who competed during the games and of the boys who sacrificed their hair upon entering adulthood. If the bow keeps all the impure at a distance and punishes the blasphemous lack of measure, the phiale indicates that the god, who is depicted pouring a libation like a mortal, functions as a model of piety, and as a reminder of the existence of a greater power, which exists even higher than the gods themselves, and just like the Delphic oracles reveals the will of Zeus. Our admiration of the statue is thus accompanied by the sense of a high morality, a moral inquiry that—beyond the visible—guides the intellect towards a divine reality. It seems as if Apollo himself stood before the sculptor, the god who taught the proper attitude to worship and to the everyday, and whom the classical period had recognized as the summation of moral strength, of light, of clarity, of measure and order, the creative power of poetry. For the first time, we can speak of a divine statue; before it, we experience the command Rilke was inspired to utter when he saw an archaic torso of Apollo: “Du mußt dein Leben ändern” (You must change your life).

Like every original work, the Piraeus Apollo fills the viewer with admiration and puzzle-ment, as regards its dating, as well as the workshop that produced it. The contrast between its austere facial characteristics, the archaic hairstyle and the rich distinct moulding of the back and legs, led to various date estimations for the statue: for some this is a work that dates to the 520s BCE, for others to the early severe style—circa 480 BCE—inspired by an earlier cult statue from a Peloponnesian workshop. There are even those who—based on apparently serious morphological arguments, such as the absence of inlaid eyes, the outline of the face, or the accompanying finds (e.g., the marble Herm stelae, and the Artemis Kindyas statue)—link it with the mannered archaistic trend of the late Hellenistic period. However, even if we do accept, based on the technical—as regards the casting—arguments, that the statue, which by a happy chance was preserved until today, was recast during the early Roman period, any doubts of its dating to the period of the creation of the classical form is negated upon encountering this great work of Hellenic plastic art.

This refutation of a late Hellenistic dating is supported by the other female bronze statues, as well as the shield, from the same find that has recently been restored in the workshop of the Museum of Piraeus.

The Bronze Statues of the 4th Century BCE

The other three statues take us to a radically different world. The spare, powerful sculptural language of the archaic youth evokes a more fertile emotion, speaks more directly to our spirit and our senses than the 4th cent. BCE goddesses whose forms the long succeeding centuries of classicism have reduced to empty stereotypes.

Between them comes not only the completion of the 5th cent. classical form that dawns in Apollo, but also an even more shocking change in its general concept, which marks the transition from the 5th to the 4th cent. BCE. The revelation of the divine now takes place before the world, before the dazzled worshipper. Through movement, rotation, expression and the direc-
tion of the gaze, the 4th cent. BCE statues create an imaginary space around themselves, pain-
terly rather than sculptural, and enforce a new relationship with the worshipper. Interest centres
on the frontal view; the form’s plasticity becomes evident from here alone. This runs parallel to
the change in the perception of the divine. The daemonic forms of the 6th cent. BCE, and the
transcendental ones of the 5th cent. BCE are succeeded by the human deities of the 4th cent.
BCE, as demonstrated by the triumphant progression of Asclepius who succeeds Zeus or influ-
cences the way his form is depicted. Similarly, the hall’s three goddesses, enclosed in their own
emotional world, immobilized in a temporally defined position bend over worshippers with
compassion, extending towards them the hand that holds the phiale.

From the start, the great Artemis was the subject of long discussions, as regards its chro-
nology, as well as its attribution to one of the great artists of the 4th cent. BCE (ill. 280–290).
The robust young woman with her characteristic hairstyle, a radiating arrangement of ringlets,
i.e., a “melon” hairstyle (GE. Melonenfrisur) in the jargon of archaeologists, was identified
immediately after her discovery, as a muse, and was associated with the tragic mask in the
same find. The work was attributed to the sculptor Silanion, creator of the portraits of Plato
and Sappho, primarily due to similarities in the rendition of the hair. However, this face, full of
life, whose preserved inlaid eye makes it glow with animation, lacks the great characterization
power of those portraits. Artemis is identified less by her divine character, than by the details:
the relevance of the quiver at her back, and the characteristic position of the fingers of her left
hand that held the bow and an arrow. The expression and the sculpted rendition of her body and
garment folds betray a deeper relationship to the work of the sculptor and painter Euphranor,
specifically with the (marble) Apollo Patroos in the Agora, which Pausanias mentioned as his
work. Euphranor was indeed the main representative of the classicalizing style that, around the
mid-4th cent. BCE, sought to return to more robust, earthly figures. As he would say, unlike
Parrasius’ Theseus, his had been nourished with meat not roses. The somewhat theatrical full
frontal view and the excessive emphasis on the form’s chiastic pose may be linked to the classi-
cizing tradition. This work—like Athena—must have been quite well known in antiquity, since
it was the model for many Roman copies (Thessaloniki, Rome, Turin).

The sculptural style of a—severely damaged by oxidation—statuette of a small Artemis
(ill. 291–299) is much closer to the classical concept of the virgin goddess of the hunt. The
youthful air the slender, virginal, practically boyish body exudes is enhanced even more by the
slight unsteadiness of the posture, head and hand in line with the relaxed leg, the Attic peplos
(garment), belted above the fold, with the himation wrapped high under the breast and around
the shoulders, so as not to hinder the movement of the huntress goddess, finally the small head
with its youthful “lampadion” (little torch) hairstyle. Great attention has been paid to the work,
which has many repoussé details (the strap and sandals); were it not for the extensive oxidiza-
tion damage, it would constitute the jewel of the museum. The austere composition of the folds,
the way the figure narrows at the top, the highly placed belt, the small head, all are elements
that stress the vertical axis, give the figure the appearance of a column and date the statue to
the late 4th, or even the early 3rd cent. BCE. This type of small Artemis was broadly dissemi-
nated, and we see it repeated in the entire series of Attic reliefs of the second half of the 4th cent. BCE. It must, therefore, derive from a renowned prototype that is very similar to, if not the Piraeus statue itself.

The largest—and most impressive—of the bronze statues of the Piraeus Museum is the statue known as the Piraeus Athena (ill. 300–314). The statue is based on Pheidias’ Athena Parthenos. The vision of the goddess with Nike at her right hand, her left holding in a spear, simultaneously propped against her shield lying on the ground, runs parallel to the spirit of the 4th century. The peplos is belted under the fold, which falls diagonally to the middle of the left thigh, while it is raised in the back to protect the head, according to custom. Athena’s head is covered with a magnificent Corinthian helmet rather than the Attic helm of the Parthenos, decorated with owls and griffins and a crest decorated with a snake. The figure stands heavily on its right leg, which is accentuated by three groups of vertical folds, while the relaxed leg moves nonchalantly back. The diagonal draping of the fold, with its equally diagonally placed aegis, transfers the sway of the statue’s movement to the right, where it comes to a climax with the turn of her head angled towards the right hand that held the Nike. The Piraeus Athena must have been a well-known work as well; this is evidenced by the many preserved Roman copies of a variation, with her left hand on her hip: the Mattei Athena in the Louvre and the Stroganoff head in Basle. This Athena lacks the majesty of the Pheidias original and even the robust nature of Kephisodotos’ Eirene or of other mid-4th century classicizing works, such as Euphranor’s Apollo Patroos and his Artemis of Piraeus; the Athena has been attributed to both sculptors in the past. In place of the dynamic juxtaposition of the clean (resembling column striations) folds that lifts those figures, the Athena’s movement and pleating display a lack of dynamism, which in the relatively small face registers as a—rather saccharine—emotionalism. Similarly humanized, to a degree that she is scarcely recognizable, is the figure of Medusa, which is far from the apotropaic archaic Gorgoneion and

*The Mattei Athena (Louvre Museum).*
equally far from the icy image of death that is the classic Rondanini Medusa.

Thanks to a coin, the Piraeus find was dated to the period during which Sulla laid siege to Piraeus. The fact that the statues were buried after a fire, directly associated with the Roman dictator’s destruction of the city in 86 BCE, as well as the coincidental simultaneous presence of four cult statues, one of Apollo, two of Artemis (the orientalizing, marble swaddled Artemis Kindyas, whose column-shaped torso revives the archaic kore of Aghios Ioannis Rendis should also be included here) constitute evidence potentially supporting the hypothesis of Professor George Dontas that the statues were transferred to Piraeus from Delos for safekeeping after the island was pillaged by Mithridates’ general. However, we cannot exclude provenance from some other Piraeus sanctuary, such as the nearby sanctuary of Zeus Soter (Papagianopoulos-Palaios) or some other sanctuary on the coast. Contrariwise, their burial does not make sense if they were actually part of Sulla’s plunder.

Proof of the classical provenance of the Piraeus find—which recently was contested by those who want to view it as proof that a neo-Attic workshop was producing original work or replicas during the 1st cent. BCE—is the shield, recently restored from the many fragments, which were discovered during the excavations and preserved all these years in the National Archaeological Museum. The restoration proved that these were not two shields, as had been theorized, one of which would have belonged to Athena, but the exterior and interior bronze overlay of an actual wooden shield dating to the end of the 5th cent. BCE (ill. 316). The shield’s exterior is exceptionally interesting, its rim decorated in a style familiar since the archaic age (a double band with leaves and braiding) and a central—framed by a laurel wreath—depiction of a classic four-horse chariot, with the dashing horses, as well as the hands and lower part of the charioteer’s body preserved.

Statue of Artemis Kindyas.
267–279: The archaic Apollo from the Piraeus bronze finds.
280–290: The large Artemis from the Piraeus bronze finds; 4th cent. BCE.
291–299: The small Artemis from the Piraeus bronze finds; 4th cent. BCE.
300–314: Athena from the Piraeus bronze finds; 4th cent. BCE.
315: Tragedy mask from the Piraeus bronze finds; 4th cent. BCE.
316: Shield from the Piraeus bronze finds; 4th cent. BCE.
A CLASSICAL SANCTUARY

THE TWO HERM STELAE that frame the entrance of the imagined sanctuary we are entering were found, practically untouched by time, along with the bronze statues. The somewhat cold precision of the rendition of the original, the archaistic Hermes Propylaios of Pheidias’ student Alkamenes, reveals that these are neo-Attic copies of the 1st cent. BCE.

The replica of the temple of the Mother of the Gods in Moschato, ancient Xypete, serves as the core of the reconstruction. The votive reliefs (from various sanctuaries in Piraeus and Attica) frame the altar like a festive chorus; the altar constituted the centre of the sanctuary and the magical point of contact with the divine.

The god himself was present in his statue, opposite the altar, just visible in the half-light of the temple.

The cult statue of the Mother of the Gods, discovered in the naiskos (small shrine), where it is also exhibited, is a rare classical replica of a frequently copied, and hence well-known work of Agorakritus, Pheidias’ other most beloved student (ill. 319). The goddess is sitting on a throne. The head, which was inlaid, is missing; so are the hands. From the pose, it appears she held a drum in her left hand and a phiale in her right. Beside her—on a separate pedestal—stands a lion. Cybele, the Mother of the Gods, a Phrygian deity, was worshipped from very early on in the entire Hellenic world, Piraeus in particular, as evidenced from the large number of reliefs discovered here. It is worth noting that Cybele’s relief remains constant, retaining unchanged—from its archaic appearance in Ionia down to the Roman period—precisely the same type of naiskos in which the enthroned goddess is portrayed, which is also found in Moschato; only the position of the lion varies, with the goddess often holding it on her knees. It is an established type of devotional effigy (an Andachtsbild, according to Buschor) that corresponds to the Christian practice, and was actually used this way, something revealed by
the large number found in private residences. The votaries the effigy addresses are never depicted. The goddess, on the other hand, is accompanied by deities that serve her as her attendants, such as Pan and the figures of a youth with a prochous (pouring vessel) and a maiden with torches, portrayed in the depictions of some of the naiskoi, and in a beautiful classical relief, possibly from the Piraeus Metroon, which is now in Berlin. These two figures are usually identified with Hermes (in one depiction the youth holds a caduceus) and Hecate, related deities and sanctuary guardians.

The interior of the famous Metroon of Piraeus, the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods, which was excavated—leaving no evidence in the soil or in the bibliography—by the French army of occupation in 1855, is rendered even better in a relief (ill. 325). The dedicator, whose name, except for the ending of the patronymic on the epistyle is lost, stands, his hand raised in the attitude of a worshipper, in front of the low round eschara (sacrificial hearth), while a votive naiskos of Cybele sits next to him on the floor. Opposite him, at the right of the relief, the figure of the goddess once stood; above, among the clouds, which conventionally designate the shift from the earthly to the divine realm, appear the heads of a well-armed company of Curetes (priests) and five Nymphs, her adherents and servants. It has been assumed—though the evidence is lacking—that the worshipper portrayed is actually a beggar-priest of Cybele. The Museum, however, does contain a funerary relief of at least one priestess of the deity (ill. 326), recognizable by a temple key, the common symbol of the priesthood, and a drum.

Expressing the spiritual features of the god in great statuary created the conditions for a new, more internal form of encountering the divine, in the votive image. The higher morality radiated by the new—sculptural—concept of the figure creates a new, unapproachable spiritual world around it. The enthroned god of the relief (ill. 332) thus maintains, thanks to his hegemonic stance and isolation from the viewer, the distance that separates, and should separate, gods from mortal human beings. The figures of an Apollonian triad in a relief from Galatsi are linked to that same world through the glorious attitudes of their famous prototypes, Skopas’ Apollo Kitharodos, Praxiteles’ Artemis Phosphoros, and Cephisodotus’ Leto.

The figures in the heroic reliefs, which an earlier mistaken belief usually called nekrodeipna (funerary banquets), are depicted enclosed in their own world, in a blessed life beyond death. The hero, reclining on his couch, takes part in an endless symposium with his companion seated opposite or next to him; at the other end, the young oenochoos (wine-pourer) is ready to fill the cups from the nearby crater. Both of the museum’s reliefs are among the best of their kind. The first—maybe the earliest classical nekrodeipnon—retains, despite the damage to the faces, all the characteristics of the Rich style, the well-formed contours of the poses and folds, enclosing the bodies of both figures in their rhythm.

One common, especially to popular worship, type of devotional relief, depicts the deity, in the distance, as indicated by its pose and size, being worshipped next to an altar or in its sanctuary by a group of microscopic worshippers usually approaching from the right. The votive relief of Heracles depicts a sacrifice to the hero who is standing like a statue in front of the altar (ill. 333). A faithful family approaches with the trittoia, the sacrifice of three animals (ox, sheep, and pig—only the last is preserved). Sanctuaries
Reproduction of the naïskos of the Mother of the Gods, Moschato.
Kore statue, late 5th cent. BCE.
of Heracles were common in many municipalities. It is possible the relief might be from the sanctuary of Herakles at Kaminia, the religious centre of the Tetrakomos, which consisted of Piraeus, Xypete (Southern Phaleron—Moschato), Phaleron, and Thymiatadai (Keratsini), which we are familiar with from certain inscriptions.

Panels depicting healing are a special category of votive reliefs, unmistakeable as regards their general type and provenance, and correspond to contemporary “tá mata” (votive offerings). They mainly filled the sanctuaries of the physician-gods and heroes, such as Asclepius, etc. The Asclepieion of Piraeus is the oldest in Attica. It was here that the god of Epidaurus first disembarked before travelling up to Athens.

Plutus, in Aristophanes’ eponymous comedy, sought refuge in his sanctuary—discovered between the port of Zea and the coast of Kastella—seeking a cure for the blindness, everyone accused him of. The relief, one of the most exquisite in the museum, dates to the end of the 5th cent. BCE—i.e., it is a little older than the comedy—depicts the healing of a woman who, lying in the abaton (sacred area), sees the god bend over her and touch her with his magic hands (ill. 329). It is possible the venerable figure of Asclepius was inspired by Alcamenes’ slightly earlier cult statue; the same holds true for Hygieia, who stands behind him, her figure reminiscent of the large female deity type of this important sculptor. The small lively relief from the early 3rd cent. BCE is a táma—according to the inscription ευξάμενος ανέθηκεν—that Pythonikos and his wife offered to the Agathe Thea, who is depicted here—possibly because of a misunderstanding—in the statue type of the Agathe Tyche (ill. 331). The location—the sanctuary of the goddess—and the reason for the offering are indicated by the replica of a human leg hanging on the wall. Very possibly Pythonikos, like the distant Cretan merchants of the peak sanctuary of Kythera, suffered from gout, that scourge of antiquity’s wealthy social classes.
317: Herm stele, copy of the archaistic Hermes Propylaeus of Alcamenes, circa 100 BCE.
318: Herm stele, copy of the archaistic Hermes Propylaeus of Alcamenes, circa 100 BCE.
319: Cult statue of Cybele, Mother of the Gods. Classical copy of a well-known work of Agorakritus; from Moschato, 4th cent. BCE.
320: Statuette of Cybele from Piraeus
2nd cent. CE.

321: Statuette of Cybele from Piraeus
1st cent. CE.
322: Votive naïskos of Cybele, classicistic work from the 2nd cent. CE.
323: Votive naïskos of Cybele, 4th cent. BCE.
324: Votive naïskos of Cybele, 2nd cent. BCE.
325: Votive relief to the Mother of the Gods, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.
326: Funerary stele of Chairestrate, a priestess of the Mother of the Gods; from Piraeus, 4th cent. BCE.
Votive relief of the “Funerary Feast” type, 400–380 BCE.
329, 330: Votive relief to Asclepius and Hygieia from the Piraeus Asclepieion, circa 400 BCE.
Relief dedicated to the Agathe Thea by Pythonicus, fulfilling a holy vow for the healing of his leg, circa 300 BCE.
332: Votive relief, early 4th cent. BCE, unknown provenance.
333: Votive relief to Heracles, 4th cent. BCE, unknown provenance.
334: Heroic votive relief, 4th cent. BCE; found in the “sea of the harbour”.
THE GRAVE MIRRORS LIFE

THE DEAD ARE CLOSER TO MORTALS THAN THE GODS ARE. The clash between the laws of the city and the unwritten divine law that requires the burial of the dead is at the very centre of Antigone’s tragedy. Even deeper—beyond and behind the law—is the indissoluble personal link with the dead: lost parent, spouse or child, every person feels part of himself has been violently removed to another sphere. The worship of the dead ensures their presence in the land of the living. Thus, just as the sanctuary is a place for the divine presence, the grave monument is the place for the dreamlike meeting between the dead and the living. Death—like all of life—is located in the sphere of the divinity.

The grave itself (the pit, the sarcophagus, or the cinerary urn) is an archaeological treasury, and a unique source of knowledge on perceptions regarding death. It not only contains the earthly remains of the dead, be they bones or ashes, but what they loved most in the world, or what those left behind considered most precious. Sealed within the earth, these gifts were preserved intact for eternity.

Earlier periods demonstrated a more direct relationship between the form of the grave, the grave offerings, and the dead. During the proto-geometric period, the grave’s presence was denoted by a stone, a mark of the deceased, while the sex was conveyed by the shape of the cinerary amphora: amphoras with handles reaching to the neck were destined for men; when the emphasis (through the position of the handles) was on the belly of the amphora they were female. This association continued in the burials of the mature geometric period, where frequently, a libation vessel would become a marker; male graves would have a crater with battle depictions, female graves an amphora with scenes from the funeral and the laying out of the dead. The grave offerings were actual functional objects, directly linked to the life of the dead. When “the whole of Greece bore arms”, those very weapons frequently accompanied the brave man to the grave, like the sword wound around the neck of the funerary amphora (ill. 335) of Salamis, or the spears, bent or pierced with a nail; in contrast, a woman’s ashes were accompanied by bronze, gold, or silver jewels and the implements of the housewife: clay loom weights and spools with incised decoration. Grave offerings from the geometric and early archaic eras are extremely valuable. Apart from the gold bands that bind the face of the dead, hence directly associated with the burial, jewellery is common, bracelets, fibulae, and bronze or, oc-
The tradition of funerary vessels, whose shape and decoration reveal a closer—almost exclusive—relationship with funerary customs or attitudes towards death and the afterlife (which was not foreign to the religious beliefs of the ancients), continued up until the classical era. The miracle of wine, Dionysus’ gift and the rebirth of the fruits of the earth guaranteed by the goddess Demeter through her Mysteries, constitute symbols of the rebirth of life. Less sophisticated, richer and with a happier subject than the arcane worship of Demeter, the worship of Dionysus left deep traces on Attic vessel painting. Countless depictions of Dionysus and ivy decorated funerary vessels; wine vessels, first and foremost the kantharos, are—as mentioned—among the most common funerary offerings in 4th cent. BCE graves.

The most well-known funerary vessel, and for us, the most beautiful introduction to the world and the veneration of the dead, is the lekythos, a type of oil and perfume vessel, used in anointing the dead, which, naturally, would accompany them to the grave or decorate the monument. The shape is old. One of the earliest oval lekythoi, which copy the Corinthian prototype, bears a siren, one of the daemonic beings that protect the world of the dead. The shape changed in the 6th cent., the body acquired a new tension, expanding upwards, with an angled shoulder from which the tube-like neck emerges. Narratives of the gods and heroes replaced the daemonic presence: heroic chariots, the labours of Heracles, and Homeric battles. In the 5th cent., the characteristic type was a balanced cylindrical lekythos with a white slip and (during the early decades of the 5th cent.) black-figure depictions or, more frequently, meander ornaments and branches of ivy. Shortly before the mid-5th century, a purely funerary subject matter prevailed in the red-figure as well as the white lekythoi. Apart from the main subject, i.e., visiting the grave and meeting with the dead, of which we have two beautiful red-figure lekythoi examples, there is a great variety of subjects, particularly in the white lekythoi, where (concurrent to the cemetery scenes, the presence of hoplites increased with the progression of the Peloponnesian war) special emphasis was placed on scenes of the prothesis (laying out of the dead). At the same time, the white ground began being used, just as in panels, as a background for colour depictions of outstanding grace.

As the end of the century approached, the larger the vessels became, the painters’ palette was enriched—under the influence of the great contemporary painters—with new colours, and their hands—
along with their imagination—were set free. As a result, these
depictions give us a sense of the period’s lost paintings. The
colour palette of a scene depicting an attacking hoplite on an,
unfortunately, very badly preserved lekythos in the museum is
extremely rich. The delicate light of the colours of the white le-
kythoi accords with the content of Attic funerary art, that serene
atmosphere of the world of the dead, which assists viewers in
the transition from the harshness of the everyday to a higher, pu-
rifed reality. The freedom of the drawing and the rich colours of
the immense (over 50 cm in height) white lekythos from Salam-
is indicates we are dealing with a work from the final period
of an art that gave us some of the masterpieces of pottery (ill.
342–347). The laying out scene takes place in front of the stele.
The young woman is lying on her deathbed, which is decorated
with bands. At her head, her husband is bent over, bottling up
his pain, while opposite him, more expressive, as is proper, two
women, the first, dressed in white, is pulling her unbound (like
the dead woman’s) hair, while the second, in black at the foot of
the bed, holds out her hands hopelessly.

As early as the archaic era, and much more frequently dur-
ing the classical era, the items—weapons and jewellery that ac-
accompanied the dead during the earlier burials—were replaced
by representations on vessels, and figurines depicting in mini-
ature, the richness of the lost life. Male graves are characterized
by the depiction of contests: battle as well as athletic contests.
The Troizene stele, with its engraved depiction of a hoplite, is
the only equivalent to the archaic Attic stelae in the National
Archaeological Museum (ill. 348). It well known that after the
geometric era—in Attica at least—weapons did not accompany
the dead as grave offerings. Therefore, it appears unlikely that
the museum’s two bronze helmets, a Corinthian and a Chalcid-
ian, from the beginning and the end of the 6th cent. respectively,
come from graves. For ancient Greeks, the end (the purpose) of
life was to be found in the integration of the human body, where the spiritual element of Greek civi-
ilization was concentrated. As places where the body was cultivated, the gymnasium and the palaestra
constituted holy ground, where the young, as well as the mature citizen, spent a large part of his life,
simultaneously cultivating body and intellect. The youth would take with him precisely those symbols
of his competitive education: the scraper, the aryballos, or the arytaina, a ceremonial ladle used for
dipping into the oil jar located in each palaestra, while depictions of athletic practice and contests were
very frequently found on funerary vessels. There is an interesting oenochoe in the Museum depicting
a torch-race honouring some deity (ill. 352). These races, a sort of relay race with torches, among the

Lekythos from the early classical age.
tribes were a feature of many Athenian festivals, primarily to honour Prometheus, who had brought fire to humanity, and Hephaestus, Theseus, Pan, and Hermes; during the Panathenean Festival, there were individual foot races. From the shape of the vessel, it appears likely this depiction refers to the Anthesteria Festival. Nike is portrayed hastening from the left to place a wreath upon the head of a youthful torchbearer, while a tutor, often mentioned in the inscriptions accompanying the dedication of the torch, stands opposite. Excavations rarely discover artisans with the tools of their trade, such as a doctor who was buried with his medical equipment, or the so-called poet of Daphne with his musical and writing instruments—a triangle, a type of harp, an aulos and a lyre, as well as papyrus, wax tablets, and a casket containing his penholder and eraser.

The graves of young women rarely contain jewels—in Attica at least. Mirrors were common grave offerings, simple, or sparsely decorated bronze discs (“radiant bronze” as it is called in one inscription), later, at the end of the 4th, folding mirrors with engraved depictions on the cover (here of Aphrodite riding a goat), and naturally pyxides (toilet boxes) for jewellery, which were usually cylindrical clay or alabaster turned footed vessels with a lid. The most common everyday vessels discovered are now, as always, those linked primarily to household activities, wool processing—distaffs, spools and weights—or to the kitchen, such as simple kettles and clay pots and pans. Scenes from the women’s quarters appear repeatedly on these vessels; women sitting next to baskets, holding wool or spindles.
in their hands, or adorning themselves (A very rare alabastron from Ilioupolis depicts the reflection in a mirror, ill. 380). In general, the dead are accompanied by the vessels they loved and used in life: vessels used during social gatherings—kylikes, skyphoi, and kantharoi—for men, unguentaria and pyxides for married women, wedding vessels, wedding cauldrons and loutrophoroi depicting marriage ceremonies for newlywed girls.

One feels different emotions faced with the grave offerings found in children’s graves, with their nursing bottles and rattles, small clay animals and dolls, or the miniature vessels of all types. Here one finds a young boy’s first strigil, the knucklebones he passed his time with, the small chous (vessel) with its childhood scenes, a gift during the Anthesteria, and the abecedarium (alphabet book) he engraved in school on a shell.
335: Proto-geometric cinerary amphora. The sword of the deceased is bent around the neck of the container; from Salamis, 10th cent. BCE.

336: Proto-geometric amphora with handles at belly height, which served as a woman's cinerary urn. In front: spools and loom weights, female burial grave offerings; from Salamis, 10th cent. BCE.
337, 338: Miniature kantharoi from a child’s burial. The vessel type and the ivy crowning it refer to the Dionysian promise of eternity, 5th cent. BCE.
339: Large classical pinakion crowned with olive leaves; from Trachones (Geroulanos Collection).
340: Red-figure lekythos. The seated dead hoplite gazes mournfully at his helmet, ignoring the woman offering him a riband, 430–420 BCE.
341: Red-figure lekythos. The dead youth is seated, withdrawn, at the base of a funerary stele. Opposite him, a young woman is coming to decorate the grave with a riband; from Voula, 430–420 BCE.
342–347: Large white ground lekythos. A prothesis scene. In front of the deceased, two wailing women: immediately behind them, a young professional mourner with unbound hair; further back the mother is extending her hands in despair; and the father is at the head of the bed. The nuances of grief expressed are striking. From the Reed Painter cycle. Last quarter of the 5th cent. BCE, Salamis.
348–350: Archaic stele of a hoplite from Troizene (348) and two bronze helmets, one Corinthian type (349) from the 7th cent. BCE and one Chalcidian type (350) from the 6th cent. BCE.
351–352: Depictions of athletes on red-figure vessels from the 5th cent. BCE:
Two children talking in the gymnasium, the one on the right still holding his strigil (351), and Nike preparing to place a wreath upon the head of a young torch-racer (352).
353: Athlete’s equipment: the arytaaina to ladle oil and the strigil.
354–361: Musical instruments (a tortoise shell used as the soundbox of a lyre, and an aulos) and writing instruments (casket with penholder, eraser, wax tablets) from the “poet’s tomb” in Daphne; 4th cent. BCE.
362–370: Medical instruments (spatulas, clamps, and spoon-spatulas) from tombs in Attica.
371–373: Alabaster pyxides from a tomb in Troizene, 5th cent. BCE.
374–376: Pyxides (374, 375) and a red-figure lekythos with the depiction of a woman spinning (376), circa mid-5th cent. BCE.
377–380: Bronze mirrors (377—379) and a red-figure alabastron (380) with the depiction of a woman looking at herself in the mirror, circa 500 BCE, from a grave in Ilioupolis.
381: Folding mirror with a relief depiction of Aphrodite riding a goat, 4th cent. BCE.
382–390: Clay animal figurines (horses, little dogs, ram and birds, as well as a huntsman composition) 5th and 6th cent. BCE.
391–395: clay dolls (puppets) from the late 6th to the early 4th cent. BCE.
396–401: Choes, small prochoes with depictions of children crawling or playing, a popular children's gift during the Anthesteria festival. A large chous with a depiction from a children's festival (401) 5th cent. BCE.
THE GRAVE MARKER

THE STELE-CROWNED BARROW covered the family grave, marking its place (marker) and perpetuating the memory of the dead (memorial). It would constitute the symbol of the respect the citizens of the Athenian democracy felt for their ancestors and of their civic pride as well.

These grave monuments, private burial enclosures, known as periboloi (the equivalent to contemporary family tombs) crowded outside the city gates, and, constructed on the borders of estates, “εγγύς οδού”, lining at irregular intervals the rural roadways of the Athens or Mesogaia basin, must have constituted one of the most characteristic elements of the Attic landscape during the classical era (5th and 4th cent. BCE).

Their form is simple: a retaining wall with a more or less well maintained façade on the road, which defines—enclosing the tomb with the graves—the family space. The stelae alignment along the length of the peribolos façade underlines the structure of the memorial and promotes the family. The centre of the peribolos façade is usually marked by a tall stele with palmettes, the main family tomb marker with the names of the dead. This is flanked on the right and the left by the grave reliefs of the family members, arranged somewhat asymmetrically and haphazardly, according to the order of death, and depicting the deceased meeting their relatives beyond death. The two corners of the peribolos façade are decorated with symmetrically arranged marble vessels (usually monumental lekythoi replicas). Sometimes the vessels are replaced by two lions or dogs, vigilant guardians of the grave, or, more rarely, archers, as well as female mourners, or sirens. It is evident—and in a way goes without saying—that the grave monument had then, as it does now, a dual function. On the one hand, it proclaimed the presence of the dead and perpetuated their relationship with their relatives; on the other hand, its wealth it proclaimed their rank—and that of their descendants—to the society of Athens. Despite the ostentatious alignment of the stelae at the monument façade (quite a few later inscriptions were addressed to passers-by), their decoration, with ribands, wreathes, and vessels (primarily lekythoi), leave no doubt as to their direct relationship, as the centre of the worship of the dead, with their grave, which was usually found behind, or next to them.

The Museum of Piraeus possesses an exceptional collection of grave stelae and marble grave vessels, loutrophoroi and lekythoi. These are monuments of, what would be called today, a bour-
geois art, more familiar to and more befitting the population of this city than the large sculptures of the religious centre of Athens. Therefore, it is unfortunate that the majority of preserved stelae are the result of chance finds rather than planned excavations. As a consequence, the grave finds were scattered, so it is often impossible to know which stele crowned which grave containing the offerings from the excavations in the cemeteries of Piraeus, Tetrapolis, the surrounding municipalities and the coast as far as Halai Aixonides (Voula), which are preserved in the Museum.

The marker—a plain or relief stele, plaque, or statue that declared the presence of the dead—connected as it was with humanity’s most intimate fears and the great hope of transcending death, constituted one of the earliest forms of art.

The museum has none of the monuments of 6th cent. aristocratic art to display; their production came to an abrupt end with Cleisthenes’ prohibition of funerary opulence in 510 BCE. The sole exception is the body of a sphinx from the crown of an archaic funerary stele, a powerful reference to the daemonic world of the dead, found in Glyfada. The sphinx, like the depiction of a lion lying on a mound, constitutes at the same time the daemonic sentinel of the netherworld and a reminder of the dangerous distance that separates us from the sphere the dead now find themselves.

On the contrary, the palmette, which replaced the sphinx as early as the 6th cent., reveals the pure dawn of the new hopeful concept of a natural power, eternally renewed through the cycle of death and birth. The palmette stele, which, from then on, would constitute the family or individual marker in the centre of the peribolos, expresses the new democratic concept of the grave monument. A mature example of the type’s classical beauty is found in the stele of a metic from Pyrra on Lesbos, which was recently found near the gate of Ectioneia. The delicate shapes of a sculpted palmette and an acanthus are drawn upon a blue ground, while the small lily amongst the coils is in colour (ill. 402). A later, triangular base from Aegaleo (ill. 403), is a special variation, in the same spirit, i.e., the simple palmette stele. It is not known whether this is a monument to the fallen, although the triangular shape, and especially the finial decoration, containing a helmet—whose crest form a spiralling ornament—in the centre of each side, make it likely.

This type of simple palmette stele quietly accompanied the wonderful evolution of the grave relief and survived its passing in 317 BCE.

The funerary stele of Panchares, son of Leochares (ill. 408) constitutes the peak of the evolution of the funerary stele, a specimen unique for its height (3.5 m.) and its decoration, which, like perhaps the lion of Moschato, decorated the tomb of an Athenian killed at Chaeronea in 338 BCE. It maintains the style of the long and narrow palmette stele with two rosettes and the name of the dead, which was established as early as the 6th cent. The standard contemporary stele has a spot to locate the depiction of a banquet or a funerary feast; here, the depiction of Panchares’ heroic death replaces it. There is only one scene from the battle. The deceased is not associated—despite his heroic nudity—with the dead man trampled by the horse (this humiliating position did not accord with the ancient concept of a heroic death), but with the hoplite who stands facing the rider attacking from the right. As indicated by his hairstyle and facial characteristics, which strongly resemble portraits of Alexander the Great, Panchares’ opponent must have been a Macedonian, and he, one of the thousand Athenian hoplites who died on the last day of that great battle for Greek freedom. This is also confirmed by the painted—barely visible—depiction of the hoplite’s greeting on the body of the loutrophoros on the lower part of the stele. The finial is
Reproduction of a stele circa 560 BCE.
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New York stele circa 525 BCE.
missing, and there are no discernible joint marks. The contemporary opulent palmette exhibited next to it, may give us an idea of what it looked like.

The loutrophoros decorating the lower part of the stele of Panchares, the vessel used during wedding—and simultaneously funerary—ablutions, which accompanied ancient man in the transition to another life, to marriage as well as death, was frequently placed on the graves of young men who died unwed (Demosthenes 44.18). It is frequently depicted in relief, either as a secondary element—as in Panchares’ stele—or as the funerary stele’s basic element, sometimes at the centre of an exceptionally ornate composition, such as the pedimental stele of a youth (ill. 414), where the handles of the loutrophoros are decorated with two youths with hunting sticks in a dance position, reminiscent of works attributed to the contemporary sculptor Leochares. The typical palmette stele (ill. 410) of two brothers (?) Sosimenes and Socrates from the municipality of Athmonon is interesting, since a chous is depicted on the relief loutrophoros, a gift usually given to children during the Choes, the third day of the Anthesteria. It has been suggested that these vessels represent the age of the dead, i.e., that the first died unwed and the second while still a child.

In many cases, the loutrophoros would replace the stele, as in the case of Lysis and his (unwed) son Timocleides, which we will examine later. It is unknown whether the elegant loutrophoros of the Museum, whose shoulder is embroidered with a mesh of very delicate foliate decoration stood over the grave of a young man (in this case, the young man’s name would be written on the base) or whether here we simply have a beautiful example of the decorative marble vessels, marble renditions of those actual clay grave vessels, that frequently decorate the corners of the peribolos, like the similarly decorated marble lekythos shown with it. The marble oenochoe (ill. 411), with an ivy wreath encircling its neck and a banquet scene carved onto its fluted body is a more exceptional case. It is obvious that the oenochoe exists in a sphere where the general references to nature’s eternal rebirth take on a specific Dionysian aspect, which suggests the deceased had a closer link to the worship of Dionysus. More common are the recessed depictions which usually adorn marble loutrophoroi and lekythoi, reproducing, especially during the 4th cent. BCE, in a simpler manner, but occasionally with greater freedom, the message of the grave reliefs. What is rare—in contrast to the painted depictions of the white lekythoi—is the depiction of the grave itself with the dead woman seated on the ground at the foot of the monument, receiving the visit of a relative accompanied by her maid servant; here a technical detail, an inlaid stele provides added interest (ill. 407).

A more obvious statement of the basic idea of the renewal of life implied by the palmettes and the Dionysian references, presents itself in the symmetrical motif of rams horn clashing at the top of two stelae, which frames the painted, just barely visible palmette and the kantharos, symbol of the eternity promised by the reborn god Dionysus (ill. 412, 413). From the mid-4th cent., pairs of threatening lions (ill. 415–416) reappeared—expressing the power of nature, although their daemonic nature had by then receded—to flank 4th cent. BCE periboloi. The link to the great beyond was restored to the stele finial by the strangely erotic figure of the siren, through which the mystical music of the faraway land of the gods echoed, calling the dead to another world (ill. 453).

During the final period of the grave monument’s evolution, these powerful animal symbols tended to represent the deceased and replace the stele. A colossal sitting lion from Moschato (ill.
417) dates to that period, a type that (on a smaller scale) is part of a series of earlier or contemporary monuments in Amphipolis and Chaeronea. A characteristic sign of the times is that here we are not dealing with a public marker, but with a private memorial to the bravery of a specific individual. The eagle (ill. 418) is governed by the same spirit. The proud bird spreads its wings and turns its head with its deep-set “Scopadic” eyes menacingly towards the serpent rising to strike; its efforts, however, in vain since the eagle’s talons have already seized it. The ends of the feathers and the body of the serpent were added. The eagle and serpent depiction, an omen (divine sign), which appeared as early as Homer, constituted an appropriate finial for a soothsayer’s monument. The piece’s style and the free, realistic rendition of the feathers would serve to herald the rise of the style of the Hellenistic era.

Sphinx, archaic stele finial from Glyfada.
Reproduction of a funerary peribolos.

402: The upper section of the palmette stele of Diogenes, son of Apollonides; from Pyrra, Lesbos.
403: Triangular finial of a three-sided funerary stele from a monument to the fallen, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE from Aegaleo. The combination of the foliate decoration and the military element is of interest.
404: Palmette finial of a funerary stele from the northern cemetery of Piraeus, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.
405: Funerary lekythos with a foliate decoration on the handle.
406: Funerary loutrophoros with a rich foliate decoration on the shoulder.
407: Funerary lekythos with a rare depiction of a graveside visit, 1st half of the 4th cent. BCE.
408–409: Huge funerary stele of Panchares, son of Leochares, possibly one of the fallen at Chaeronea (338 BCE). The scene depicts the clash between an Athenian hoplite and a Macedonian rider.
410: Funerary stele of Sosimenes and Socrates from the Municipality of Athens. The loutrophoros and the chous refer to the age of the two brothers.

411: Marble funerary oenochoe with relief depicting the dexiosis.
412: Finial of an Attic funerary stele depicting two rams clashing horns. In the centre a painted palmette is barely visible, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.

413: Finial of a stele depicting two rams clashing horns; Dionysus' symbol, the kantharos is in the centre. From the northern cemetery of Piraeus, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.

414: Funerary stele with a loutrophoros relief, 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.
415–416: a pair of lions from a grave peribolos of the 4th cent. BCE.
417: Larger than life marble lion, which marked a grave on Piraeus Street in Moschato; after the mid-4th cent. BCE.
418: Ensemble of an eagle and a snake, possibly the marker of a seer's grave, late 4th cent. BCE.
FUNERARY STELAE were the basic means of expressing the aesthetics and the perceptions of the ancient Athenian on life and death. The museum’s collection of funerary reliefs, unique in quality and variety, illustrates the evolution of the type from its revival in the workshops that developed around Pheidias and his students in Athens until its violent end in 317 BCE. A rift in this evolution, situated around the mid-4th century appears to divide two worlds: faced with the sense of a serene acceptance of death in the youth, the maiden, or the mother lost to childbirth—diffused in the hall containing the reliefs of the first period (420–350 BCE)—one cannot help but be bothered by the—Hellenistic, already—exaggerated demonstrations of passion and wealth that characterize the art of the relief, as well as the social practices of Athenian society from 350 up until 317 BCE. Here, our approach will endeavour to follow a dual course, examining first the subject matter, and subsequently the morphological evolution of the Funerary stele.

The Subject Matter of the Stelae

In its new beginning, the function of the ancient stele-marker expanded and evolved into a narrative regarding the dead, which mainly emphasizing their familial bonds. This illustration of pain and worship—guaranteeing the continuation of the family (anthropological elements that link antiquity to the present period)—opened up the prospect of another relationship with death. The image of the dead, the one relatives and friends would retain internally, would have nothing to do with their chance, individual characteristics; what would survive—like in a dream—would be a beautiful memory and a sense of the daemonic power surrounding the dead.
Being monuments to individuals, stelae were erected on the occasion of a death and usually bore a name. The deceased is centre stage, depicted larger than the rest and is usually seated—frequently enthroned. The head is sometimes turned forwards and the gaze is distant. The standard depiction the deceased is placed in, the usual portrayal is the dexiosis, the handclasp, a scene of calm co-existence, a silent dialogue between the living and their beloved dead, which links them in a common location, beyond life and death, while simultaneously keeping them apart. It permits them for the first time to realistically express their feelings, yet the relatives’ mourning, as well as, primarily, the internal detachment of the aloof deceased, permeates the familial scene with a sense of death.

Pride of place—although the exclusively male prerogative of the archaic age was lost—still belonged to Athenian citizens, whether the deceased themselves, or—more frequently—the ones bidding farewell to the dead, the newly-wed wife and the young son, or some relative. Sometimes the dead grandfather welcomes his soldier-grandson. The depiction is idealized, inspired by the heroes of the tribes on the Parthenon frieze: The Athenian citizen is clad in a himation, has short hair and a short neat beard, and leans on a staff, as was the custom during long conversations in the agora (ill. 419). Happy is he who has his entire family at his bedside in his old age, as shown in the small funerary stele (ill. 424), where the typical dexiosis scene is completed with a procession of relatives, reminiscent of the style of votive reliefs.

Particularly noticeable in classical—as compared to archaic—Attic reliefs is the presence of women, depicted either as unwed maidens, or as young married women in the anacalypsis pose (raising the veil), and frequently as mothers. The woman, the mistress of the house, is usually depicted seated, receiving the greetings of her husband or a female relative; rarely do we encounter the dead woman with her dead son. The division between the dead woman’s sphere and that of the living was revealed from the beginning of the century with the woman turning, as Philo, towards the spectator (ill. 450). Before the mid-4th century, this assumed a dramatic aspect, as in a somewhat crude relief in the museum, where the female relative’s attention appears to be directed with exceptionally intensity at an intangible vision of the dead woman, who has turned her head to face the spectator directly.

Much more frequently the dead woman is absorbed in herself, as in some of the everyday scenes of the women’s quarters, where a young woman will be gazing at herself in the mirror, or adorning herself with the help of her maidservant who brings her a pyxis with her jewellery, a band, or a necklace, all scenes familiar to us from vessel depictions. One of the most important works of the first decade of the 4th cent. BCE belongs to this category, the funerary stele of a young woman with a young maidservant from ancient Aixone (ill. 428) The tilt and shape of her face, rendered practically in the round, as well as the composed attitude of the body, exhibits the classical clean lines and serenity of the best Attic art. The interaction between the hands of the two figures around the lost centre of the necklace is part of the same artistic tradition. Nowhere, however, do women appear so dreadfully excluded from the outside—the earthly world—as in a relief with a bondwoman fetching her mistress a huge basket of wool, a reference to a reality that means nothing to her any more (ill. 429, 430). Even in scenes such as the familiar “steele of farewell”, about which more will be said later, the internal distance of the dead woman is recognized—discretely expressed beneath the emotionalism of the gestures—through her facial expression and the loose, almost slack way she is holding her mother’s hand.
The isolation the young mother feels at leaving her child an orphan is tragic in a different way, possessing greater human drama. We have been quick to accuse ancient art of idealism and indifference to the everyday emotions, yet it has a great deal to say in the modest tongue of the funerary reliefs regarding this inexplicable, in the eyes of children, separation. Childbirth, until recently a very common reason for the death of so many women, is rarely shown in ancient art or tragedy, as is the depiction of death in general. These are usually expressed in the depictions on some marble vessels, such as the lekythos with a reclining woman who desperately extends her hands to grasp the life slipping away from her. Occasionally, a reference to childbirth as the cause of death is indicated through the portrayal of the maidservant holding, or—as on the stele of Eirene of Byzantium—bringing the newborn to the dead woman. On the lekythos (ill. 434), Nikostrate “γυνή αρίστη” (the best of women), with the dishevelled appearance of a woman who has recently given birth is looking at herself in the mirror for the last time, while her now orphaned child—next to his inconsolable father, or, elsewhere, alone—desperately extends his hands to the vision of his lost mother. Old, by then century-old, Littias, would ask his children to portray him on his grave at the moment of biding farewell to his daughter and his grand-daughter, little Choirine (ill. 433). Similar scenes in the male world are shown through the relationship of father and son or grandfather and grandson. In the relief of Hippomachus and Callias, the father gazes into empty space seeking the lost figure of his son, who, in another world, bends sorrowfully over his father. We owe the first attempts at depicting individual characteristics to this in-
tensification, this individualization of the spiritual world. This is evident in the humble relief of a man (ill. 438). The epigram informs us he lost one son while he still lived, and then welcomed the second one in Hades himself (“Ανδρών ενθάδε κεί ται, ός αυτό τον μέν υιόν αποφθίμενον, τον δ’ υπέδεκτο θανών”). The venerable age of the deceased, like that of the centenarian Littias was discreetly indicated by the hairless forehead, while on the contrary, classical sculptors very rarely modified female faces by later adding deeply scored lines and wrinkled necks (ill. 437).

A particularly interesting feature of the evolution of Athenian sensitivity is the presence of the child or young athlete on the stele. The reason is twofold: there is sorrow for the lost young life, but even more the anguish regarding the future of the family bloodline the child represented. Contrary to the funerary stelae of adults, children (boys especially), as well as young athletes are depicted facing forward, usually alone, without any relatives bidding them farewell, with their favourite toy or animal, enclosed in the sorrow of death. On a marble lekythos (ill. 440), twin boys, Moschos and Crates, whose height (much greater than that of their parents who simply frame them) testifies to a subconscious tendency to idolize them, turning them into new Dioscurs, while they themselves gaze inquiringly at us, indifferently holding their toys, while their beloved dog tries in vain to attract their attention. A little girl bends sorrowfully over her doll (ill. 436), or tightly embraces her cherished pet, a bird or a little dog. Finally, young Phyrikias, holding his lyre and a small hare—the two things he that brought him joy in life—now bends over his dead mother in silent conversation (ill. 421). It is to him, and not to the probably long dead Nikoboule, the inconsolable father’s epigram is addressed: Κείσαι πατρί γόον δους Φυρκία, εί δε τις έστι/τέρψις εν ηλικίαι, τήνδε θανών ἔλιπες (You lie here, Phyrkias, having brought grief to your father; if there is any pleasure in the prime of life, dying, you left this behind). These toys, which we encounter, placed as offerings in children’s graves, constitute the most certain guide to the soul and world of children.

The reason for some of the most striking scenes of the isolation of death—and some of the most beautiful reliefs—has always been, since the archaic era, the unforeseen death of a youth, something which more than anything else distresses a family. The youth is depicted as an athlete, usually alone, sometimes accompanied by his aged tutor. The angle towards the viewer, the heroic nudity—and the heroic poses that characterize the portrayal of these young athletes—are indications of an—unacknowledged—intent to glorify a youth who, not having the time to leave behind children to honour him after death, expects to be honoured by passers-by.

The evolution of the form on the stele

Two major dividing lines in the early and mid-4th cent. BCE, were decisive in the evolution of art and especially of the grave relief type.

The first is indicated by a series of reliefs of exceptional artistry, dating to a little before and a little after the turn of the century. In these stelae we observe, step by step, an evolution, which, through the development of the plasticity of the figures and the simultaneous deepening of the natural and moral (emotional) space of the composition, will arrive at liberating them from the structural frame of the stele. On the stele of Nicrosso (420–410 BCE), which retains the ancient palmette relief stele type, the figure of the young girl with her goose has freed itself from the body of the stele; she appears to stand before it, obstructing the palmette with her head (ill. 445).
The stele of the young hoplites Chairedemus and Lyceas of Salamis (ill. 446) dates to the years of the Peloponnesian War. The two youths, who inevitably call to mind the Dioscuri, are joined not through a handshake or some gesture but—in a sculptural representation of their common fate—the rhythm of their parallel progress. The significance of the figure in the foreground, which demonstrates the influence of the Peloponnesian type of the Doryphorus (Spear Bearer) of Polycleitus, is underlined by its heroic nudity, an increase in plasticity and its expansion into space in front of the clothed comrade or brother, who recedes into the relief’s background. Nevertheless, the harmonious contour appears to keep both figures bound to the slab, forming an integral part of it, exactly as a 5th cent. BCE statue is enclosed in the particular sculptural domain defined by its stance, or a citizen in the domain of the city. The stele of a young actor from Salamis (ill. 447) belongs to the same world. The sculptural perception of the figure, the contour of the face and the hairstyle have close similarities to the—contemporary—stele of Chairestratus and Lyceas. The deceased is gazing at a tragic mask held in his raised hand. It has not been determined whether he is standing or sitting—both positions are acceptable. The breathtaking, to us, encounter of the actor and his mask in the transcendent domain of death may possibly surpass the simple reference to the tool of his trade, or even a victory in some theatrical contest during the amazing period that experienced the titanic clash of a Sophocles and a Euripides. In any case, the stele confirms the high social, or at least financial, position actors held in ancient Athens.

The dominance of the contour began evolving into the so-called Rich style of the end of the century, into a manner where body, clothing, and hairstyle loose weight and physical substance and submit to the exquisitely presented shapes of a beautiful, affected stance, drapery, or hairstyle. In the young woman gazing at herself in the mirror, the three-quarter turn of her body is so effectively enclosed within the harmonious contour that the woman has no essential need of the support, which she coquettishly borrowed from Pheidian sculptural prototypes, such as the Aphrodite of the Gardens (ill. 443). The transparent chiton, which slides off, erotically revealing the shoulder, is found again in a marble lekythos (ill. 448, 449). It is worn, however, by a young woman whose head is covered with a himation and a bridal veil she is raising in the gesture of anakalypsis, as befits the portrait of newly married woman bidding her parents farewell. The connection—aesthetic and emotional—among these Rich style figures, closed in on themselves, created by incorporating the beautifully presented contours of attitudes and gestures in a broader harmonious configuration, is seen, once again, in a somewhat newer stele in the Museum, which, with ancient grace, combines the palmette and lotus frieze of the “relief with the cat” with the somewhat rigid depiction of Theano (two extremely well known works in the National Archaeological Museum).

In the unfortunately heavily mutilated stele of Philo (or Philousia, if one assumes the epigraph omitted the ending of her name), the sculptural perception of the Rich style came face to face with a new style that sought to overthrow the harmonious, almost narcissistic world of the end of the 5th cent. BCE and give new power to the human form. In comparison to the well-wrought contour that contains—rising from the back, following the tilt of the head and continuing to the charming standard gesture—her relative’s form, Philo appears to belong to another world. The emphasis on the massiveness and the heaviness of the body, discernible in its stance, as well as in the way the head is supported and the determined turn towards the viewer, demon-
strate that constant sculptural values replaced the contour as the artist’s means of expression. Parallel to the increase in the plasticity of the bodily forms, the role of the garment changed: its relationship to the body became realer, all the static well-wrought shapes and beautiful draperies were abandoned. The garment no longer slavishly follows the lines of the body, but lies upon it describing its curves; sometimes as it falls, it stretches, gathers or wrinkles, apparently obeying its own weight and stressing its own sculptural value. The new animated body that rouses the

figures, breaking down the boundary provided by the ground, forced the conventional border to develop depth so as to enclose more massive forms. In Philo’s relief (ill. 450), we have the first example of a naïskos serving as the border of a depiction.

In the early 4th cent. BCE stele depicting Hippomachus taking leave of his father Callias (ill. 451), the new plasticity of the figures, underlined by the framing drapery of the himatia, releases them from the slab of the stele, which is essentially cancelled by the proportional foreshortened rendering of Hippomachus’ upper left arm. The figures now move freely in, or in front of the naïskos, whose pediment and pilasters defined the visible—still unreal—space of the depiction. At the same time, the sculptural autonomy of the figures opened up the path to liberating individual sentiment and internalizing motion. The common element was no longer the continuous contour that fixed the figures of the two hoplites, Chairedemus and Lyceas, to the surface of the slab in an identical elegiac mood. The connection may now be perceived as resulting from an internal power. Their movements are governed by individual spiritual impulses: the slight tilt of Hippomachus’ head is an expression of the compassion and sorrow we feel crushing him. The father gazes distantly, in agony towards the void, which contains his son somewhere. Or might
Funerary stele, circa 430 BCE (National Archaeological Museum).
he himself be dead? Whatever the case may be, it is obvious that in this way, the stele’s depiction of death was becoming more and more human, and is experienced by the figures as the pain and emptiness of a permanent separation.

In the stele of Agetor of Megara (380–370 BCE), the figure, as was appropriate to the young athlete type, is rendered facing forward (ill. 441). With the turn and simultaneous angle of his body, the athlete employing the strigil, occupies the entire width of the stele, while simultaneously seeking support from the pilaster of the frame. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that the sense of bodily—as well as spiritual—instability, completely foreign to the self-confidence of the mature classical athlete, may be due to the youth’s age, indicated by his still hairless pubes.

Although slighter older, and steadier on its legs, the statuette of a victorious boy holding a strigil, from circa 400–390 BCE (ill. 442) is already governed by a painterly approach to the body, contemporary to the extension of the relief’s depth, and correspondingly, an increasing spiritual uncertainty. Thus, the austere beauty of the chest and stomach muscles, and the chiastic movement of the Polycleitan 5th cent. BCE prototypes are erased by the soft chiaroscuro and the almost dream-like impression created by the slightly bent head, which, like Agetor, gazes uncertainly into the void.

Funerary stelae and Monuments 350–317 BCE

A tendency towards excess characterized the evolution of the grave relief after the mid-4th cent. It was not only the ostentatious increase in the size of the stelae. The main thing was the extension of the depth of the depiction and the number of people, which was associated with emotional excess in the expression of mourning, through crowded circularly arranged depictions, where a common anguish appears to sweep along the dead and the living, relatives and friends.

We see a particularly successful rendition of the period style (its success is established by the number of replicas) in the emotionally charged family scene of the “farewell stele” (ill. 452). Mother and daughter literally fall into each other’s arms; however, if one pays closer attention, the distance created by death is already apparent on their faces. Because internalizing the anguish of death does not unite the figures. Instead, it isolates them, undermining any possibility of contact between them. This intensified anguish acquired an independent sculptural expression in the finial of a stele (ill. 453), where two professional female mourners frame the Muse of the Otherworld, the kithara-playing siren.

A stele from Piraeus Street (ill. 454, 455) is a typical example of an Attic family funerary monument of the mid-4th cent. BCE, where semi-circularly arranged figures frame the enthroned, deceased woman, who—as clearly indicated by the discrete presence of the nursemaid standing behind her with a baby (in a pointed cap) in her arms—died in childbirth. Opposite the dead woman, eternally bound to her through a handclasp, stands her husband, while her mother is depicted in the background, facing full front, closing the semicircular space. Already, the man and woman are almost conspicuous figures, their stance and drapery revealing the academic (classicist) style of the sculptor. The couple’s heads are missing, which underlines the mother’s sad expression with her deeply engraved facial features: the eyes, hollowed by pain, and the half-opened mouth, which link the figure to the tradition of the great contemporary Parian sculp-
tor Scopas, especially with the rendition of the mourning daughters of Helios on the Sidon sarcophagus attributed to him.

The common denominator behind all this frequently appears to be the desire for display, another, possibly the primary, characteristic of the period. The contemporary liberation of the individual from the moral bonds of the city, did not only lead to the desperation of loneliness in the face of death, which we perceived in the previous reliefs, but also to a type of strident display of human vanity, familiar to us today as well. To this we owe some of the most impressive Attic grave monuments, many of which ornamented the busy road linking Athens to the harbour of Piraeus along the Long Walls. The monument of Kallithea (ill. 459), discovered in 1968 next to the Long Walls, near the Kallithea station, constitutes the apogee of the evolution of the period’s funerary monuments and lavish graves. The monument was erected by the Histrian metic Nikeratos, son of Polyidos, for himself and his son Polyxenos (the family must have already been well-known in that region around the Euæinos Pontos, in present-day Romania). It is the apogee of a series of grave monuments erected by metics, Greek and foreign, who lived in Attica, and primarily in Piraeus during the 4th cent. BCE. We obtain information on their origins from decrees referring to the Thracian Bendis, the Egyptian Isis, the Cypriot Aphrodite and the Phoenician Hercules. Were it not for the inscriptions, the figures of these stelae cannot be easily differentiated from those of citizens. This explains the complaint of the anonymous Athenian Old Oligarch regarding the levelling effect of Athenian democracy, since one could no longer tell an Athenian, a foreign metic, or even a slave from their exterior appearance. Indeed, we already saw that the palmette-ornamented stele of a metic from Lesbos is one of the most beautiful examples of the classical palmette-ornamented stele. Of interest, due to their origin, are the small grave relief of Eirene of Byzantium, with the name of the dead woman written in Greek (Eirene’s language) and Phoenician, which may have been the language of her husband, as well as a very fragmented stele, where the Phoenician inscription of the pediment ends with what appears to be the last letter of the word ΦΟΙΝΙΞ (Phoenician), on the architrave, and the depiction of a palm tree in the background of the stele (ill. 456). Thanks to the preserved hand holding the writing tablet, it is possible to recognize his profession, which apparently accords with the Phoenician banking tradition. At this point, the monument of Kallithea has nothing in common with those plain funerary monuments, and we can only imagine what—were he aware of it—the oligarchic author of the Pseudo-Xenophon Constitution of the Athenians would have said. It is very probable that the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus may have been a distant prototype for the monument, something that says a great deal about the high opinion the owner had of himself. On a high, slightly inclined podium crowned by a frieze depicting an Amazonomachy, on a three-tiered base (the first bearing the inscription, the second a frieze of monsters and wild animals: lions, bulls, and unicorns), stands a grave naiskos with two Ionian columns. There, before a ground of grey Eleusinian marble, three stand-alone statues are arrayed, turned towards the viewer. The son, a young athlete, stands in the centre, his father is on his right, and on the left stands a young slave burdened with the himation of his young master.

In its similarities with the arrangement of the Daochos monument at Delphi, the slim build of the son, as well as the uniform folds of the himation covering the figure of the bondman, one recognizes the school of Lysippus, while the father’s heavy form, with his himation wrapped around the waist is situated between Mausolus and the Delphi philosopher. The Amazonomachy
frieze appears to date to the same period. The thinly spread arrangement of attacking, wide-striding Greeks and whirling Amazons place the monument chronologically after the Mausoleum, sometime between the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates (335/4 BCE) and the votive offering of Daochos, i.e., around the beginning of the last quarter of the century. On the other hand, the painted decoration, the palmettes and knucklebones that highlight the waves at the seams of the monument, the dark ground which projects the now white sculpted figures, the red chlamydes (cloaks), and the bronze-coloured breastplates and leg-guards of the Greeks, the yellow short chitons of the Amazons that give life to the frieze, contributed a very different—almost painterly—style to the monument, which is appropriate for the period. In addition, the preserved colours indicate the monument had not stood visible for long. Its destruction was probably due to natural causes, such as, for example, an earthquake or the Iridanos River, which traversed the Long Walls at that point. Its restoration, however, provided an opportunity to identify, among the architectural members collected during its excavation, many fragments, coming from another, similar yet slightly larger and more sumptuous monument. That find, along with a section of the relief of a rider preserved in the National Museum, and the pedestal of another monument
recently discovered in Pallini, demonstrate that the Kallithea monument did not constitute an exception or a rich metic’s whim, but exemplified a widespread fashion that, naturally, would provoke a reaction. This came to pass under Demetrius Phalereus in 317 BCE.

Two other stelae in the museum (ill. 468, 469), echo, in a more traditional fashion, the motif of the dead young athlete accompanied by his slave, found in the Kallithea monument. These are two variations on the figure of the young athlete, familiar to us from the Ilissos stele in the National Archaeological Museum and many other copies. The youth internalizes the pain of his premature death with unique power, as evidenced by the splendid head of the first and most fragmented stele, a recent find from the northern cemetery of ancient Piraeus on Thivon Street.

Other monuments, similar to the one found in Kallithea must have existed along the length of the main roads leading to the city. We already referred to the fragments of a neighbouring twin monument. Some of the “orphaned” torsos and detached heads of the museum must have belonged to compositions of a similar type and size, such as the statue attributed to King Casander—with the confirmation of the characteristic Macedonian shape of the himation with its rounded corners—or the kore (ill. 470), and two striking heads of a youth (ill. 473) and a mature
man (ill. 474). The differences between these heads and the charming small female head that is reminiscent of the sculptures of Epidaurus (ill. 471, 472) are indicative of the distance that separates the opposite ends of this great century.

The monument of Kallithea and similar monuments prominent examples of precisely the type of funerary ostentation that, provoking censure, set the stage for the legislation with which two hundred years after the law of Cleisthenes, Demetrius Phalereus, in his role as Cassander’s governor, finally put an end to the art of the Attic funerary relief. One can understand a great deal specifically regarding the reaction of old Athenian families, especially, to the provocation of similar monuments, from the modest loutrophoros with its commonplace dexiosis depiction of a seated man exhibited directly across from it. Suddenly encountering, amidst an anonymous crowd of grave monuments, the loutrophoros that ornamented the tomb of Socrates’ student Lysis is a deeply emotional experience. The name, father’s name, and municipality inscribed on the cylindrical base of monument identifies Lysis, [son of] Democrats of Aixone (ill. 466, 467). In the familiar dialogue of the same name, Plato informs us that Lysis came from an old family of Aixone, his ancestry going back to the gods. The reason he chose to be buried on his property in Moschato, is naturally unknown; the old aristocracy’s scorn towards the arrogance of the nouveau-riche, such as the Histrian metic, may have played a role, however, in the selection of this ordinary monument.

*The torso of the young Polyxenos, son of Nikeratos from the Kallithea monument.*
419: Characteristic Athenian citizen type (short, well-groomed beard, staff) on a funerary relief from the early 4th cent. BCE.
420: The image of spousal harmony, the foundation of the oikos (household) on the funerary stele of Patrocleia and Damonicus; late 5th cent. BCE.
421: Funerary stele of young Phyrktias with a lyre and bunny, age-appropriate recreation objects. Seated opposite him is his dead mother or sister Nikoboule; from Kallithea, late 5th cent. BCE.
422: The dexiosis scene on the funerary stele of Salamis immortalizes the bond of the father and his dead warrior son; early 4th cent. BCE.
423: Funerary stele of Euphanes' family, from the cemetery of Piraeus; early 4th cent. BCE.
424: Funerary stele of Lysarete bidding her husband farewell. The presence of children and her granddaughter underlines the unity of the household, demonstrated by the handclasp (dexiosis) of the couple, 2nd quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
Funerary stele of a married woman with a relative standing opposite her. The architrave is decorated with palmettes and lotus flowers; from Piraeus, 1st half of the 4th cent. BCE.
427: Funerary stele of Artemisia, who may have been a foreigner (metic); from the northern Piraeus cemetery, early 4th cent. BCE.
428: Funerary stele of a young woman who is putting on her ornaments; from Ano Glyfada, 1st quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
429, 430: Funerary stele of a young woman. The wool-filled kalathos the maidservant is carrying refers to the closed world of the women’s quarters; from the northern Piraeus cemetery, circa 380 BCE.
431: Funerary lekythos depicting the pains of the birth, which will result in the young woman’s death; 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.
432: Funerary stele of the metic Eirene of Byzantium. The maidservant is bringing the child to the dead mother; from the northern cemetery of Piraeus, 375–350 BCE.
433: Funerary relief of the centenarian Littias, who is bidding his daughter and granddaughter farewell; from the northern cemetery of Piraeus, early 4th cent. BCE.
434: Funerary lekythos of Nikostrate, “an excellent woman”; 1st quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
435: Funerary stele of Patrocleia of Rhamnous; 1st half of the 4th cent. BCE.
436: Funerary stele of a young girl holding her doll; 360–370 BCE.
437: Detail from a funerary stele of the 3rd quarter of the 4th cent. BCE. The facial features of the dead woman have been altered after the fact to correspond to the grave of an old woman.
438: Funerary stele with a dexiosis depiction of an old man who—according to the inscription—bid one son goodbye during his lifetime, and welcomed the other from the grave, 2nd quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
439: Funerary stele of a young athlete with his tutor from Glyfada. The frontal depiction of young children and athletes demonstrates the intention to canonize a prematurely deceased child as a hero; 1st half of the 4th cent. BCE.
Funerary lekythos with the depiction of two deceased children (possibly twins) between their parents; from Peristeri, 3rd quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
441: Funerary stele of the young athlete Agetor of Megara; 2nd quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
442: Funerary statue of a young athlete; circa 400 BCE.
443. Funerary stele of a girl gazing at herself in the mirror; circa 410 BCE.
444. Funerary stele of a young woman from the northern cemetery of Piraeus; circa 410 BCE.
445. Funerary stele of young Nikisso; 4th quarter of the 4th cent. BCE.
446. Funerary stele of Chairedemus and Lyceas, two young hoplites who fell during the Peloponnesian War. There is an obvious attempt to associate them with the Dioscuri, or Achilles and Patroclus; from Salamis, circa 420 BCE
447: Funerary stele of an actor holding a theatre mask; from Salamis, circa 420 BCE.
448, 449: Funerary lekythos of a newly married woman bidding her parents farewell. From the funerary peribolos of Teisarchos in Aghios Ioannis Rendis, circa 410 BCE.
450: Funerary stele of Philo or Philousia from Salamis. Late 5th or early 4th cent. BCE. The date, spanning two periods, is revealed in the juxtaposition of different perceptions through the sculptural depiction of the figures.
451: The funerary stele of Hippomachus and Callias is characterized by an extension of the natural and emotional space; early 4th cent., from Salamis.
452: The well-known “Farewell Stele”: circa 330 BCE.
453: Funerary stele of Proxenides of Steiria, his wife Aristodike, and Menippe. The lamentation for the prematurely lost daughter reaches its apogee in the image of the siren playing the kythara; from Piraeus, 350–330 BCE.
454, 455: Funerary stele of a woman in childbirth; the semi-circular arrangement stresses the unity of the familial space; from Piraeus Street, 350–330 BCE.
456: Section of the funerary stele of a metic from Phoenicia from the northern cemetery of Piraeus.
457: Figure of a bald old man from a funerary stele; 340–330 BCE.
458: The naiskos of the “monument of Kallithea” with the statue of the young Polyxenos, son of Nikeratos, between his father and his slave with a himation.

459: The restored grave monument of Kallithea; a daring display of wealth by the Histrian metic Nikeratos, son of Polyidos, 330–320 BCE.
Section of the frieze of the monument of Kallithea depicting an Amazonomachy.
461: Section of the frieze of the monument of Kallithea depicting an Amazonomachy.
462: Mounted Amazon from the frieze of the monument of Kallithea.
463: Naiskos of the monument of Kallithea: section of the mid-level frieze with bulls, lions and monsters.

464: Naiskos of the monument of Kallithea: inscription on bottom-level frieze.
465: Mounted Amazon from the frieze of the monument of Kallithea.
466, 467: The funerary loutrophoros of Plato’s Lysis and his son Timocleides from Moschato; 2nd half of the 4th cent. BCE.
Section of the funerary stele of a young athlete with his little slave; the body and stance reveal the influence of the Heracles prototype; circa 330 BCE.
469: Funerary stele of a young athlete with his little slave: a variation on the type of the Illissos stele, located in the National Archaeological Museum; circa 330 BCE.
Statue of a young woman, possible from a grave naiskos; 330–320 BCE.
Head of a young woman, revealing intense movement, which makes it difficult to attribute to a grave monument. Similar to the works credited to the sculptor Timotheus; circa 380 BCE.
473: Head of a young athlete, possibly from a grave naiskos; circa 330 BCE.
474: Male head from a grave naïskos; circa 330 BCE.
ART DURING THE PERIOD OF THE CITY’S DECLINE

THE SPREAD OF HELLENISM through the vast empire of Alexander and the Diadochi, did not only signal the transfer of the geographic centre of the Eastern Mediterranean and the marginalization of Athens (and Piraeus): the heavy cost of Greece’s victory was the gradual disappearance of the essential meaning—as opposed to the form, which spread all over the East—of the polis, upon which this civilization had been constructed.

In the new—Hellenistic now and no longer Hellenic—world, the individual and individual passions assumed greater importance as compared to the polis and political contests. Correspondingly, in art, the sculptural conception of the idea was replaced by the rhetoric of emotion, as more suitable means of expression—in the stance and expression of the period’s statues—and by a new—painterly one might say—feeling for the true life of the surface, the momentary and the chance, the charming and the ugly. On the other hand, a reaction to an image of the god as the embodiment of the excess of human passions, would lead—especially in cities with a long and glorious tradition—to a return to older archaic and classical forms that would nourish the art of the next period, which would be dominated by Rome.

This sensuous perception of a world governed by female grace and childish tenderness, is represented by the few—in accord with the decline of the city of Piraeus itself—Hellenistic statues in the museum. In first place is the headless (the head was an insertion) statue of a young female divinity or personification (ill. 476), clad in a thin, high-belted chiton tied with cords around the shoulders and back. The crisp himation wraps loosely around the waist and covers the lower body, thus revealing more of, and with greater sensuousness, the belly and breast. The original location and identity of this original work are unknown; dating to the end of the 4th cent. BCE, keeping alive the tradition of the school of Praxiteles, it was recently found discarded in the Ano Liossia refuse dump. The same type can be discerned in another, less accomplished female statue (ill. 475). The two female figures are framed by the array of ex-voto statuettes of three small children, where one recognizes a unique, unknown to the classical era, feeling for the individuality of the childish form. The oldest, the statuette (ill. 477) of a young girl raising the overfold of her peplos, is in a more conservative pose. Another (ill. 478), resting on a small column, with a goose in one hand, its foot crossed in front and its head turning in the opposite direction reproduces a type common to contemporary
sanctuaries. As does the plump nude little boy with a ball (ill. 479). The provenance of some of these votive offerings of statuettes of small children from the Asclepieion of Piraeus—certified by the excavator of Iakovos Dragatsis—was confirmed by the recent discovery of yet another (headless unfortunately) girl with a goose on the shore of Kastella near the sanctuary’s location. We know that similar votive offerings—such as the child with a goose admired at the Asclepieion on Cos by the heroines of Herondas’ Fourth Mimiambos—were common in the sanctuaries of Asclepius; this does not, however, necessarily exclude other sanctuaries, especially the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia, whose worship and myth link it closely with the kourotrophos (child nourishing) goddess of Brauron.

The evolution of this charming idiom can be observed in the playful figure of a seated nymph, which for years ornamented the façade of a neoclassical house in Piraeus, a Roman 2nd cent. CE copy of the famous statuary group with the characteristic title “Invitation to the Dance”, a perfect example of the Rococo style of Hellenistic sculpture. The same spirit is expressed in variations, often in a “grotesque” style, of earlier and contemporary Hellenistic creations, such as the clay figurine of a squatting woman—a parody of Doidalsas’ Aphrodite—in itself a very strong sculptural piece, where all the sensual elements of the original were transformed through realistic exaggeration into their opposites (ill. 480–482). In contrast, another branch of Hellenistic art, the art of portraiture, which centred on the individual and flourished greatly during the Roman era, is poorly represented in the Museum—indicative of the decline of Hellenistic Piraeus. The sole example of a Hellenistic portrait is—if one excludes the questionable attribution of the headless statue of a general to Cassander—is the 3rd cent. BCE small wreath-crowned head of a young ruler.

Contemporary to these modernist trends, and characteristic of an era in search of its lost centre—the classical city—was the return to classical, even archaic forms, through which the declining world of the 2nd cent. BCE was attempting to reconnect with the great sculptural
tradition of the 5th and 6th cent. BCE. This trend is illustrated by classicizing works, such as a small head of Zeus, or another of a youth, as well as the archaistic statue of Artemis Phosphoros from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia. Restored in the 2nd cent. BCE after the departure of the Macedonian guard, it is a unique example of the hieratic—archaistic—tendency of this eclectic era (ill. 483). As we shall see in the selections of the copyists of the Roman era, these art forms would have a great future in the new Roman world.

The epilogue to the long history of the Attic funerary relief was written by the prohibition of Demetrius Phalereus. The subsequent dissolution of the workshops of the marble sculptors had long-term consequences for this type of sculpture, represented here only by a small relief of Demetrius and Idyle from the late 4th cent. BCE, which demonstrates the survival of the classical dexiosis.

Greek Art in the Roman Era

The museum’s exhibits are exceptionally instructive regarding the character of Attic artistic production during the Roman years. During the Imperial era, Athens was considered—and was in a way—a free city and Rome’s ally. The still vibrant classical tradition rendered Athens the independent intellectual capital of the empire. Under Roman protection, Athens knew prosperity and a new glory, a share of which went to Piraeus, although it would never regain its old prestige as the port and naval station of an empire. Naturally, during the Imperial era, Athens owed a large part of its prosperity to tourism and academic life. However, local artisanship played a significant role, based primarily as it was on the production of replicas and variations of classical works, on various scales and for various decorative uses, such as statues, reliefs, and vessels to decorate formal chambers and gardens, sarcophagi, etc.

The commercial character of this type of production is illustrated by the cargo of a trading ship that sunk, evidently due to some awkward manoeuvre, in the harbour of Piraeus and was found by chance in 1933, in the course of a harbour deepening project. The find consisted of
marble decorative panels, whose uniform size, shape, and frames indicated they were destined to be embedded in the walls of some opulent building in Rome, where copies of the panels have indeed been located, in, for example, the ornamentation of the parapet of the enclosure of the Forum of Nerva. The iconographic originals of the panels belong to various periods and techniques. Some are in the Severe Style, such as the sculptor Socrates’ three Graces from the entrance to the Acropolis, others classical, such as the exceptionally popular Amazonomachy that decorated the exterior of the shield of Pheidias’ Athena Parthenos (ill. 489, 493), others late classical, such as the abduction of a woman (possibly Iole) by Heracles in a quadriga, led by a youth on foot serving as a nymphagogos (bride’s guide), a characteristic motif of the late 5th cent. BCE, or the dance of the Nymphs and the depiction of Hermes delivering the infant Dionysus to the Nymph Nyssa, dating to the 4th cent. BCE (ill. 494–498).

Another special, extremely popular category is that of archaistic works depicting figures in a rigid affected attitude, balanced on their toes, their garments decorated with characteristic swallow-tails, represented here by two types: the first is an array of two depictions, the first of the dispute between Apollo and Heracles over the Delphic tripod, and next to it, unrelated to the preceding one, a scene of veneration, the second has a procession of the gods (Athena, Apollo, and Artemis) led by Hermes. Copies were embellished with many variations, in the hairstyle and garment of the Graces, for example, or in the background of the Amazonomachy scenes, as well as other changes that altered the style of the composition, such as the altar with a tree, and the woman added to the dance of the Nymphs. The classicisist sphinx with a polos decorated by a palmette belongs to the same find. All the works are characterized by the chilliness of the technically faultless copyists of Hadrian’s period, with certain modernist elements (for example, the use of a drill), which date the find to the mid-2nd cent. CE.
A slightly newer sarcophagus from Nea Ionia is a beautiful example of a branch of Neo-Attic art that would flood the entire Roman Mediterranean with its products. In the centre of the front central section (the others are simply decorated with griffins and garlands) is a depiction of the hunt of the Calydonian boar, an especially popular subject in sarcophagus iconography, with obvious references to the fateful inevitability of death. Meleager is depicted in the centre, spear raised, ready to strike the boar, which has already overwhelmed Ankaios, while from the left Atalanta is shooting it with an arrow. At the same time, the death of the beast would constitute the beginning of a series of events that are not portrayed, which would lead to Meleager own death, when his own mother cast into the fire the brand on which his life depended (ill. 499–501).

The Athena of the western pediment of the Parthenon, and a Hellenistic Artemis Agrotera (Huntress) are examples of the choices and work methods of the neo-Attic copyists. A characteristic of the perfunctory technique of these workshops was to approach the figure solely from the front, contrary to the ancient technique of manipulating the figure’s mass from all angles. However, the work thus acquires the particular charm of a figure that is apparently attempting to escape from the stone, a feature we have learned to appreciate in the—naturally immeasurably more powerful—works of great sculptors such as Michelangelo. Lucian, in his biographical work The Vision, vividly described the external appearance and social class of these copyists. According to Lucian, Statuary was “a working woman, masculine looking, with untidy hair, horny hands, and dress kilted up; she was all powdered with plaster, like my uncle when he was chipping marble”. And further down, (when Culture was describing the fate of the sculptor): “You may turn out a Phidias or a Polyclitus, to be sure, and create a number of wonderful works; but even so, though your art will be generally commended,
no sensible observer will be found to wish himself like you; whatever your real qualities, you will always rank as a common craftsman who makes his living with his hands”. It is to this art, as well as to the copyists of ancient manuscripts, that we owe, to a great extent, our knowledge of ancient art. One fine example is a maenad statuette, with a cavity to receive the head, from the 2nd cent. CE (ill. 502). The larger than life statue of a young man from the Antonine period (circa 150 CE), a marble copy from Northern Greece of a post- Polycleitian Hermes type (ill. 503), also has a particular fascination. The statue’s curls and finely delineated facial features reveal the bronze original. The statue was discovered in Kifissia, the beloved suburb of Roman Athens, familiar to us through the Noctes Atticae (Attic Nights) of Aullus Gellius; it may have ornamented one of the halls in the villa of Herodes Atticus.

A few characteristic samples of the evolution of the funerary relief during the 1st cent. BCE and the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd cent. CE demonstrate the gradual stylization of this type of sculpture we found so absorbing earlier. The series begins on the left with the stele of a youth, his hand braced on a Herm stele, his dog standing on his left, possibly dating to the 1st cent. BCE (ill. 504). Here, the conception of the body and the framing (with Corinthian columns and antefixes) is still Hellenistic. It shares with the subsequent reliefs a frontal perception of the form, like a portrait. The remaining reliefs fully express the Roman funerary monument type, with a frontal rendition of the dead enclosed in an arched frame, its exterior corners decorated with rosettes. All the reliefs have mortises for tenons on the side. In the first monument, dating to the 1st cent. CE (ill. 506), a rigid-looking youth, places his hand on the head of a kithara-playing siren, while the base is decorated with two Tritons. The next monument’s depiction of a Herculaneum Woman type (ill. 505), from the early 2nd cent. CE, is more conventional. More interesting, as a monument to the proliferation of the worship of Isis in the entire Eastern Mediterranean (she had a temple in Piraeus from the 4th cent. BCE) during that period, is the funerary stele (ill. 507) of Ammia Biboulia, daughter of Philocrates (from Sounion), a priestess of the Egyptian goddess, as indicated by the hair style, the Isis Knot (fastening the chiton at the centre of her breast) and the vessels of worship, the sistrum (there is an actual sistrum [rattle] with a Sarapis-head in the Museum, as well as a miniature one from a site in Piraeus) and the situla (bucket) with water from the Nile. And finally, the contemporary depiction of an endangered ship, on the funerary stele of a seaman, referred to afflictions with which many of the harbour’s residents were familiar with.

In the series of portraits of Roman emperors, officials, and members of the local aristocracy, which cover the period between the 1st to the 3rd cent. CE, the Hellenistic conception of the portrait, with its evident foundation in the tradition of the divine image, is imposed upon the realistic, Roman conception of the waxen funerary ancestral mask; then again, we perceive a sign of the times in the influence of the imperial portrait, evident in the trend towards Greek subjects imitating the ruling emperor’s hair style. The Greek version of the imperial portrait appears in the earliest preserved portrait (ill. 509) of the emperor Claudius (41–54 CE), as well as in the inset head of the larger than life statue (ill. 508) of Trajan (98–117 CE), more so, however, in that of the Philhellenic emperor and great benefactor of Athens—and Piraeus—Hadrian (117–138 CE), whose two colossal statues, exhibited in
the museum, stand at over 3 m. and are unique in Greece for their size (ill. 512). The emperor is depicted in a breastplate and chlamys (paludamentum), bracing his left leg. The statues were discovered in adjoining plots in the harbour near a Roman temple; regardless, they may still have been destined for export. The first still retains the emperor’s inset wreath-crowned head. The second, headless, was associated with the emperor thanks to the familiar ornamentation of the breastplate with the Palladium standing on the back of the Roman she-wolf, being crowned by two Nikes, while the tongues on the lower end of the breastplate are decorated with portrayals of subject nations. The power of the radiance of the imperial institution is indicated by the extent to which the external features of the busts of private citizens were influenced by those of the emperors. Such examples are the bust of a breastplated general, a contemporary of Trajan (ill. 510) and one of the 2nd cent. Athenian Gaius Memmius, son of Threptus, from the municipality of Lambtrai, who dedicated it to Highest Zeus (ill. 511). Within the multi-ethnic environment of the great imperial cities, the ruling class of Roman citizens could be distinguished through the toga, a characteristic garment forbidden to all other inhabitants of the empire. To the gens togata (toga-clad nation), as the Romans were called, belongs the museum’s unidentified headless statue from the 2nd cent. CE, which was found in the sea off Piraeus. The realistic 3rd cent. CE portrait of an unknown man, with stark, tormented features and a short beard, reflects all the harshness of the 3rd century, which experienced the great crisis of the empire (ill. 513). The rare portrait of one of the lesser known emperors, the patrician Balbinus, who reigned for three months in 268 CE (ill. 514), is a significant monument from that same period. An identical base (only an eagle and feet remain) may have belonged to a copy of his statue or of his co-emperor Pupienus.

*Neo-Attic decorative panels.*
475: Headless female statue; early Hellenistic era.
476: Headless statue of a young female deity; late 4th cent. BCE.
477: Statuette of a young girl; late 4th cent. BCE.
478: Hellenistic era statuette of a young girl, possible from the Asclepieion of Piraeus.
479: Hellenistic era statuette of a young boy from the Asclepieion of Piraeus.
480–482: Hellenistic era clay figurine of a crouching female figure from Pigadakia in Voula.
483: Archaistic statue of Artemis Phosphoros from the sanctuary of Artemis Munychia; 2nd cent. BCE.
484: Head of Zeus. Hellenistic copy of a well-known classical type; from Piraeus.
485: Portrait head of a Hellenistic ruler, 3rd cent. BCE.
487, 488: Head of a youth from an ensemble; a Hellenistic era classicizing work.
489–493: Neo-Attic decorative panels with depictions from classical reliefs; from the harbour of Piraeus circa mid-2nd cent. CE.
494–498: Neo-Attic decorative panels with depictions copied from late classical and archaic reliefs; from the harbour of Piraeus, circa mid-2nd cent. CE.
499–501: Marble "Attic" sarcophagus with a depiction of the hunt of the Calydonian boar; late 2nd cent. CE (Nea Ionia).
502: Statuette of a maenad, copy of a classical work, 2nd cent. CE.
503: Statue of a young man, a copy of a Hermes type of the Polycleitus school; from Kifissia, 2nd cent. CE.
504: Funerary relief of a youth next to a Herm stele; 1st cent. BCE.
505: Early 2nd cent. CE funerary relief of a young woman.
506: Funerary relief of a young man with a siren, and Tritons on the base; 2nd half of the 1st cent. CE.
507: Funerary stele of Ammia Biboulia, priestess of Isis, and daughter of Philocrates of Sounion, early 3rd cent. CE.
508: Colossal head of the emperor Trajan (98–117 CE).
509: Head of the emperor Claudius (41–54 CE).
510: Bust of a breastplated man; mid-1st cent. CE.
511: Bust of Gaius Memmius Threptus from the Attic municipality of Lamprai; 2nd cent. CE.
Colossal statue of the emperor Hadrian (117–138 CE) from the port of Piraeus.
513: Portrait of an unknown man, circa mid-3rd cent. CE.
514: Larger than life statue of the emperor Balbinus (238 CE).
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