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ABSTRACT

This dissertation marks the first synthetic and contextual analysis of domestic sculpture for the whole of the Hellenistic period (323 BCE – 31 BCE). Prior to this study, Hellenistic domestic sculpture had been examined from a broadly literary perspective or had been the focus of smaller regional or site-specific studies. Rather than taking any one approach, this dissertation examines both the literary testimonia and the material record in order to develop as full a picture as possible for the location, function and meaning(s) of these pieces.

The study begins with a reconsideration of the literary evidence. The testimonia deal chiefly with the residences of the Hellenistic kings and their conspicuous displays of wealth in the most public rooms in the home, namely courtyards and dining rooms. Following this, the material evidence from the Greek mainland and Asia Minor is considered. The general evidence supports the literary testimonia’s location for these sculptures. In addition, several individual examples offer insights into the sophistication of domestic decorative programs among the Greeks, something usually associated with the Romans. Next, several distinctly Italian elements are identified, such as the prevalence of garden sculpture and domestic sculpture used in religious context. This material has tended to be studied as separate from the Greek, in spite of the view that it was largely inspired by earlier Greek examples. The multicultural island of Delos is then
analyzed. It has produced the largest corpus of domestic statues and is illustrative of both Greek and Roman architectural and decorative traditions. Following this, the final chapter tackles the thorny issue of these statues’ “meaning” in light of domestic religion, suggesting that their primary purpose was as display, announcing the wealth, taste and prestige of the homeowner.

This dissertation will fill an important gap in the scholarship on Hellenistic domestic decoration. This study will offer useful insights into how private sculpture was used for and viewed by the whole of the Hellenistic landscape and how, contrary to popular belief, the material functioned in much the same manner as public sculpture.
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Pompeii

Pompeii AD 79

The Search for Alexander
“Pollio Asinius, ut fuit acris vehementiae, sic quoque spectari monumenta sua voluit.”

- Pliny, *NH* 36.33

Pliny the Elder wrote this in relation to the sculptural collecting habits of the great Roman politician. He goes on to list the several statues in the collection, some by famous artists of the Greek past. While this particular collection may well have been displayed in the public library that he helped fund, two elements of this quote are worth noting. The first is that Pollio was indeed a collector. Rather than spoils taken in war and displayed in the state, here an individual was responsible for actively searching for sculptural material. The second is the emphasis placed on viewing. Pollio wants people to actively see his collection, emphasizing the relationship sculpture had with display and with a viewing context. Other writers like Cicero also attest to this interest in collecting and note that this material was not only displayed in public, but in the home as well.¹

This penchant for sculptural collecting and display among the Romans is often viewed in light of the Greek world, and the luxury that this decoration implies is seen as an example of the Hellenization that the Roman élite underwent in the later Hellenistic

¹Cic. *Att*. 1.6.2; 1.8.2; 1.9.2; 1.10.3; 1.4.3; 1.1.5.
period.\textsuperscript{2} And yet, any connection to the display practices of the Hellenistic period is seldom explored, although this would lead to a better understanding of the Hellenistic process. Zanker, for example, has examined this phenomenon of “cultural memory” and cultural appropriation in the domestic arts of Pompeii.\textsuperscript{3} While he illustrates the general connections between Pompeian artistic display and the realm of Greek (Hellenistic) references, a more precise relationship between the two is not explored. References in subject or allusions to an earlier Greek display tradition can help define the Pompeian situation, but without an understanding of the earlier Hellenistic practices themselves a better understanding of the relationship between the two cannot be reached.

In recent years, this relationship between the world of late Republican Rome and Hellenistic Greece has been of increasing concern for scholars. Whether in the realm of literature, architecture or the arts, much “Republican” material is now being assessed within a broader Hellenistic perspective. This renewed interest in cross-cultural relationships has also led to new studies among those interested in Greek material, as they use the research of these Roman scholars to reinterpret old assumptions. One area in which this has been particularly noticeable is in the field of domestic studies. Recent studies and reinterpretations of the material from Pompeii has led scholars to investigate new ideas and use new methodologies on similar remains from Olynthos, Delos and elsewhere. This has helped to flesh out a picture of the home lives of the Hellenistic peoples across the Mediterranean. It is within this broader view of the Hellenistic world

\textsuperscript{2} See Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 143-174.
\textsuperscript{3} Zanker (1998), 16-19. For analyses of sculptural collections and the thematic allusions to the Greek world, see 151-152, 169-172.
and with a renewed interest in the domestic lives of the ancients that any analysis of the domestic sculpture of the period should be undertaken.

1.1 Hellenistic Domestic Studies

Recent years have seen an explosion of interest in Greek domestic studies. The reason for this scholarly attention is twofold: 1) an increasing desire to explore the personal rather than public lives of the ancient Greeks and 2) a realization that the mass of domestic architecture uncovered in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries needed reappraisal in light of newer approaches and analytical methodologies. This interest was also partially spurred on by similar work being done concerning Roman domestic material that included architectural, spatial and decorative research, re-evaluating material and conclusions dating back to the early excavations at Pompeii in the eighteenth century. This new research on Greek domestic studies, however, has largely been an examination of the remaining architecture, with little attention paid to the decoration or the spatial usage of the home. The architecture itself has to be understood before those elements inhabiting the architecture can be analyzed, but it has caused decorative domestic studies to lag behind the architectural.

The architectural studies that have been done range from broad, multi-site evaluations that attempt to gain an overall view of Greek architecture to more specific examinations of issues particular to a given site. In 1986, Hoepfner and Schwandner

---

4 Some research has been done of the usage of space, but largely this is in relation to the debate concerning the seclusion of women within the Greek home. See Nevett (1994). In addition, work has been done on some elements of decoration, most notably in mosaics and wall painting, but these tend to be concerned with chronological and typological questions, rather than holistic studies that look at the material in its domestic context. See Danbabin (1999); Bruno (1985).
released their seminal study on Greek domestic architecture that examined several sites from around the Mediterranean. Their research pointed to a type of normative Greek home, the *Typenhaus*, which was interpreted as being a reflection of democratic values. Heavily influenced by the Roman architect Vitruvius, this work was criticized for not fully understanding how varied Greek domestic architecture was. In 1999, Nevett produced a monograph that was similarly broad in scope, but attempted to synthesize more recent work that considered space in the Greek home as less normative and more multi-functional. As such, she rejected the idea of a *Typenhaus* and, through an archaeological investigation, saw a more complex and dynamic relationship between architectural form and social ideologies. Much of her work relied on the new use of assemblage analysis to examine the use of space in the home. This had been done first in the Roman world, with the houses at Pompeii, but was used effectively in the Greek world at the site of Olynthos.

Among the sites with extensive domestic remains, the site of Olynthos was first excavated in the 1930’s by Robinson, but recently re-examined by Cahill. The systematic recording of the domestic assemblages by the original excavator, coupled with the new appreciation for architectural space and usage has allowed Cahill to interpret the houses’ assemblages in an important, and statistically relevant, manner. His work has shown how often a room’s assemblages have little to do with the architecturally determined function of room. Cahill’s work has done much to help deepen our understanding of use of space in the Greek home at one of the most important sites in

---

5 The work was reissued and expanded in 1994. See Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994).
6 Nevett (1999).
7 Robinson and Graham (1938); Cahill (2002).
Greece for domestic architecture. Similar site-specific studies have been carried out recently at Eretria and Pergamon. While these studies have not had the same focus on domestic assemblages as the work at Olynthos, they have re-examined material that had gone unstudied for years and brought a new appreciation of more recent archaeological methodology.⁸

What these studies tend to emphasize is the general development of Greek domestic architecture over the course of the Hellenistic period, the era to which the vast majority of Greek domestic remains are dated. Over time, the houses tended to become larger and more lavish, while the assemblage records point to a multifaceted use of space within the Greek home. One difficulty in this general picture is the lack of abundant material found in context. While much architecture has been excavated over the years, the material that would turn these houses into homes, the small finds associated with occupancy and use, are rare or are found in inappropriate contexts. In addition, it has only been comparatively recently that such assemblages have been a concern for archaeologists. Though this general picture holds true for most of the small finds one uncovers in domestic contexts, the category of finds associated with domestic decoration can often prove to be the exception to this rule.

In antiquity there were many types of domestic decoration. The material could range from a small appliqué hung on a wall, to floor mosaics, to wall painting. Some material, like the appliqués, could be easily transferred from one area of a home to another. Others, such as floor mosaics, were immobile and therefore specifically associated with the part of the home in which they were found. This had led scholars to

⁸ For Eretria, see Reber (1998). For the houses at Pergamon, see Wulf (1999).
analyze this material and uncover interesting associations, such as how long, paratactic wall painting is usually placed in areas of high movement like corridors, while single frame, mono-scenic paintings are often in rooms of stationary activity such as dining rooms. Within this material, it has largely been wall painting and mosaic that have received the most attention from scholars. The early excavations at Pompeii set the agenda with the discovery of material that was to lead to the “Four Pompeian Styles of Painting”. Other decorative media lagged behind, even when present in relatively sufficient numbers. One medium that particularly has received little scholarly attention is domestic sculpture.

1.2 Hellenistic Domestic Sculpture

The study of Hellenistic domestic sculpture has suffered from four traditional scholarly problems. The first was the belief that the material dating to the Hellenistic period was either not worthy of study or at least was not as worthy as that of other periods. Thus Hellenistic sculpture was seen as something base in relation to Classical sculpture and to be put to one side. The second was the general subservience that domestic remains took in relation to public material. To this end, even when sites with extensive domestic remains were unearthed, these would often take second place to the study of any public buildings uncovered, or they would receive cursory consideration, with attention paid primarily to architectural form and not to the material uncovered in the house. The third was that several of the sites with domestic remains, Pergamon, Priene, and Delos, were excavated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries,

---

9 On this idea and how Roman painting fits within its architectural framework, see Leach (1997), 70-71 with references.
when archaeological practices were not as codified as they are now. Lastly, with one exception the total number of examples of domestic statuary from any one given site was small, which did not encourage further research on the topic. Thus studies that examined Hellenistic domestic sculpture in-depth were non-existent, and for a long time one of the largest studies on the topic remained those pages from the excavation reports at Priene devoted to reporting the domestic finds from the city’s homes.\textsuperscript{10}

It was with the publication of Marcadé’s general book on the sculpture of Delos that Hellenistic domestic sculpture received a fuller treatment.\textsuperscript{11} This was not, however, a particular focus of the monograph; it was simply that so much of the sculptural material from the island had come from domestic contexts that the issue had to be addressed. Issues of patronage, typologies and intent were examined, although they fell under the broader focus of the Delian sculptural record as a whole. In addition, while numerous comparisons were made with other Hellenistic sculptures, the study concentrated on the one site and did not fully address broader concerns about domestic sculpture. This method continued with other site-specific studies, such as the publication of material from Rhodes, which contained sections on domestic material within larger studies of sculptural collections.\textsuperscript{12} These studies slowly began to flesh out the picture of Hellenistic domestic sculpture site by site, building enough of a corpus so that the first full-length treatment on the material as a whole could be produced.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{10} See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 366-375. \\
\textsuperscript{11} Marcadé (1969). \\
\textsuperscript{12} Merker (1973).}
Harward produced his dissertation in 1982 and it was the first work to examine the larger picture by synthesizing the known domestic material.\(^\text{13}\) Though the evidence was heavily weighted to the site of Delos, he also considered the finds from Olynthos, Pella, Eretria, Priene, Pergamon and Delos in order to identify commonalities and discern the roles that sculpture played in the domestic lives of the Greeks. Though stating that his aim was to use an “archaeological approach” to the material, his analysis was highly literary and methodologically problematic.\(^\text{14}\) He saw that the fourth century philosophers condemning the arts of πολιτεία, or luxury, did not include sculpture in their arguments. Given that domestic sculpture exists in the material record at this date, then, arguing \textit{ex silentio}, this media must have been acceptable to the moralizing authors. Thus the sculptures must have been not decorative, but religious.\(^\text{15}\) While examining some issues related to the material evidence, Harward created a work that was largely literary in focus and whose analysis was based almost exclusively on the material from one site—Delos. This dissertation remains to date the only full-length treatment of Hellenistic domestic sculpture.

### 1.3 The Italian Evidence

Another difficulty with Harward’s analysis is that he failed to take into account the scholarship that was being produced on Roman domestic sculpture. He did see a difference between the Greeks and Romans in terms of motivations for domestic

\(^{13}\) Harward (1982).

\(^{14}\) Harward (1982), 1-6. The majority of his dissertation discusses the literary evidence for domestic sculpture, philosophical attitudes toward domestic art and certain references to art objects within a religious context.

\(^{15}\) See Harward (1982), 57-79. As examples, see Ar. \textit{Vesp.} 1212-1215; Pl. \textit{Resp.} 372d-373a, 529c; Xen. \textit{Mem.} 3.8.10, \textit{Hier.} 11.2; Ael. \textit{VH} 14.17. In the end, Harward (1982) does pay lip service to decorative functions for the sculpture, but insists that the original function was that of piety (149).
sculpture, but still failed to fully address the issue.\textsuperscript{16} Scholars have increasingly been examining much “Republican” material in light of an expanded Hellenistic world-view. It is now commonplace to incorporate both Roman and Greek material and evidence when discussing the Hellenistic period, realizing that Rome was one of the dominant cultural groups of the Mediterranean after the battles of the second century and that prior contacts with Greeks from Sicily and elsewhere had already produced a certain amount of cultural Hellenization. This cross-cultural flow of ideas in the Hellenistic period is especially important in the case of domestic sculpture, given that Romans were one of the major cultural groups on the island of Delos. Specifically, these Romans came from the area of Campania in Italy. This is especially fortuitous as the majority of our information concerning Roman domestic architecture and decoration comes from the houses and villas of Campania that were buried by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius.

The early study of the material from Pompeii was largely focused on two problems: 1) exploring the veracity of Vitruvius in light of the actual architectural remains and 2) fixing a chronological sequence for Pompeian painting styles. These two debates, coupled with the early excavations that were done \textit{en masse} to the detriment of proper archaeological recording, have led to a situation where only recently have the remains and assemblage records for the houses been examined. Still, even with this renewed interest in the material from Pompeii, only one study has been done that examines the domestic sculpture in detail. Dwyer studied five houses at Pompeii and examined their contents in order to determine what he could about domestic sculpture.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{16} Harward saw “the divorce of domestic sculpture from its religious context to be a Roman phenomenon occasioned in large part by the Romans’ passion for collecting.” See Harward (1982), 147-148.
\textsuperscript{17} Dwyer (1982).
\end{footnotesize}
Through his analysis of the material and the early excavation notebooks, he noticed several features, including the importance of gardens and fountains as display areas and that most of the marble work was produced locally and the bronze elsewhere. Among other things, he also noted an indebtedness that Pompeian domestic sculpture had to earlier Hellenistic sculpture, yet he never fully analyzed the nature of this debt.\(^\text{18}\)

Compounding the difficulty of any such analysis, however, is the fact that several of the houses at Pompeii have Hellenistic levels, suggesting possible contemporaneous practices. These levels have been understudied, making relationships between chronological periods at the site, let alone relationships between Pompeii and the rest of the Hellenistic world, difficult to fully understand.

Elsewhere in Campania work has been done on single sites examining the sculptural collections especially of larger villas. The most famous of these villa sites is the Villa dei Papiri, whose sculptural collection has been the focus of scholars for many years.\(^\text{19}\) Wojcik has completed the most extensive study of the villa and has remarked on the several themes that can be found among the collected works.\(^\text{20}\) She noted the use of sculptural pendants, historical portraits, references to previous artwork and several other thematic designs that were present, emphasizing the general decorative nature of the collection and its often recherché allusions. It was clear that the total number of sculptures present was noteworthy, a similar situation to the villa site at Oplontis. The sculptural display of this villa was similar to the Villa dei Papiri, but it also showed how

\(^{18}\)“This art [Hellenistic], which contrasts with both the high style of official monuments and the primitive style of popular art, is the mainstream of Pompeian domestic sculpture.” Dwyer (1982), 16.

\(^{19}\)Pandermalis (1971), with references. Sgobbo (1971); Sgobbo (1972); Warden and Romano (1994).

\(^{20}\)Wojcik (1986).
gardens played an important role as a decorative milieu for domestic sculpture. These sites provided enough material to lead to Neudecker’s general studies on sculptural collections in Roman villas. Building on theories developed by Zanker, he examined material from numerous sites and discovered that the ideas and themes present in the villas at Campania were common throughout the empire, though to greater or lesser extents.

These various studies on material outside of Pompeii were to foreshadow a renewed interest among archaeologists and social historians in the remains at Pompeii itself. Utilizing statistical analyses and historical methods, scholars like Allison and Wallace-Hadrill brought new interpretations to the material that would see the remains within a larger social framework. Their work on spatial usage and patterns would allow future scholars to provide more nuanced readings of the domestic remains at Pompeii and elsewhere and placed the focus of Roman domestic studies squarely on proper archaeological interpretation.

1.4 Domestic Sculpture and Delos

This emphasis on archaeology was central to the most important work done on Hellenistic domestic sculpture of recent years. Kreeb analyzed not only the material on Delos, but also examined the excavation notebooks with the intent of incorporating as

---

21 Also known as the Villa di Poppea at Torre Annunziata. See de Franciscis (1975); de Franciscis (1982); de Caro (1987); Bergmann (2002).
24 Allison (1992); Wallace-Hadrill (1994). This socio-historical approach is also central to Zanker’s interpretations of the houses at Pompeii and their decoration. See Zanker (1998).
much archaeological data as possible.\textsuperscript{25} He also built upon the work done by Marcadé and all the scholars who produced research on individual statues or assemblages and extended the analysis of the sculptures to include and reconstruct the architectural settings of the pieces. Kreeb was among the first to stress the decorative functions of Greek domestic sculpture, though noting religious, votive, apotropaic and other possible functions. His work showed that the placement of sculptures in the Delian home took into account sightlines and areas of “public” activity such as courtyards and dining rooms, all emphasizing the visual qualities of the piece. This emphasis was so strong, that in some instances it seems that the placement of a statue was architecturally determined during the construction of its home. Kreeb’s research was the first in Hellenistic domestic sculptural studies to place an appropriate stress on archaeological context.

In 2001, Sanders wrote a dissertation that built upon Kreeb’s work on Delos.\textsuperscript{26} Using his expanded catalogue of Delian domestic sculpture, she examined issues of patronage, subject matter and the notion of a copy industry on the island. In many respects her research was in the same vein as that of Wallace-Hadrill in that she took a social approach to the material and was among the first to frame the sculptural record in relation to the multi-cultural population of the island. She also produced the most up-to-date sculptural catalogue of the material on Delos, with a total of 260 pieces including statues, portraits, reliefs, herms and statue bases. Her work illustrates what may now be done in the field of Hellenistic domestic sculpture. With an appropriate emphasis on the archaeological and assemblage contexts of the material, one can attempt to reconstruct

\textsuperscript{25} Kreeb (1988).
\textsuperscript{26} Sanders (2001).
the display setting for the sculpture. Once this has been done, then socio-cultural interpretations can be brought to bear in order to best understand the nature and purpose(s) that domestic sculpture served in the home.

1.5 The Scope of this Study

A single synthetic study of Hellenistic domestic sculpture that was overly literary and that did not take into account the proper archaeological contexts of the evidence is insufficient. In addition, Harward’s dissertation was produced before certain fundamental changes in the nature of Hellenistic studies in general, and sculptural studies specifically. A new evaluation of the material is in order. New attitudes towards the material record, an emphasis on archaeological environment and the incorporation of social history all should be included in order to fully appreciate the sculptural record. In addition, Harward did not include any material from Roman contexts, a culture that could have an impact upon the study of Hellenistic Greek material and a subject that has received more scholarly attention. All of these areas and methodologies should be utilized to best understand why domestic space became a new locus for sculpture over the course of the Hellenistic period.

This study will examine the evidence for domestic sculpture across the Hellenistic period. This will cover the period from the traditional dates of 323 – 31 BCE, though there will be some material covered outside this chronological range. The earliest evidence for domestic sculpture dates to the fourth century BCE, and an analysis of this material will prove important to establish the trends that will follow. In addition, some later Hellenistic houses have some levels that can only be dated to the first centuries
BCE/CE. These sculptures may fall outside the precise chronological range of the Hellenistic period, but likely reflect practices that can be ascribed to that age. The material will be derived from several catalogues compiled by previous scholars. Where new evidence has been unearthed, this will be incorporated into the analysis. This means that the sites to be discussed have largely been determined by previous scholarship and will include evidence from the Greek mainland and islands, the Anatolian coast and Campania.

Two areas that will not be covered in this study are the Hellenistic cities of Antioch and Alexandria. Both of these major Hellenistic sites have undergone recent archaeological activity and produced domestic remains, but both are overly problematic. The houses at Antioch have Hellenistic levels, but are largely post-Hellenistic in date and the sculptures uncovered therein should be considered more properly Roman. In addition, their limited publication precludes any in-depth analysis, though one hopes that this will soon be remedied.\textsuperscript{27} Similarly, excavations at Alexandria have unearthed some domestic architecture with extensive decoration, but as of yet no sculpture seems to have been found. The current excavations will hopefully spur new investigations and perhaps uncover some examples of domestic sculpture in the future.\textsuperscript{28} It is also for this reason that several sites with extensive Hellenistic domestic architecture, some even with decoration, will not be discussed. These sites have not yet produced any examples of

\textsuperscript{27} For the houses at Antioch, see Dobbins (2000). For the domestic sculpture, see Vermeule (2000), 94-100. The subject matter of the sculptures range from portraits, satyrs, herms and the deities Aphrodite and Dionysos.

\textsuperscript{28} For example, recent excavations near the former British Consulate have unearthed a house dating to the first half of the third century BCE with decorated dining room containing a Macedonian style pebble mosaic floor with a central rosette medallion. This certainly hints at the decorative potential for the houses at Alexandria. See Empereur (1998), 60-61.
domestic sculpture, and so while they may add to an overall picture of domestic architecture and decoration they will be excluded.\(^ {29} \)

The second chapter of this study will examine the literary and epigraphical testimonia surrounding Hellenistic domestic decoration. While the number of references to domestic sculpture specifically is small, broad conclusions may be drawn from the attitudes individuals had towards domestic decoration in general. In addition, the Republican references to domestic sculpture will also be analyzed. Noted for their sculptural collecting, the Romans mentioned domestic sculpture more often than did the Greeks, and an author like Cicero can prove especially insightful. From this analysis, general attitudes towards domestic decoration will be sought in order to see if any patterns of display can be determined. Those areas of the home that receive the most decorative attention will be briefly analyzed. The architectural terminology of these areas will be surveyed in order to see if the use of these spaces follows any particular patterns.

The third chapter will examine the archaeological evidence from the Greek mainland and Asia Minor. The major sites associated with Hellenistic domestic sculpture are Olynthos, Eretria, Priene, and Pergamon. Other sites, such as Pella and Rhodes, have some examples of domestic sculpture and will be briefly examined, but their excavation and publication histories preclude extensive analyses. The material will be analyzed in order to determine if the archaeological evidence differs at all from the decorative

\(^ {29} \) Recent monographs on the architecture at Halieis and Morgantina have added to our knowledge of Hellenistic architecture. Several houses at Morgantina have yielded mosaics that attest to the general decorative wealth of the city. For the houses at Halieis, see Ault (1994). For the houses at Morgantina, see Tsakiris (1984). For general overviews of Hellenistic architecture, see Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994); Nevett (1999) with references.
patterns established through the testimonia. Emphasis will be placed on the archaeological contexts of the sculptures, as well as what other decorative material was found in the home. Thus any relationships between the sculptures and their architectural surroundings or among the decorative material will be explored.

Chapter four will survey the domestic sculpture from Campanian homes and villa sites. This material should be incorporated as it formed an important component to Hellenistic domestic decoration. To examine all of the evidence from these sites is beyond the scope of this study, but where Hellenistic levels can be determined or when the sculpture can possibly reflect Hellenistic practices this material will be analyzed. Given the volume of material, this section will examine the sculpture in three sections, houses, villas and gardens. The exploration will also limit itself to Campania given its special relationship to the Greek world in general and the island of Delos specifically.

Chapter five will examine the domestic sculpture from the island of Delos. This island has the largest collection of domestic sculpture from the Hellenistic period and is in many ways the culmination of Hellenistic domestic sculpture. Recent treatments on this material have made this collection one of the better studied groups of Hellenistic sculpture, but this evidence will be re-examined in light of the studies conducted on the other earlier sites.

The sixth and final chapter will present the conclusions from this study. Included in this will be a brief review of domestic religion, in order to explore what relationship may have existed between domestic sculpture and cult practice in the home. This chapter will summarize what possible role(s) domestic sculpture played in the home. In this section, as elsewhere, certain conceptual oppositions are found, such as public vs. private
and decorative vs. religious. This is more a reflection of distinctions made by previous scholars that emphasize one over the other than an attempt to formalize dichotomies. These oppositions should rather be viewed as on a continuum, and so any stress placed in the following pages is one of degree based on the evidence at hand and not an absolute.
CHAPTER 2

THE LITERARY AND EPIGRAPHICAL TESTIMONIA

Although there are numerous literary and epigraphical sources that deal with the decoration of space in the ancient Greek world, few deal with decoration in a domestic setting and even fewer still refer to sculpture erected within an individual’s home. Compounding these difficulties is the problem of date, as the majority of the sources available date to the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, a time to be sure when the foundation for private art was set for the Hellenistic period, but one that still provides little evidence for the practices in the Hellenistic period proper. For the most part, these sources have been collected and analyzed by Harward, with the conclusion that painting and not sculpture was the major domestic art form of the fifth and fourth centuries.\(^1\) While the sources do support such a conclusion, what is perhaps more interesting to observe is the manner in which private art displays were used by the Greeks in this phase. Such an analysis would aid in understanding just how the Greeks initially formed a notion of “display” in a domestic setting and perhaps provide clues as to how concepts of space were played out in an individual’s home with an eye towards decoration.

\(^1\) Harward (1982), 7-32. His conclusion is based mostly on the criticisms of the fourth century philosophers concerning painting, indicating its primacy. See as examples Pl. Resp. 372d-373a; Xen. Mem. 3.8.10; Oec. 9.2.4. The moralizing tone of the debate marks such displays as inappropriate, but the existence of such criticisms implies that such displays were normal.
2.1 Greek Sources

The earliest known evidence for the use of art in a domestic setting surrounds the flamboyant figure of Alkibiades, the late fifth century Athenian general. The story is related how Alkibiades forced the painter Agatharkhos to decorate his house with panel paintings by “imprisoning” him within and not letting him leave until the work had been completed. Other sources relate how Alkibiades was a patron of painting in general, having had images of himself set up within the Pinakotheke of the Propylaia at Athens. What marks him as unique, however, is an emphasis on the personal as he dedicated public images of himself crowned by personifications of the Olympic and Pythian games and of himself lying in the lap of a personification of the Nemean games, while at the same time making a very public display of having his private home painted. What Alkibiades was doing, essentially, was glorifying himself in the way that Perikles had glorified Athens a generation earlier and promoting his own private interests in a very public manner.

Supplementing these literary sources are the so-called “Attic Stelai”, inscribed and fragmentary stelai which were excavated in Athens and record the sale of private

---

2 Plut. Vit. Alc. 16; Ps.-Andoc. 4.17-18. Agatharkhos is known through other sources to have been an innovative painter, employing σκηνογραφία for scene paintings for a production of Aiskhylos (Vit. De arch. 7, præef. 11). On the “truth” of this story, see Harward (1982), 7-8.

3 The paintings were visible in the time of Pausanias, but all the sources are late, so it is possible that they may have been erected after Alkibiades’ day. See Paus. 1.22.6-7; Ath. 12.534d; Plut. Vit. Alc. 16.

4 Harward (1982), 8-10. Such personal promotion was new and for the Athenians, smacked of tyranny. In fact, Plutarch reports that the painting of Alkibiades in the lap of the Nemean games caused an outcry among the Athenians, who viewed the representation as hinting of “tyranny and lawlessness” (Plut. Vit. Alc. 16.5). In addition, the escape of Agatharkhos from Alkibiades’ house is described as being ὀπὸν παρὰ βασιλέως (Ps.-Andoc 4.17). On this sentiment reflecting actual Classical opinion, see Burn (1954), 140. On the importance of Alkibiades painting his private home, see Robertson (1975), 414-415.
property at public auction after the famous mutilation of the herms in 415/414 BCE.\(^5\) These stelai provide helpful insight into the domestic property of the wealthy at this time, those individuals who would have been compatriots of Alkibiades, himself tried for the mutilation, and within the same general economic and social stratum.\(^6\) As but one example, Amyx has argued that the 102 Panathenaic amphorae recorded on the stelai may well have belonged to Alkibiades and been the winnings he received for his victory in the chariot races at the Panathenaic games of 418 BCE.\(^7\) The majority of the objects listed are what one would assume from wealthy households – chairs, couches, stools and other furnishings, tools, livestock, slaves and even the property itself. Also noted on the stelai is the sale of painted panels. The words used to describe these on the stelai are πίνακες γεγραμμένοι and πίναξ ποικίλος.\(^8\) The terms themselves are problematic. The adjective ποικίλος may be the easier of the two to understand. Though in and of itself the term simply means “decorated”, or “with many colors”, Pollux adds that the πίναξ ποικίλος was also ἀπ’ ὀροφῆς, a phrase that has been interpreted as referring to a painted ceiling panel.\(^9\)

---

\(^5\) See Pollux, \textit{Onomastikon} 10 for the stelai and Andokides, \textit{de Mysteriis} for the events surrounding the mutilation of the herms. The stelai are published in Pritchett (1953); Pritchett (1956); Amyx (1958); Pritchett (1961).

\(^6\) Paus. 1.2.5 refers to the “House of Poulytion”, the same Poulytion that took part in the profanation of the Mysteries with Alkibiades (Thuc. 6.28; Andoc. 1.12, 14; Isoc. 16.6; Plut. \textit{Vit. Alc.} 19). Pausanias notes the sculpture he sees in the house, though this sculpture most likely dates to the mid or late second century BCE based on surviving inscriptions and fragments. See Pollitt (1986), 165. Nonetheless, Poulytion’s house seems to have been proverbially magnificent (Pl. \textit{Eryxias} 394c, 400b). On the passage in Pausanias, see Pollitt (1990), 121; Frazier (1965), v. II, 50-54, commentary to 1.2.5.

\(^7\) Amyx (1958), 178-186.


\(^9\) On ποικίλος in general, see Wace (1948), 54. Pollux 10, 84, derived ultimately from Eratosthenes’ \textit{Skeugraphikon}. See Pipen (1956), 323; Pritchett (1956), 251-253. The dating of ceiling panel painting remains unclear. Throughout the fifth century geometric and floral patterns existed such as on the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous and the Propylaia and Parthenon at Athens, but the first preserved instance of a figural representation remains the painted coffer from the Nereid Monument of Xanthos. Dated to ca. 390-380 BCE, the painting (revealed under ultra-violet light) represents a veiled female head (possibly wearing a sakkos) in three-quarter view, thus placing the advent of figural work on painted coffers after the auction of the πίνακες mentioned in the Attic Stelai. Though there is nothing to suggest that the πίναξ ποικίλος must have been figural, this has been the standard assumption based primarily on a poorly understood passage in
Though such a decorative ceiling panel would stand out as unique for a private dwelling, there is nothing to outwardly suggest that this could not be the case.\textsuperscript{10} The adjective \textit{γεγραμμένος} can have numerous meanings, as it seems to mean simply “drawn”, or in this case “painted”. The paintings that Agatharkhos did for Alkibiades are described simply as \textit{γραφαὶ}, the execution of which is described as \textit{γραφαντα}.\textsuperscript{11} Thus they may simply have been panel paintings of the ordinary sort rather than painted ceiling coffers. Whatever their precise meaning, however, it is clear that the terms refer to a type of panel painting (standing alone or possibly to be inlaid), precisely what Alkibiades had erected in the Pinakotheke of the Athenian Propylaia.\textsuperscript{12}

Pliny where he states that Pausias of Sikyon was the first to introduce the practice of painting on panels (\textit{NH} 35.123). It has been suggested that this Pausias was the first to use spatial depth on the surface of a coffer lid (Trimble (1973), 10 n. 24). See Carter (1983), 44-180, esp. 56-59 for the early development of decorated ceiling coffers. For the Nereid Monument’s painted coffer, see Couple and Demargne (1969), 93-98; Tancke (1989), 12-14; Ridgway (1997), 78-88, though she deals with the sculpture of the monument, whose traces of paint may have acted as a pendant to the painted coffers to form an overall narrative tableau.

\textsuperscript{10} Primarily such decorated coffers are to be found on temples and tombs. Painted coffers can be found in Etruscan tombs of the early Classical period in addition to those Greek sacred buildings previously mentioned (\textit{supra}, 20, n. 9). Sculpted coffers may be found on the Temple of Athena at Paestum and on the North Porch of the Erechtheion, though it is not until the Temple of Asclepios at Epidaurus (ca. 360 BCE) that sculpted coffers became the norm. Based on the Epidaurian building inscriptions and comparisons to the Propylaea at Samothrace, the Asklepeion seems to have had both painted and carved ceiling coffers that were to become influential for such monuments as the Mausoleon at Halicarnassos and the Temple of Athena at Priene. See Carter (1983), 56-59. Painted panels were in existence at the time of the Attic Stelai, but that they would have been in a private home and not on a temple or tomb, the two most characteristic locations, is problematic.

\textsuperscript{11} Pausanias refers to the two paintings as \textit{γραφαὶ} (1.22.6), while Plutarch utilizes the verb (\textit{Vit. Alc.} 16.4). It is interesting to note that Agatharkhos’ supposed invention of a type of perspective system in painting (\textit{Vit. De arch.} 7, \textit{praef.} 11) may have parallels to what Pausias is credited with having done in ceiling coffers (\textit{supra}, 20, n. 9). On this subject in general, with references to earlier literature and the problematic nature of Agatharkhos’ chronology, see Pollitt (1974), 240-245 \textit{s.v. σκηνοσθεῖα}.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{πίναξ} is the term used by Satyros to describe the two paintings of Alkibiades’ Olympic, Pythian and Nemean victories (Ath. 12.534d). Combined with the passages in Pausanias and Plutarch, they may well have been thought of as \textit{πίνακες γεγραμμένοι}. See also \textit{IG} I\textit{1} 427.59-62 that lists \textit{πίνακες γεγραμμένοι}—1, a \textit{πίνακες ... γεγραμμένοι} and a [\textit{πίνακες ποικίλοι}] by Axiokhos among the property of the Hermokopidai.
As Harward has noted, what is peculiarly lacking in the lists of the Attic Stelai is any mention of luxury goods.\textsuperscript{13} Smaller and more valuable items such as jewelry may have been confiscated or plundered by the authorities or sold or hidden by the defendants prior to arrest.\textsuperscript{14} Also lacking, of course, is any mention of larger, decorative sculpture from the Stelai. Smaller sculpture, such as terracottas, small votives or decorative bronzes may have been removed in a similar fashion to the smaller luxury goods, but larger sculpture would have been difficult to unload so easily. Perhaps such material, if religious in nature, would have been sent to Eleusis or dedicated in the City Eleusinion, but there is no record of such a dedication, which one might suppose, as the Athenians would have tried to placate the goddesses as publicly as they had been profaned.\textsuperscript{15} Given both the intrinsic and pecuniary worth of such items it is doubtful that some record of their movement would not have survived and so it is most likely that such sculpture did not, for the most part, adorn the private houses of the Athenian élite.

Rather than looking to material that does not exist on the stelai or reaching conclusions about material from arguments \textit{ex silentio}, perhaps a more fruitful question would be to ask how the material of the stelai may have been displayed within the homes of the defendants. Again, one can return to Alkibiades as an example. Given the large

\textsuperscript{13} Harward (1982), 12. The only mention of an item in precious metals is a silver cup on Stele 6, 172-173. See Amyx (1958), 206-208. Even utilitarian bronzes are quite rare with three instances bronze pots appearing: cooking pots on Stele 1, 15-17, a cauldron on Stele 1, 96 (see Amyx (1958), 211-212; 190 n. 24, 218-219, 290) and an obelos on Stele 1, 95 (see Pritchett (1956), 313). Several unspecified “bronze items” (ἐξεπροσωπισματα) are also mentioned on Stele 6, 86 (see Pritchett (1956), 310). With regard to this material and to sculpture, however, it should be remembered that the Attic Stelai are incomplete.

\textsuperscript{14} Amyx (1958), 208, esp. n. 61 and 62 with references to earlier literature.

\textsuperscript{15} Harward (1982), 14-15, notes such a possibility, but insists that such material would have been mostly, if not exclusively religious in nature. It is possible that non-religious material (e.g., athletic statuary) could have been dedicated to the goddesses as spoils from those who had profaned the mysteries. Such non-religious dedications are known from the literary sources (Xen. \textit{Eq}. 1.1) and inscriptions. See Miles (1998), 3, 187, whose inscription cat. nos. 1 and 2 date roughly to the fifth and early fourth centuries.
number of the Panathenaic vases sold, and given that they were filled with a valuable and useable commodity, it is unlikely that all 102 were put on display in a single home. It is also unlikely, given the prestige these vases held, Alkibiades’ attempts to promote his athletic victories publicly and their general aesthetic worth, that none would have been on display. How would such material have been shown off in a home? A clue may be derived from Xenophon’s *Oikonomikon*.

Dated to the first quarter of the fourth century, the *Oikonomikon* is a work that purports to relate the appropriate way in which a Greek should run a country οἶκος.\(^\text{16}\) This didactic exegesis is presented in the form a dialogue between Kritoboulos and Sokrates, who tells of his meeting with Iskhomachos, a proper citizen and a gentleman (καλῶν ἀνὴρ κἀγαθός), who instructs Sokrates in the proper management of an individual’s household. In Book 8, Iskhomakhos relates how the orderly arrangement of goods in a house is important as it reflects an orderly and so well-run household. Everything must be in its appropriate place so that one may find it easily and avoid confusion.\(^\text{17}\) Such orderliness extends beyond the mere storage of goods, however, as the passage continues and explains how one can perceive this ideal even in the arrangement of everyday pottery.\(^\text{18}\) Although these pots are mere earthenware containers (γυττραί), the speaker uses the language of Greek aesthetics for their arrangement, as orderliness (εὐσωφθείσας) leads to a

\(^{16}\) On the uncertain date of composition of the *Oikonomikon*, see Pomeroy (1994), 5-8, who notes that Xenophon may have written the work in two separate parts or later may have edited an earlier version, but seems to have been working on the version that has come down to us after 362 BCE (8). The dramatic date of the work seems to be ca. 420-410 BCE for the dialogue between Sokrates and Kritoboulos, with Sokrates’ meeting with Iskhomakhos occurring sometime before this. See Pomeroy (1994), 18-19. The material is then roughly contemporary with the actions and lives of the Hermokopidai.

\(^{17}\) Xenophon, betraying his military past, compares the nature of a household to those of an army and a trireme. The former, like the later two, will be in chaos unless order is maintained (8.1-9). Thus the putting of things in their appropriate place ἐν γυττραί (8.10) is imperative to avoid disaster. See Pomeroy (1994), 285-286.

sense of beauty (κάλλιος). Although these terms are part of the philosophical language inherited by Xenophon, the use of the verb φαίνομαι certainly leads to an emphasis on viewing or perception that falls within an aesthetic vocabulary. The term εύρεθμία, originally used by the dramatists but first used in relation to the visual arts by Xenophon, in general can be thought of as meaning “the quality of being well-shaped, well formed”, though an overall stressing of the term’s subjective and qualitative natures is understood as an early characteristic of professional art criticism in the fourth century BCE. If Iskhomakhos is concerned with an aesthetic display of mere earthenware pots that can lead to a sense “beauty”, then it stands to reason that at least some of the 102 Panathenaic amphorae, richly decorated symbols of prestige and status that were part of Alkibiades’ household goods, may also have been displayed with such an aesthetic sense in mind. These amphorae may have been displayed with a conscious attempt to engage and please the viewer and so reflect well upon the household in general and the owner specifically. If this is the case, then this would perhaps provide a small clue as to how material within an individual’s home was placed on display and how such decoration reflected and heightened the status of the individual.

---

19 ὡς καὶ χώρας ὅψιν εὐρεθμία φαίνεται εὐκρινῶς κείμενας· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἱκάν τιν ἀπὸ τοῦτο ἀπαντᾷ καλλίων φαίνεται κατὰ κόσμῳ κείμενα· (Xen. Oec. 8.20).
20 Although εὐρεθμίας had an original meaning of “rhythymical”, as in choral dancing, Xenophon elsewhere uses the term in the sense of “well formed” as in the fit of a suit of armor (Mem. 3.10.10-12). This would fit with Plato’s general use of the term as “orderly” and possibly imply a shared interest in the circle of Sokrates. That εὐρεθμίας is a substantive following φαίνεται would seem to provide for an aesthetic reading as the moral/philosophical language is provided by εὐκρινῶς κείμενας “even pots appear graceful when they arranged in a discriminating manner” (trans. Pomeroy).
21 Pollitt (1974), 177. In general, see Pollitt (1974), 169-181 with references to earlier scholarship. The earliest known uses of εὐρεθμίας are in Ar. Thesm. 121, Plut. 759; Eur. Cyc. 563. The aforementioned passage in Xenophon’s Memorabilia (3.10.10-12) is the first known application of the term to the visual arts.
22 As will be seen in the next chapter, Panathenaic amphorae were on display in the House of the Mosaics at Eretria in the mid fourth century BCE.
Although there is no evidence for domestic sculpture listed in the stelai, one can perhaps infer that domestic sculpture of some sort did exist in Athens at this time from other sources. While Sophokles’ *Elektra* has a dramatic date that takes place during the mythical Bronze Age reign of the Atreidai, the play itself is roughly contemporary with the actions of the Hermokopidai and the Attic Stelai. Immediately prior to the murder of Klytaimnestra, Elektra and Orestes have a brief interlude before the Mycenean palace. Standing in front of the palace, perhaps just by or inside the entrance gates, there are several statues of gods (ἠθν θεῶ) that Orestes and Pylades must placate, most notably one of Apollo Πνευματήριος (“He who stands before, is protector”) to whom Elektra prays for the successful completion of the matricide. Jebb has suggested that the term πρόπυλα, fitting for the entranceway to the palace at Mycenae, in this instance is a “statelier term for πρόθκου, the porch or vestibule of the house.” A parallel may be found in Aristophanes’ *Wasps*, produced in 422 BCE, where a similar shrine to Apollo Agyieus is set up in the πρόπυλα of Bdelykleon’s house. Clearly in this instance one is dealing with a domestic setting where an image of a god stands just in front of the main entryway of the house, or perhaps in the immediate interior of the house as soon as one entered.

23 Based on internal evidence, especially metrics, and the relationship of Euripides’ *Elektra* to this play, Jebb (1894) provides a date of 420-414 BCE for the play (i-iv). This is based on a date of 413 for Euripides’ play, now thought to date to 418/417 (see Webster (1967), 4, 116-117). Dale (1967) would see a closer relationship between this play and Euripides’ *Helen*, again dated to 413/412 (133-134, n. to line 1505). In general, see Kells (1973), 1-2. All these dates, at least, place Sophokles’ *Elektra* in the second to last decade of the fifth century, the same time as the Attic Stelai.

24 ἀλλ’ ἄσω τίχος ἠχείν ἱπτώ, πατρίδοι παρηκειόμενον ἐθν θεῶ, ἀντικεί πρόπυλα ναίσσων τίδε (1373-1375). Elektra prays to the statue of Apollo at 1376, as Klytaimnestra had done at 637. The other statues may have been to Zeus and Hermes, to whom the chorus refers to at 1396 and who were invoked by the returning herald in Aesch. Ag. 509-515. Jebb (1894), 183, n. to line 1374.

25 Ar. Vesp. 875 οὐ δέστοι ἄμαξα, γείτων Ἀγιοκλεία, τοι’ μαῦ πρόθκου προπύλα. Apollo Agyieus was the “god of the streets” and that such a small altar with possibly a stone pillar to represent the god stood in front of many Athenian houses is suggested by their commonality as stage sets in drama. See Aesch. Ag. 1081; Eur. Phoen. 631; Ar. Thesm. 748; Pherekrates fr. 87; Men. Dys. 659. See Sommerstein (1983), 209, n. to line 875.
from the street. Though dealing with material that seems to have a primarily religious and not decorative function, it does suggest that sculpted images of deities may have been present in the homes of wealthy Athenians by the end of the fifth century, a notion perhaps supported by the numerous herms found in front of homes at this time.

Such a decorative scheme seems to be paralleled by Alkibiades’ placement of his paintings within the Propylaia at Athens. As has been suggested, these paintings were erected to glorify Alkibiades in a manner that had previously only been used to glorify the Athenian state and were placed within the Propylaia in a manner equivalent to the placement of the statues mentioned in Sophokles and in Aristophanes. It may well be that the πίνακες γεγραμμένοι and πίναξ ποικίλος of the Attic Stelai that mirrored these larger panel paintings may have been erected in a similar fashion within the πρόθυρον of an individual’s home. Thus it is possible to suggest that there is evidence, though slight, that there were decorative elements in private homes by the end of the fifth century BCE. The literary and epigraphical sources imply that some sort of statuary, painted panels and painted pottery may all have been present in individual homes and that there may have been aesthetic considerations when these items were displayed. Alkibiades represents a landmark use of such domestic art, having used art to promote himself in a manner not seen before. The direct representations of himself on the panel paintings in the Athenian Propylaia represent one manifestation of this personal promotion, while the possible

27 A precise definition for πρόθυρον is difficult, but Vitruvius should suffice when he states that πρόθυρον graecae dicuntur quae sunt ante januas vestibula (De arch. 6.7.5) whereas a θύρων is inter duas januas (De arch. 7.1). For a discussion, see Hellmann (1992), 348-349, s.v. πρόθυρον. The type of πρόθυρον addressed in these cases has been found in the archaeological record for houses in late fifth to early fourth centuries, namely at the Dema house in Attika (see Jones et al. (1962), 79) and all of the houses at Halieis (see Boyd and Rudolph (1978), 344, n. 16), especially House 7 (see Ault (1994), 83). In general, see Nevett (1999) for instances of the πρόθυρον in Greek domestic architecture. Perhaps the most famous instance of the πρόθυρον in literature is Pl. Prt. 314c.3 in describing the house of Kallias as an example of typical urban housing in Athens at this time. For a discussion and plan of this house, see Pesando (1987), 29-43.
display of his Panathenaic amphorae could have served the same function in his home. While this is pure speculation, it is clear that Alkibiades had artistic material in his home to display and that he displayed artistic material in public in order to glorify himself. It would not seem out of place to suggest that he did the same in his own home.

The tradition of individuals using private art for their own promotion continued with the tyrants and kings of the fourth century. Archelaos, the king of Macedonia, may have been one of the earliest of these rulers to so utilize art. The king hired the famed painter Zeuxis to paint his house, which may have included a painting of the god Pan. Pan was later associated with the Macedonian royal house and so this early painting may have been used as a message linking the dynasty (and so the king) with a divine ancestor. Dionysios I of Syracuse is said to have had decorated dining couches and have been interested in tapestries. These tapestries may well have been displayed in the ᾠδή of his palace and matched similar displays by the tyrant when a Syracusan delegation set up pavilions at Olympia. In this instance we know that the display in the pavilion was lavish on purpose ἐνα θαυμασθέντι μᾶλλον ὁ πύραμος ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. While no other decoration is mentioned, the display context seems clear: like Archelaos, Dionysios I seems to have used interior decoration for personal aggrandizement. Such may also be the case for the tyrant’s son and successor, Dionysios II.

In the thirteenth Platonic epistle, the author writes a letter of general well wishes to the Syracusan tyrant and mentions the following:

29 Ael. VH 14.17; Plin. NH 35.62.
30 See Harward (1982), 19-20, n. 43 with bibliography.
33 Dion. Hal. Lys. 29.
Two elements of this passage are worthy of note. First, there is the mention of the sculptor Leokhares. This sculptor, a student of Skopas, is well attested in the sources and a famed artist of the mid-fourth century. Here the sculptor is presented as young and talented, suggesting that an aesthetic value judgment played a part in deciding what sculpture to acquire. Second, with a context that implies a date of ca. 366/365 BCE., the first relatively firm testimony for sculpture in a domestic setting is given. That the testimony is not more arresting stems from the fact that no domestic space is actually mentioned, though domesticity is implied in the friendly tone and offer of sculpture to the tyrant’s wife. Also, Platonic scholars have argued over this letter’s authenticity for over a century, and the authorship of the letter is in doubt. Even if the letter is not authentic, however, it may matter little to the notion of domestic art. As will be shown in the next chapter, domestic sculpture was known by this date and if the letter was a later fiction, then the author thought that the presence of sculpture in a wealthy ruler’s palace would

34 Pl. Epist. 13.361a.
35 See Overbeck (1868), 1301-1315; Stewart (1990), 282-284.
36 See Wohl (1998), 87, n. 1 for an overview of past scholarship on the authenticity of the letters. By 1978, Guthry’s informal poll suggested that scholarship was equally divided with fourteen scholars supporting the letter and fifteen opposing it (401). Wohl is correct, however, to note that the evaluative criteria for determining the letter’s authenticity are largely subjective and she studies the question by reading the letters as a corpus that shows “the impossibility of an authentic written philosophy and of an authoritative self-present philosopher” (60). The question remains open, but in antiquity this and the other letters were considered authentic. See Diog. Laert. 3.61 in general and Plut. Vit. Dion. 21; Mor. 463c-d, 533b-c for the thirteenth letter.
not be amiss at this time. Given the wealth noted in the Syracusan court, this would not seem improbable.

In addition to Plato’s epistle, there is one other reference to domestic sculpture in the palace of Dionysios II. Timaios tells the story of Xenokrates receiving a gold crown upon winning a drinking contest that had been suggested by Dionysios. Xenokrates then placed this crown on a herm as he left the palace, the same herm upon which he was used to placing his floral wreath every night.

The question of authenticity is again in doubt, but in this instance the story seems sound and it is known that such herms stood outside the doorways of houses at this time. While the text gives no description of the herm itself, what is interesting is the location of the statue. The αυλή was an unroofed court that was common to all Greek buildings, whether sacred or secular, and it could also designate the area of an entire farm for rural properties. Usually the term is found in the phrase θύσα αυλεία to denote the doorway onto the court and, while the preposition in this case is somewhat

37 Stewart (1990) believes the letter to be from one of Plato’s “students” and that the sentiment for collecting would most likely not pre-date the Hellenistic period (63). He does note the letter’s importance for pointing the way towards sculpture in the home.
38 Ath. 10.437b.
39 A fragment of Philodemos found in the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum supports Athenaios/Timaios. See FGrH 566 F 158a for Timaios and 158b for Philodemos. Diog. Laert. 4.11 mentions Xenokrates traveling to Sicily with his teacher Plato, but Plut. Vit. Dion 22 states that the pupil was Speusippos.
40 Harward (1982), 25. Interest in the artistic merits (or lack thereof) of the herm is misleading and whether beautifully carved or a simple shaft, the piece fulfilled its intended role as “sculpture” to mark a boundary. Though mostly attested at Athens, post-classical herms such as this would most likely have been figural, especially given the wealth of the Syracusan tyrant. On herms in general, see Wrede (1985).
41 See Hellmann (1992), s.v. αὐλή, η; Ginouvès (1998), 14, 152, 155 n. 38, 186 n. 108. The term had been in use since Homer for a “court” in general, but in the period just after Alexander the term came to be applied to large residences and palaces. See Tamm (1968), 141-168.
vague, it should more than likely mean “near” or “beside”, indicating the doorway that leads from the court. This would seem the natural place for a herm as a boundary marker, but it illustrates that there might have been domestic sculpture in an area of high traffic and high visibility. Xenokrates may have been indicating his disdain for the tyrant’s gifts, or he may have been making a personal gift/sacrifice, but the location guaranteed the visibility of his act. Though the sole purpose of the herm may have been to act as marker, Xenokrates’ act turned it into a notice board for a personal statement. This would imply an understanding of the power of art that would be seen by individuals and place the philosopher, if not the herm and the tyrant as well, in the tradition of the fourth century rulers.

Such displays of wealth in the fourth century, however, were not restricted to kings and tyrants. Other wealthy individuals seem to have decorated their homes in manners akin to the rulers. Sokrates admonishes the unnecessary luxury of contemporary homes in Plato’s Republic, though his foil Glaukon views paintings, tapestries and such as normal amenities for his social stratum. Sokrates again denounces contemporary luxury in Xenophon’s Memorabilia when he states “paintings and tapestries steal more pleasures than they impart”. Not restricted to urban centers alone, Iskhomakhos also mentions that he has decorated living rooms within his country estate.

42 A similar act occurs at Theophr. Char. 16.10, when the “Superstitious Man” goes out and buys sacrificial material and then εἰσελθὼν εἰσὶν στεγασμένον ποὺς Ἱμμαθροδίτησις ὁπνευ τῆν ἤμέραν. The Hermaphrodite here is likely a double herm with a male on one side and a female on the other. No location within the home for the herm is mentioned.

43 Pl. Resp. 372d-373a. Glaukon replies to Sokrates by stating that such luxuries are ἀπεχ λοιμέναι.

44 Xen. Mem. 3.8.10. γραφεῖ τε καὶ ποικίλαι πλείους εἰσφοράς ἀποτελεῖσθαι ἢ παρέχασθαι.

45 Xen. Oec. 9.4. The difficulty with this passage is that it is framed within a moralizing account on the immoral consequences of luxury. Iskomakhos previously states that his house is ὃς ποικίλοις πολλοῖς κατοικήσει (9.2) and that the most valuable possessions are stored in the bedroom (θάλαμος) as it is the safest room (9.3), presumably owing to its privacy. Even the decoration is done in order to keep the house
interest in this case is that Iskhomakhos’ decorated room is specifically a “living room”.
This is not surprising if making a “public” display of one’s decoration was a consideration given that the διαστημήσιον would be one of the rooms most open to outside visitors in a house.46 These examples, though not on the scale of the fourth century rulers, illustrate that a trend was beginning in the later fifth and fourth centuries towards domestic decoration. Certainly there was enough of a trend for the philosophers to criticize such ostentation in their works, but the gates had been opened and there was little they could do save rant against the practice of the day.47

If Alkibiades can point the way towards the notion of individualism, with perhaps the fourth century tyrants linking the notions of lavish expenditure with an individual intent that blurred the distinction between individual and state driven art, then it would seem logical to examine the role of the individual and ruler that was to have the single greatest impact upon the culture of the Hellenistic period – Alexander the Great. Though it would be difficult to separate Alexander the individual from Alexander the king and head of the Macedonian empire, his personal charisma, good fortune and particular brand

46 See Ginouvès (1998), 159. The διαστημήσια, as part of the living quarters, may have included the ἀνδραύλια and other rooms for dining, suggesting a further link to public displays of decoration, as with Dionysios I.
47 In all three passages (Pl. Resp. 372d-373a; Xen. Mem. 3.8.10; Oec. 9.4), “Sokrates” disapproves of such display. Similar attacks were made by the fourth century orators, see Dem 3.25-26, 13.29-30, 21.158-159, 23.208; Isoc. 7.52. Ostentatious displays had been frowned upon at Athens since the Archaic period with the sumptuary laws of Solon. Such laws, however, curbed public displays of wealth and so individuals wishing to show their wealth, taste or virtues may have turned to private decoration in the fifth century. In spite of Xenophon’s attacks against such display, the actual accumulation of wealth is a desirable goal in the Oikonomikon and is the product of hard work and virtue (9.13, 11.12, 12.15, 14.7, 14.9). See Pomeroy (1994), 51-55 with references. See Harward (1992), 57-79, who discusses such attitudes as “The Arts of Truphe”. The expression of ποιήμα through artistic display, while undesirable in the fifth and fourth centuries, seems to have lost its negative connotations by the later fourth century, in the world of the individual ruler. See Harward (1982), 72-78 with references. Aristotle may have been the first to attempt a reconciliation between the older, negative view and the more positive (Eth. Nic. 1122a18-1123a23, 1125a11-12). He states as much when he says μεγαλοπρεπῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος κατανοεῖσθαι περιποίητος τῷ πλῆθῳ (κόμος γὰρ τῆς καὶ ἀυτῆς), καὶ περὶ ταύτα μᾶλλον δεκαπενδώ διὰ τοῦ θυμοῦ (ακελλίστα γὰρ ταύτα) (Eth. Nic. 1123а.6-9).
of monarchy were to have a lasting impact upon the leaders, individuals and general
culture of the centuries that were to follow. Given the lasting impression that Alexander
was to have and given that scholars know that he used art in very specific ways to further
his own ends, it is frustrating that the sources for Alexander’s use of art are so few.48
Even so, the case is not hopeless and one can indeed extract certain suggestions from the
literary sources, as there are many passages that at least mention Alexander’s
commissioning or dedicating pieces of art and that allude to his role as art patron.

One of the most important of these sources is Plutarch’s essay *On the Fortune or
Virtue of Alexander.*49 In this epideictic oration, Plutarch discusses Alexander’s relation
to fortune, how he was used by it and rose above it and how this was all possible on
account of his virtues. Among his many virtues was his patronage of the arts.

Although one can see Plutarch’s philosophical bias toward a single (imperial)
monarch in this passage, Alexander is credited with allowing the arts to flourish under his
rule, commissioning vast quantities of artistic endeavors in all media, a notion that is
reflected in the sources for Alexander.51 The number and types of dedications made by

---

48 Also compounding the issue is Alexander’s fame, which led to numerous anecdotes being told about the
monarch that are often difficult to separate from the truth, as Harward (1982) notes (26). The story of
Alexander visiting the painter Apelles in Plin. *NH* 35.45 is a good example, for Plutarch tells the same
story, only with Megabyzos and Apelles as the particulars (*Mor.* 58d, e, 471f-472) and Aelian follows, only
with Megabyzos and Zeuxis (*VH* 2.2).

49 *On the Fortune or Virtue of Alexander* = Plut. *Mor.* 326D-345B.

50 Plut. *Mor.* 333D-333F.

51 On the literary sources of Alexander’s patronage of the arts, see Brown (1996). Though most of the art
dating to this period is now lost, suppositions can be made about the nature of the works commissioned.
His “use” of art does seem to have been very specific and influential. In general, see Smith (1990), 19-32.
Alexander are well known. In sculpture there were dedications like the Granikos Monument at Dion and in painting the likes of the portrait of Alexander holding the thunderbolt in the temple of Artemis at Ephesos. In the realm of architecture, they range from the construction of temples, such as those to Athena at Priene and Artemis at Ephesos, to the grand funerary monument of Hephaistion. With this monument, one can perhaps get a sense of what Alexander was interested in artistically, as he longed for his architect Stasikrates to design the monument, for he μεγαλωργίαν τοῦ και τύλιμαν και κόμπου ἐν ταῖς κανονιμίαις ἐπαγγελλόμενον. Alexander seemed to admire the qualities of “ingenuity, novelty, magnificence, boldness and ostentation” and sought these out when surrounding himself with art and artists. All of Alexander’s court artists, Lysippos, Apelles and Pyrgoteles, were famed in antiquity as being the best and the most innovative in their respective media and worthy of working for the monarch. Though there was a long tradition of the Macedonian court acting as patrons for artists, this does seem to parallel certain aspects of the character of Alkibiades. Like Alexander, he looked to the innovative artists of his day (Agatharkhos) and he erected paintings that glorified himself in noted locations (the Athenian Propylaia). Perhaps with the course laid out by Alkibiades, over the one hundred years from the late fifth to the late fourth centuries a growing emphasis on the singularity of the individual beyond collective notion of the state began to form. The desire to express this individuality was a natural outgrowth and

This may best be exemplified in the field of portraiture. See Pollitt (1986), 20-30; Ridgway (1990), 108-124; Stewart (1993), esp. 1-225.

52 Plat. Vit. Alex, 72.5.


54 For Lysippos, see Plin. NH 34.61-67. For Apelles, see Plin. NH 35.79-97. For Pyrgoteles, see Plin. NH 7.125, 37.8.
it was to hit a watershed with Alexander. What we have in both the literary and material records would seem to support this.\textsuperscript{55}

How Alexander may have expressed such a notion in a domestic setting is more difficult to assess, but it does seem that ostentation was again an important characteristic. He certainly grew up in a luxuriant environment that may have provided the young king with a taste for art. In addition to the general wealth and splendor of a palace environment, his great-grandfather Arkhelaos I had commissioned Zeuxis, the greatest painter of the day to adorn the walls of the palace at Pella.\textsuperscript{56} Alexander’s father, Philip II continued this tradition by employing such artists as Euphranor, Khares, Leokhares and Lysippos to create works to commemorate the royal family both at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{57} The sources indicate that Alexander also liked such grandiosity in his personal surroundings. Athenaios quotes several earlier sources referring to the general “luxury of Alexander the Great” that all discuss the king’s habit of surrounding himself with finery.\textsuperscript{58} The most indicative statement, perhaps, relating to Alexander’s view of an appropriate domestic setting may be that which describes the pavilion he built in 327 BCE to celebrate the marriages \textit{en masse} of himself and his troops. Athenaios, quoting Khares, describes the pavilion as follows:

\begin{quote}
κατασκεύαστο δὲ ὁ ὀίκος πολυτελεῖ, καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς ἰματίας τε καὶ ὀθυμοῖς πολυπολείπως, ὡς δὲ πᾶσα παρθένως καὶ φοινικαὶς χρυσάττως, τοῦ δὲ μὲνερ τὴν σκηνὴν ύπεκινοεῖν κίοις εἰκοσαγείες περίχυσοι καὶ δικλίθιοι καὶ περίσσωνοι. περιβάλλοντο δὲ ἐν τῷ περιβάλλον πολυπολείπος ὁλιγάντα ἱώστοι καὶ διάχυστοι, κανόνες ἔχομαι περιχύσως καὶ περισσώς.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{55} For a very brief but useful summary, see Pollitt (1986), 7-10.
\textsuperscript{56} Ael. \textit{VH} 14.17
\textsuperscript{57} The most famous example, perhaps, being the statues of the Macedonian royal family in the Philippeion at Olympia. See Paus. 5.20.10.
\textsuperscript{58} See Brown (1996), 94-95, for a collection of the comments Athenaios quotes, along with those of others and general commentary.
\textsuperscript{59} Ath. 12.538d. A much shorter description is in Ael. \textit{VH} 8.7.
Clearly the king lived in the lap of luxury, even while on the road. The mention of draperies (μαρτάκης), rugs (τάπο ...), wall hangings (αὐλασιάς) and the sumptuous nature of the furniture all match what was listed in the sources for the fourth century tyrants and speaks to an importance of displaying one’s wealth within a domestic setting where such material can be seen by others. Brown is correct to note that while some authors state that Alexander expressed moderation on campaign, his disbelief in witnessing the wealth of Darius’ tent was more a question of degree than of absolute shock.60 Even if this was the case, he soon took to liking this grand style for he lived in many of the palaces of the defeated Persian king, most especially that in Babylon, as it “surpassed by far the others in size and in all other respects”.61

One of the sole pieces of art connected with Alexander the Great that we can perhaps talk of in terms of a domestic context is the famed Herakles Epitrapezios of Lyssipos. This piece, which had supposedly come down to the Roman Novius Vindex via Hannibal and Sulla, is described in several later sources as being a small bronze representing the hero after his apotheosis, reclining at the dining table of the gods with a base signed by the sculptor.62 These sources are problematic beyond the highly anecdotal flavor of the sculpture’s pedigree, as Martial’s second poem transcribes the inscription on the statue base with the words Άουσίππο πέλεγο, Φιδιαὶ πεποίηται.63 Ridgway is right to note the problem of even an unfamiliar viewer mistaking the styles of the two great artists, but

60 Brown (1996), 95. Plutarch relates the tale of Alexander entering the tent and, upon seeing the wealth, declaring “This, it would seem, is to be a king” (Vit. Alex. 20.8).
61 Strabo 15.3.9-10.
62 Mart. 9.43, 9.44; Stat. Sil. 4.6. Both writers were at work under the Flavians in the later first century CE.
63 Mart. 9.44.6.
even more that preserved bases of the Sikyonian master are never signed in the genitive.\textsuperscript{64} Based on these sources, however, scholars have assumed that Vindex owned a copy of the Lysippan piece and not the original and so several larger versions of this work have been identified as later Roman renditions.\textsuperscript{65} The most famous of these is the colossal version uncovered in Alba Fucens in 1960.\textsuperscript{66} The piece, though fragmentary, shows a Herakles with a phiale in his left hand, with his right resting on a club, thus reversing the pose as described by Martial and Statius. Though problematic, scholars have assumed that this reversal represents a variation and that Lysippos was the originator of a colossal version of the statue, later miniaturized, perhaps even by Lysippos himself, for Alexander.\textsuperscript{67} This general acceptance of a Lysippan “original” miniature has been questioned recently, and not only on the grounds that the literary testimonia of two later, ingratiating poets is insufficient evidence. In analyzing the head from the Alba Fucens statue, Ridgway has concluded that the beard type (divided in a symmetrical arrangement) is not consistent with fourth century typologies and that the piece is indicative of a Roman creation in the late Republican period “only vaguely inspired by Classical prototypes.”\textsuperscript{68} Her analysis of the surviving versions seems sound in that it illustrates how much variation exists among the pieces so that the notion of a specific

\textsuperscript{64} Ridgway (1997), 295.
\textsuperscript{65} For these copies in general and their impact upon a Lysippan “original”, see Bartmann (1992), 147-186; Ridgway (1997), 297-304; \textit{LIMC} IV (1988), s.v. “Herakles Epitrapezios”, 774-776, nos. 957-983 (O. Palagia). On the \textit{Epitrapezios} within a distinctively Lysippan context, see Lisippo, 140-147; Stewart (1990), 293, no. 13, T130.
\textsuperscript{66} For the original publication, see de Visscher (1962). On the complex where it was found, see de Visscher \textit{et al.} (1963); Lauter (1971).
\textsuperscript{67} Most notably in this instance, Harward (1982), 28-30, though he discounts most sources on Alexander’s patronage. See also Richter (1963), 137-139; Stewart (1978), 167, n. 19; Bartmann (1992), 147-150, esp. n. 9.
\textsuperscript{68} Ridgway (1997), 298. She does note that such parted beard types appear on second century BCE Greek originals, but that at this period Roman influence cannot be discounted (315, n. 33).
creation should be abandoned and the material should now be thought of as distinctly
Roman variations on a motif. Having dismissed much of the argumentation in light of
the iconographical, chronological and geographical problems of the surviving
Epitrapezios types, Ridgway concludes that the only “positive” evidence for the type of
statue under question remains the two literary descriptions, providing as plausible a case
for a Roman context as a Greek. In these poems the statue is described as a small
bronze that rests on the table of its owner. Though such a piece, even if it did exist prior
to the Roman period, would say much about the general decorative choices of its owner,
its portability and locative variability would make it difficult to assign a permanent
decorative function. While some of the internal associations of the piece (to Alexander,
to Herakles, to the gods, to a man at rest after his labors) would remain, the display
context could change, thus altering any view toward decorative intent. At least this piece
of evidence for private art associated with Alexander can be brought into serious doubt.

While the literary evidence for domestic decoration falls off in the period after
Alexander, there is mention of one royal structure and its decoration that follows in the
tradition of the Macedonian king and could provide some insight into the way that

69 The motif of the Herakles Epitrapezios may have begun in the Classical period with Lysippos creating a
colossal variant for the city of Taras, and Spartan tetradrachms dating from 260-210 BCE show a similar
figure. Among the scholars who would see Lysippian origins for the figure there is still considerable
debate. Moreno would see a small bronze in Vienna (Lisippo, cat. no. 4.17(2); Bartmann, cat. no. 21) as
most faithful to the original, while Bartmann (1992) sees the piece as somewhat anomalous. Such
confusion may derive from the fact that the Epitrapezios, as we understand the piece, is actually based on a
later Hellenistic/Roman Republican sculpture based on an image like the Belvedere Torso. See Zadoks-

70 See Ridgway (1997), 299-303 with references to the surviving variants and to the associated secondary
literature. Though her point about the differences between Greek and Roman dining practices is well
taken, she perhaps go too far as an encouragement to drink (if such was even the statue’s function) would
be as applicable in a Greek context as in a Roman one. In addition, though the “original” may have
reclined on a couch, it could also be that the sitting on rock alludes to some other unknown feature of
Herakles that would be applicable in a Greek context (ritual with a phiale?) or could represent the hero on
Olympus after his apotheosis.
Hellenistic royal palaces may have been decorated. In the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaios, the authors quotes Kallixeinos of Rhodes’ description of the pavilion Ptolemy II Philadelphus set up as part of his grand procession. The pavilion of Ptolemy was a colonnaded hall roofed over by an *ouraniskos* (canopy). The hall was large enough to hold 130 couches in addition to numerous other furnishings and works of art. Perhaps as large as 32.00 m x 42.65 m, the outer shell of this structure seems to conform in general to an Egyptian *oikos*, which resembled a Roman basilica, though the decoration and spatial arrangements within the structure are purely Greek. As with Alexander’s pavilion, the keyword for the decoration of this pavilion was “luxury”. The beams of the walls were covered in tapestries (*ἐμπετάσμασι*), while in-between the beams were painted panels (*φατνίγματα γραττά*). Inside there were Phoenician curtains (*αὐλαικὸς φορκίνας*), paintings done by artists of the Sikyonian school (*πόιναις τῶν Σικυωνών ξυγράφων*), golden tripods (*χρυσῷ τρίποδες*), Persian carpets (*φυλαι Περσικαί*) and all manner of rich furniture, paintings and other finery. All of this is described for *καλὴ γὰρ εἰς ἕπεξοβιλὴν ὅξια τε ἀκοὺς ἑτερίθη*. Most important for this study, at the base of the piers within the grand hall there were 100 marble statues done by the foremost artists. These statues are not described and so little can be said, but their presence, along with all of the other finery, illustrate to what extent Ptolemy was concerned with decorating his

71 Ath. 5.196a-197c = *FGrH* iii.58. See Studniczka (1914) in general for an analysis and reconstruction of this pavilion, esp. 30-47, 133-161 for the pavilion’s relationship to the *ἀθετών* of domestic houses. For the procession in general, along with analyses of its individual elements, see Rice (1983).


73 The term usually refers to ceiling coffers, though here seems to imply a similar “placing” between beams along a wall as opposed to a ceiling.

74 διέκειτο δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς σκιρόσι παραστάδιοι ζηρὰ μαμλόρια τῶν πρώτων περιτῶν ἑκατῶν.
pavilion. The importance of this structure lies in its use as a dining area, where guests would have been entertained. Ptolemy’s decorative scheme would have been used to impress the foreign dignitaries in attendance and to reflect his own personal power and prestige. This would then place Ptolemy II within the general tradition of fourth century rulers’ use of art, even perhaps matching the pavilion erected by Alexander, and illustrate the importance of placing one’s art in areas of maximum visibility, such as spaces used for dining.

Later in the third century, Ptolemy II’s descendant, Ptolemy IV Philopater built a type of pleasure barge used as the Egyptian ship of state, the so-called Thalamegos, which incorporated many decorative schemes in similar dining contexts. The boat had two decks and was laid out on a traditional Greek house plan, with a colonnaded entrance vestibule, which led to dining rooms, porticoes, bedrooms and most other rooms to be found in a Hellenistic villa. While the ship had many decorative refinements such as gilding, jeweled fixings and expensive woods, there was also much sculpture included in the dining rooms used for symposia. The largest of these rooms was one that could hold twenty dining couches and contained a sculpted frieze in ivory that was remarkable for its

---

75 Though not called statues explicitly, “works” showing tragic comedic and satyric scenes were placed high along the wall. They were more than likely statues, however, as they were placed in niches and wore clothing, συμπόσια τε ἀρχα ἀλληλον ἐν ἀυτοῖς παρακολούθην τέ και ἑμποτεν καὶ σατυρικων χρισίων ἀλληλον ἔχοντος μαστήσθων (Ath. 5.196f-197a). The subject matter of these pieces is appropriate for sympotic contexts.

76 “Furthermore, the elements of the boats, pavilion, and procession are arranged with a calculated eye to their effect on the spectator (this is to be expected in the case of the pavilion, which must have been intended as a place of royal hospitality for the important foreign theoroi attending the festival of which the Grand Procession was a part)”. Rice (1983), 150.

77 Ath. 5.204e-206c. This barge contains several elements of “typical” Greek domestic architecture, though agrandized into a “palatial” form, and so its decorative scheme may be included in this analysis. On the architecture of this barge, see Raeder (1988), 365-367. Grimm (1981), 17-18, views both the pavilion of Ptolemy II and the Thalamegos as examples of “Hofkunst” and so the two decorative schemes may be linked.
lavish expense (τὴν χρηστότητα ἔδωκε ἀξιοθαύμαστο). In another cabin that could hold five dining couches was a small shrine to Aphrodite that contained a marble statue of the goddess, while further on there was a room sacred to Dionysos, in which there was a niche containing portrait statues of the royal family executed in Parian marble.

This would seem to parallel a similar boat created for Hieron II, tyrant of Syracuse. The boat of Hieron was less of a palatial or official boat and was more of a specialized trading/war barge than that of Ptolemy. Its architecture is less well understood than its Egyptian counterpart, but it contained rooms of various types, including a shrine to Aphrodite, a library and compartments containing couches that seemed to be used both in dining and for everyday use. The whole was elaborately decorated, most famously with the mosaic that depicted the entire story of the Iliad, and at least the Aphrodite shrine contained both paintings and statues.

These last sources illustrate the place of importance dining areas had in the context of decorative schemes. The sources almost exclusively refer to kings, rulers and tyrants and so this emphasis on areas of communal space, or space where individuals from outside the domestic unit would have been entertained within the household, is not surprising. These areas afforded the monarchs the greatest ability to display their wealth.

78 Ath. 5.205b-c. On Kallixeinos’ interests in art, see Rice (1983), 158-159. This particular comment of Kallixeinos’ has been used to date the author and uncover whether he saw the Thalamegos while it was still in use or later, but in general this seems an appropriate personal comment. See Studniczka (1914), 17-18; Caspari (1916), 8; Rice (1983), 168-169.

79 Ath. 5.205d-f. Seemingly a dining room, as it contained thirteen couches.

80 Ath. 5.206f-209e. See Casson (1971), 191-199.

81 γυναικείας δὲ καὶ ἀγάλματος, ἵνα δὲ τιτικίον καπασκευάζων ὑπερβαλλόν τις καπασκευαστὸ. Ath. 5.207e. What is usually translated as a “shrine” to Aphrodite is referred to solely as an Ἀφροδίσιον ... τρίκλινον. The triclinia was likely just a dining area and the use of the adjective Ἀφροδίσιον, as opposed to the proper noun in the genitive, implies a sexual quality to the room that is perhaps not appropriate for a shrine. In a brief note, Duncan-Jones (1977) analyzes the practicality of the Syracusa and comes to the conclusion that the ship was less of a cargo barge and more of a statement as to the tyrant’s “ability to mobilize resources” (332). Thus display of wealth and luxury is again of paramount importance.
and opulence to outsiders and so reflect the power, prestige and status that such displays brought with them. This may well have been the motivation for all of the individuals mentioned in the sources. It can be argued that structures like the palaces, pavilions and state barges of these rulers were more public than the homes of ordinary citizens and so application of the term “domestic” is faulty. As will be shown in the next chapter, however, these structures were influenced by contemporary domestic architecture and were to have a major impact upon the architectural development of dwellings in the Hellenistic period. In addition, the social activities that took place in areas such as the dining rooms of the palaces were common practices across status lines in Greek culture. It was simply the scale of such activities that was different. Thus, while the Greek literary and epigraphical sources provide few explicit statements with regard to more humble domestic decoration and sculpture, those sources that discuss the displays of wealth on the part of the social élite may provide a clue as to the nature of domestic decoration, given that these displays occurred in architectural spaces and under social circumstances that were also known in Greek domestic contexts.

2.2 Roman Sources

Unlike the Greek sources, the sources for domestic decoration in the Roman sphere during the Hellenistic period do offer clear instances of sculpture in a household setting. These instances are not numerous, however, and the Latin sources offer more

---

82 The artistic culture at Rome was influenced by numerous factors prior to the Hellenistic period, such as Etruscan and native Italic precedents, which were to affect the culture of display in later periods. These, however, were before Rome’s expansion in Italy and conquest of the east, which brought Rome into contact with such Hellenic cultural centers as Sicily and the Greek mainland. This expansion in the Hellenistic period was to have a profound effect on Rome and brought her into the cultural koinai of the
examples of luxury in the private home, tending to relate the general opulence of an individual’s dwelling without providing specifics as to the type of decoration or where such decoration was placed in a *villa* or *domus*. In addition, these sources provide better insight than the Greek sources into the reasons behind such sumptuous home decor. Given these facts and that the majority of these sources date to the Imperial period, only a reflective sample of them will be examined, emphasizing those pertaining to sculpture.

Early on much of the material that was brought back from the “luxuriant” (re: decadent) east was used as spoils and plunder to be displayed in the public triumphs of conquering generals. It is known that afterward some of the material was sold at auction to help pay for the expense of the triumph and other objects were dedicated in Roman temples. The material that was sold at auction was often taken into individuals’ homes for decoration. Polybios remarks that the goods brought back from Marcellus’ sack of Syracuse in 211 BCE was separated into domestic and public goods, while later it was noteworthy that Mummius took none of the booty from his sack of Corinth for his own home, suggesting that this was the common practice. It should be noted that the initial display of the material in the triumph was used to advertise the martial prowess of Rome in general and augment the personal standing of the individual *triumphator*. Perhaps the ownership of such material and its presentation in one’s home was thought of in a similar way.

---

83 The most noted passage for such an auction does not stem from a triumph, but rather from the inheritance of Pergamon from Attalos III. See Plin. *NH* 33.148-150 where it is said that all *verecundia exempta* at the auction. Liv. 26.34.12 mentions how statues taken as spoils were handed over to priests to determine whether they were sacred or profane, presumably for re-dedication. For examples of booty taken and displayed in triumphal processions, see Pollitt (1966), 40-47, 63-66.

fashion, based on the initial display context, and so Mummius was seen as unusual and perhaps something of a boor for not realizing the “value” or potential of the art he brought back to Rome.85

One individual who did realize the value of the art he had taken was Gaius Verres. Verres had taken art treasures from many cities and sanctuaries in the Greek world, but is most (in)famous for his plundering of Sicily while propraetor from 73-70 BCE. So extensive was his activity that the Sicilians went to the Senate in Rome for help, whereupon Verres was tried for misconduct, with Cicero acting as prosecutor. Many of the objects taken by Verres were displayed in his home, and though the precise location of many are not known, it is possible that some of the pieces were displayed in rooms open to viewing by individuals from outside the family unit.86 The location of two statues that he took is known, however, and they were erected in just such a location, as they were displayed beside the impluvium of his house, most likely in the center of his atrium.87 Verres was also happy to decorate the homes of others on occasion, as when he took the numerous art treasures that had been dedicated in a temple of Minerva the Virgin

85 Plin. NH 35.24; Vell. Pat. 1.13.4. This view may have more to do with Roman art criticism of a later period, than any intrinsic value a statue may have had in a domestic context. For a parallel, see Cic. Verr. 4.55.121, where the aforementioned Marcellus is lauded for not decorating his home with spoils in an act of humility.

86 Cic. Verr. 2.1.50. Quas iste tabulas illine, quae signa sustulit! Quae cognovi egomet apud istem in aedibus nuper, cum obsignandi gratia venisset. Aedes generally means a “house” or “dwelling” in the singular and a “collection of rooms” in the plural, often meaning an entire house. By the time of Cicero, the term often refers to a temple in the singular and to a house in the plural. See Ginouvès (1998), 152-153. As a collection of rooms, however, it is possible that aedes can refer to groupings of rooms, like the hospitalia and andronitis, that were open to visitors from the outside, sometimes with dining functions. See Ginouvès (1998), 159.

87 Cic. Verr. 2.1.61. Ne haec quidem duo signa pulcherrima quae nunc ad impluvium tuum stant, quae multos annos ad valvas Iunonis Samiae steterunt, habes quo modo emeris. The passage continues saying that these two statues had been abandoned by others, implying more were displayed in such a context. On the atrium as public space, see infra, 56-57.
and, ironically, gave them to a house of ill repute. Nor was Verres averse to plundering other homes as well. While staying at the home of a friend Sthenius, Verres was so taken by the numerous art treasures that he decided to take them all for himself.

Though perhaps an extreme example, Verres is indicative of what had been a growing interest in private collecting of art among the wealthier Romans for some time. At this time, many Roman citizens were avid collectors of statuary and frequently magistrates would borrow works from private homes and display them in public for a period of time. The most noted collector of sculpture of the first century BCE, Asinius Pollio, was most eager to show off his private collection in a public space, for he was *ut fuit acris vehementiae*. Even Verres’ prosecutor was a noted collector. In a series of letters written to his friend Atticus, Cicero describes his desire for numerous statues to be purchased on his behalf. Most of these were intended for Cicero’s gymnasium in Tusculum, the “Academy”, and so would have been on public display in his home and intimately connected with their owner. A few, however, were clearly intended for display in the orator’s home, such as the relief sculptures he wished to place in his *atriolum*. This “little atrium” was exactly like its larger counterpart, though often placed at the back of a Roman home in an area that would be less public than an *atrium* proper, perhaps suggesting material that was more concerned with personal viewing. It is interesting to note that Cicero wishes to place his sculpture in this area, as Verres too had

---

88 Cic. Verr. 2.4.123. *Ille deos deorum spoliis ornari noluit, hic ornamenta Minervae virginis in meretriciam domum transstulit.*
89 Cic. Verr. 2.2.84. Prior to this theft, Sthenius’ home was described as a *domum eius exornatam atque instructam.*
90 Cic. Verr. 2.4.6.
91 Plin. NH 36.33.
92 See Cic. Att. 1.6.2; 1.8.2; 1.9.2; 1.10.3; 1.4.3; 1.1.5.
93 Cic. Att. 1.10.3.
sculpture near his atrium, especially given the link between peristyles, atria and the open spaces of gymnasia.\textsuperscript{94} It would seem that atria in Roman houses were prime locations for the display of domestic sculpture.

Atria are also mentioned in domestic decoration when Pliny the Elder speaks of sumptuary laws that should be in place to guard against the extravagance that had been a feature of private homes for quite some time. When speaking of M. Scaurus, aedile in 58 BCE, Pliny notes that Scaurus had used expensive marble columns for a temporary theater at Rome, but after only a month transferred them to his own house. Pliny laments, \textit{etiamne tacuerunt, maximas earum atque adeo duodequadragenum pedum Lucullei marmoris in atrio Scauri conlocari?}\textsuperscript{95} Again the emphasis is on the decoration of the house’s atrium. That Pliny mentions the need for laws in order to curb such behavior indicates to what level the expense of decorating one’s home had achieved by the late Republic/early Imperial periods. Nowhere is this more apparent than with the man after whom the marble in Pliny’s lament is named, L. Lucullus. The extensive and lavish embellishments with which he decorated his homes are described as \textit{παιδιά}, all an outgrowth of the \textit{otium}, which he spent on private collecting. Though no specific works are mentioned, the artworks placed within his homes did include sculpture. So great were his outlays that even in later times, described as being fuller in \textit{πυφή} than the past, his gardens were still singled out as costly.\textsuperscript{96} In general, this seems to follow a trend over

\textsuperscript{94} See infra, 55-57.
\textsuperscript{95} Plin. \textit{NH} 36.6.
\textsuperscript{96} Plut. \textit{Vit. Luc.} 39.1-3.
the first century BCE that singles out the period as one of increasing wealth spent on the
lavishness of private homes.\footnote{Plin. \textit{NH} 36.109-110.}

Though perhaps forming a special category, different from that of “regular”
domestic sculpture, a common type of sculpture placed in the homes of prominent Roman
citizens was commemorative portrait sculpture of deceased ancestors. Writing in the
second century BCE, Polybios is the earliest source for this practice.

Here there seems to be a clear commemorative and religious function to these
sculptures. On important religious occasions, such as public sacrifices, these images are
brought out and worn as masks by the living, making the ancestors ritually present for the
occasion. Within the context of ancestor cult, it is perhaps not surprising to find that
these sculptures are placed \textit{eis t\'\' o\'n etiphanesato"\nu t\'\'on t\'\'is oikias}. In the most
conspicuous area of the house these ancestors could not only watch over their
descendants, but also be most visible to their descendants and any others who came to the
house.\footnote{Polyb. 6.54.3.} Polybios continues later on to suggest why the “viewing” of these images was
so important.

\begin{quote}
\textit{t\'\' o\' de megiston, o\'i ke\'\'e paroxymwntai pr\'\'o\'t\'\o\' p\'\o\'n upom\'\'en he\'\'e\'\'e t\'\'on
koin\'\nuv piaxmat\'\nuv chr\'\'o\'\nu t\'\'o\'v te\'\'on t\'\'is synakolwthias e\'\'e\'\'i agath\'\nuv t\'\'on
\'\'i\'\nuv eukleias.}\footnote{Polyb. 6.53.4-6. On these masks in general, see Flower (1996).}
\end{quote}

\footnote{Pliny, upset that such portraits had been replaced in his day by statues created by foreign sculptors, says
that they were placed in the atria (\textit{NH} 35.6-7). This presupposes that these non-portrait sculptures were
also in the atria of homes.}
The purpose for the public display of these venerated images is to inspire the youth to emulate the deeds of the noble men of the past. The context suggests that this is all for the benefit of Rome over the individual, but nonetheless the stress is on the individual inspiration that these images can impart. Similarly, these images would stress the nobility of the individual families that displayed them, either at public events or in one’s home, and so a reciprocal relationship is at play. Clearly these sculptures were of extreme importance to the élite Roman family and in some ways should be thought of as distinct from other types of sculpture, especially if their use in public stressed a “living” quality. They do, however, also illustrate a notion that should not be forgotten about private sculpture in general: whatever the nature of domestic religion and its rites, religious and decorative functions for domestic sculpture were not mutually exclusive.

The Greek and Roman literary and epigraphical sources present a picture of sculpture in a domestic setting that focuses primarily on their use as decorative or status-claiming material. The Greek evidence is rather lacking when it comes to discussions of sculpture in the homes of an everyday citizen, but there are numerous references to sculpture and other decorative items adorning the palaces and other buildings associated with fourth century and Hellenistic rulers. It would seem that much of the impetus for such decoration began among the rulers and then perhaps filtered to the social and economic élite of the Hellenistic period. The stress is clearly on material displayed in areas of the home open to those from outside the household unit, with a special emphasis on areas of dining. It would seem that dining played an important social function and it may be that the lavishness expended on dinner parties for food also expressed itself in
lavish decoration. All of these functions were meant to impress upon the visitor the wealth and status of the individual.

The Roman evidence also suggests that the display of wealth and status were important considerations in the placement of domestic sculpture. Dining seems less important in these sources and atria are seen as the prime display areas. Here the material would be seen by the most people, whether family members, guests or clientes, and the viewing of sculpture by such individuals would have provided the maximum benefits for the owner of the home. Though there is the possibility that these sculptures served some religious functions, especially the ancestral masks, it is the decorative and status functions that seem paramount. Given that the sources are remarkably unified in their descriptions of where domestic sculpture and decoration occur, it would be beneficial to examine the architectural terminology used and see in what way these terms/areas are used within a domestic decorative context.

2.3 Architectural Terminology

The literary and epigraphical sources, both Greek and Latin, emphasize decoration in areas that were frequently open to individuals outside the oikos unit. This ranged from areas used for extended periods of time, such as dining rooms (άνθεως, triclinia) to areas where individuals might simply be received by the host or pass through on their way to another room (αὐλαί, atria). Both of these types of areas provided the

---

101 Book 4 of Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae discusses many aspects of Greek dining and sympotic practice. Clearly contrasted are the lavish parties thrown by the Macedonians and the sparing dinners of the Athenians (4.128a-138b). Such displays of conspicuous consumption seem to have been important to the Macedonians and they may have inherited such ideas from the grandiose affairs of the Persians (Hdt. 1.133).
maximum viewing potential for the display of art in an individual’s home, both to outsiders and to those living in the home. Therefore, it would prove beneficial to examine a few of the key terms, both architectural and literary, in order to illuminate how these rooms may have been decorated and used by the individuals in their homes. While an analysis of architectural contexts will follow in the next chapter, this brief overview will clarify the manner in which these key areas are discussed in the sources and how these architectural terms refer to the usage of space in a domestic setting.

The Greek sources seem clear that those rooms that serve a dining function are often those areas that are associated with domestic decoration and sculpture. This may not be surprising as the ἀνάδεικτον was a room open to visitors outside the oikos unit and so a prime location for the display of material wealth. In literature, this space is designated as the area where the men will gather for dinning and entertainment, and guests are frequently led there, as it is an area open to outsiders. Unfortunately, there is no direct mention of decoration associated with the term ἀνάδεικτον. Those references discussed that mention decorated dining areas are the only ones that link the concepts of dining and decoration in the domestic sphere. Here is a case, however, where the archaeological evidence can help in light of lacking literary evidence. There are numerous rooms in excavated remains that have been identified as ἀνάδεικτος and contain decoration, especially mosaic pavements. The consequence of this decoration will be considered...

---

102 Aesch. Ag. 243; Cho. 712; Hdt. 1.34, 3.123; Eur. HF 954; Xen. Symp. 1.4.13; Oec. 9.6; Ar. Eccl. 676; Lys. 1.9; Ath. 4.148b, 5.193c, 12.542d; Pollux 1.79, 6.7, 9.146; Vit. De arch., 6.7.5; Ael. VH 8.7. Included are the cognates ἀνάδεικτος and ἀνάδεικτος. In general, see Orlandos and Travlos (1986) with individual entries.

103 Examples include: The House of the Comedian and The House of Good Fortune at Olynthos; The House of the Mosaics at Eretria; House 1.1, 1.5 and an ἀνάδεικτος in the Kanali district at Pella; House IIIQ room E, House IIIIN room I, the House of Dionysus and the House of the Masks from Delos; The House of the Faun at Pompeii. Other mosaics would probably have been in such areas based on content, such as the ἀνάδεικτος...
in a later chapter, but it should be noted that the archaeological evidence supports the notion of decoration in the dining areas of houses.

Although the concept of a room associated with public dining and entertainment goes back to the Archaic period, archaeologically there seems to have been a shift in the size and dimensions of these rooms. From the smaller seven couch, square ἀνάπλοζα found in earlier houses, the Hellenistic period marks a shift to larger, more oblong or rectangular ἀνάπλοζατα, frequently referred to as “broad rooms”.104 As part of the movement to larger, more opulent housing, these rooms would have been in the homes of the wealthiest citizens and mark an increase in the overall decoration of the dining room, as in the House of the Trident and the House of the Tritons from Delos and the Hellenistic house with the Griffon mosaic from Samos. This shift in architectural form would bring an associated shift in the nature of the dining experience. Unlike the traditional ἀνάπλοζα, the place of honor in a broad room would have been in the middle of the back wall, as opposed to the first couch to the right of the door. This is a practice more suited to ritual, or royal dining and it may be that such an architectural form was

---

104 Bergquist (1990) distinguishes between the “broad room” and the “long room”, both of which can be traced to the Archaic period in public contexts. The “broad room” seems to become the dominant form in domestic architecture based on the evidence from Delos and while often multi-functional, they seemed to have served as the main dining and entertaining area in larger homes. See Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 296-297; Raeder (1998), 326-346. For the Hellenistic dining room in general, see Hoepfner (1996), 17-36. The older, more square style is surprisingly homogeneous in dimension whereas the “broad room” has a greater variety in dimension, frequently as it is an add-on to an existing architectural unit. A summary of the dimensions of a typical fifth and fourth century dining room may be found in Dunbabin (1998), 82-83.
adapted from such a royal context. It would not be surprising, then, that such rooms also betray an increase in overall decoration as exemplified by the literary sources that describe royal dining halls.

Like the ἀνδρέα, the peristyle court in a Greek home would have been an area open to outsiders as it acts as the main junction for traffic flow within a home. This would have made the peristyle court a perfect area for decoration aimed at those who lived in the home and any guests, as it would offer maximum viewing potential. Given the possibilities offered, along with the importance the Roman sources place on the atrium for decoration, an investigation into this architectural element is worthwhile. Within a decorative context, the pavilion that Ptolemy II Philadelphus set up as part of his grand procession contained a περίστυλος that was open on three sides and was where the guests’ attendants could stand. Although the associated columns have ornamental capitals, no decoration within the peristyle itself is mentioned. This illustrates the primary difficulty with the term. The περίστυλος of Ptolemy would seem to have more in common with the large colonnaded courts of the Hellenistic palaces than with the smaller courts of domestic homes. Polybios also uses the term in this sense when he discusses the colonnaded court of a Persian palace. The modern use of the term, as applied by archaeologists and architectural historians, would seem to derive from Vitruvius’ description of a Greek home where he uses the Latin transliterations peristylon or

105 Hellström (1996), 164-168, has suggested this process for the ἀνδρέα of late Classical Labraunda. Athenaios describes such a practice in the late Classical period, when he relates how Philip II of Macedon entertained Menekrates of Syracuse and sat his guest on an elevated and decorated “middle” couch. See Ath. 7.289e. See Dunbabin (1998), 87-88, who believes that the practice could only have occurred in the spatial layout of rooms such as at Labraunda.

106 Ath. 5.196c. On the decoration in this pavilion, see supra, 37-39, esp. n. 71.

107 Polyb. 10.27.10.
The earliest Greek sources for the term use it as an adjective to describe an area “surrounded by columns”, especially the court of a large public building. It is not until the beginning of the third century BCE that the substantive is first used as a neuter noun in inscriptions from Delos, though soon after Diodorus Siculus and Polybios use the substantive as a masculine noun. The term only appears at this late a date, perhaps because the Greek language has many cognates and synonyms for περίστυλος, such as περίστυλος, περίστωμας and πτερών, all of which essentially describe the same architectural features. Thus, while the peristyle court may have been a common architectural feature in the homes of the Hellenistic period, it is difficult to trace any possible sources for its decoration. Though the passage concerning Ptolemy II’s pavilion and the Roman sources’ description of decorated atria are suggestive, little can be discerned from an analysis of the term itself.

The term ἀνάλημα was used in conjunction with statuary in the passage of Athenaios concerning Xenokrates and Dionysios II’s drinking party. As stated, the term refers to an open area courtyard and is as old as Homer, though by the Hellenistic period the term comes to designate an entire palace. For the post Classical era, the area designated as an ἀνάλημα seems to have been a relatively public space. Twice in the writings of Plato an individual entertains visitors in his courtyard. In the Protagoras, a friend wakes Sokrates

---

108 Vit. De arch. 6.7.1-3.
109 Hdt. 2.148.153 describes the peristyle court for a labyrinth at Fayoum, while Eur. Andr. 1099 speaks of guards being sent to the temple colonnades.
110 Diod. Sic. 1.48.47. Polyb. 10.27.10.
111 In general, see Hellmann (1992), 333-335, s.v. περίστυλος for an overview of the terms’ use in Greek inscriptions and literature. Those sources that use the terms περίστυλος, περίστωμας, περίστωμας and πτερών are listed in Orlandos and Travlos (1986) under their respective entries. Based partly on Hellmann’s analysis, Ginouvès places the term in her section on religious architecture (temples and treasuries) and not in her section on domestic architecture. See Ginouvès (1998), 45-46, 157, n. 76.
112 See supra, 29-30, esp. n. 41.
in the middle of the night in order to visit Protagoras.\textsuperscript{113} It is then decided that they should stay and talk until dawn in Sokrates’ court. In the \textit{Republic}, several individuals go to visit Polemarkhos and find his father Kephalos in the courtyard, crowned with a wreath after a sacrifice.\textsuperscript{114} The visitors then sit with Kephalos in chairs that were already in the courtyard, presupposing that this was a place for group activity. In both cases the \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\eta} is used as the term for a courtyard in a house that is owned by a private citizen. In both cases, the courtyard is used for the entertaining of people from outside the household unit. If sculptural decoration was a part of the \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\eta} in the fourth century, as indicated in the passage of Athenaios, then it is suggestive that such material was placed in an area that would have been used as one of the “public” areas of a Greek home.

By the time of Alexander, the term \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\eta} had come to designate something new: the royal palace on the whole, or its central courtyard. This new usage may have had its origins in New Comedy with Menander and Diphilos, but it was certainly entrenched by the time of Theokritos.\textsuperscript{115} Polybios uses the term most frequently and almost exclusively as meaning “palace”.\textsuperscript{116} Athenaios suggests that this new meaning refers to the large courtyards in rulers’ palaces where royal troops and bodyguards would camp to protect their ruler.\textsuperscript{117} Tamm suggests that the Hellenistic usage may have derived from the satrapal courts of the east that are first called \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\etai}.\textsuperscript{118} If this is so, then the pivotal figure

\textsuperscript{113} Pl. \textit{Prt}. 311a.
\textsuperscript{114} Pl. \textit{Resp}. 1.328c. This closely matches the story in Athenaios where Xenokrates, crowned with a wreath, visits the herm in the \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\eta}. Perhaps Polemarkhos had a herm here as well?
\textsuperscript{115} The quotations from Menander and Diphilos are preserved at Ath. 5.189e, who specifically uses them as examples of the new meaning of the term. Theoc. \textit{Id}. 15.60 refers to the palace at Alexandria when the two central characters ask an old women if she has come from the \textit{\textalpha\upsilon\nu\eta}.
\textsuperscript{116} Polyb. 5.25.3, 5.25.9, 5.25.12, 5.34.4, 5.40.2, 15.28.4, 15.30.4. For a brief analysis, see Tamm (1967), 159.
\textsuperscript{117} Ath. 5.189e.
\textsuperscript{118} Tamm (1967), 160-161.
in this new usage would again be Alexander, as he adopted so many of the eastern trappings for his new vision of ruler. Persian monarchs such as Darius and Xerxes were used to entertaining attendants in great halls and courtyards, which the Greeks may have understood as αὐλαὶ κατόπτεραι, as Herodotos did when he discusses Egyptian hypostyle halls.\(^{119}\) Although the new usage may imply a hall where troops simply rested, it is clear that entertaining also occurred. The tent of Alexander that has been discussed certainly mirrors the grand audience halls of Persian palaces, and the diadochoi used αὐλαὶ for such royal audiences.\(^{120}\) Were they as decorated as Alexander’s tent, then here too is an example of an interior space being decorated for public viewing.

As for the terminology of the Roman house, Leach has conducted an influential study based on certain preconceived notions of Roman spatial terminology that arose from the early study of the domestic remains at Pompeii.\(^{121}\) Roman domestic architecture of the Hellenistic period and its links to Greek architecture will be examined in subsequent chapters, but Leach’s study does reflect a similar sense of “public viewing” for important rooms in a Roman domus.

With an emphasis on decoration in dining areas, it is interesting that the terminology for Roman dining practices seems much more fluid than that of the Greeks. The term most often used in the Roman sources for an area of dining activity is triclinium. Difficulties arise with this term when one realizes that dining complexes were often not fixed locations. Rooms in which stone couches are found are clearly exclusively for dining, but other rooms could have served this function as the need arose.

\(^{120}\) See Tamm (1967), 160-161.
\(^{121}\) Leach (1997), 50-52.
with moveable furniture. This would seem to be the case when Vitruvius stresses the importance for seasonal *triclinia*.\textsuperscript{122} From her analysis, Leach believes that *triclinia* refer to dining rooms that emphasize the close relationship among diners and stress the social aspects of dining, while *cenationes* refer to larger, more lavish rooms that could accommodate much larger dining groups.\textsuperscript{123} If this is so, then the *triclinia* would seem to match the ἀνδρόεσσες of the Greek ὀίκους, while the *cenationes*, such as the dining room in Nero’s *Domus Aurea* come closer to the large dining rooms in the palatial residences of Alexander and the Hellenistic kings.\textsuperscript{124} If the individual Romans were wealthy enough to have such large dining halls in their *domus*, then these rooms may have received decoration similar to what was seen in the Greek Hellenistic palaces.

The Roman peristyle is slightly different from its Greek counterpart. Often included in a section of the house that is separate from the main domestic quarters, the peristyle is intimately linked to the exedrae that surround it and is usually viewed as a complex. Compounding the difficulty is that most Roman writers use the Latin terms *porticus* or *ambulatio* for peristyle, though Cicero exemplifies the occasional use of specialized terminology attributable to Greek origins such as *xystus* or *palaestra*.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{122} Vit. De arch. 6.4.1-2.
\textsuperscript{123} Leach (1997), 68-69. See Sen. Ep. 90.14, 115. Based on the letters of Pliny the Younger, Leach postulates that *triclinia* could be dining rooms with fixed couches.
\textsuperscript{124} Dunbabin (1998) does not differentiate between the terms, but stresses that the *triclinium* specifically referred to a three couch dining room with a Pi-shape configuration. See Dunbabin (1998), 89-98. This is the same configuration used in the Hellenistic broad rooms. While the Roman social context and rules of dining differed from those of the earlier Greeks, the notion that in the late Republic (Hellenistic period) the architecture of the *triclinium* gave the illusion of equality, but reinforced a strict social hierarchy, would not seem out of place in a Greek social context. On the social system embedded in Roman dining, see D’Arms (1990). Nielsen (1998), would see the Roman *triclinium* as a mix of Greek “royal” styles – the ἀνδρόεσσες of dining room used by the Macedonians and Pergamenes and the broad room type used by the Seleucids and Ptolemies – stressing for the Romans, the mixture of *luxuria* and *convivium*. See Nielsen (1998), 126-130.
\textsuperscript{125} For *xystus*, see Cic. Ad Brut. 9.3; Luc. 9.15; Att. 1.8.27. For *palaestra*, see Cic. Or. 2.20; Fam. 7.23.13; Att 1.10.2. See Leach (1997), 59.
Vitruvius uses the term peristyle more frequently than any other author and what becomes clear is a distinction in the Roman terminology that views peristyles not as descendants of the Greek domestic model, but of the open spaces within gymnasia.\textsuperscript{126} Though this distinction comes through in an analysis of the terminology, it is important to note that the Roman domestic peristyle still acts as a space that the outside world could see. The peristyle was as a transitional zone between the public space of a Roman \textit{domus}, open to all clients and visitors, and the invitational space of the home, open to outsiders but only at the invitation of the homeowner. Not simply large open areas, this invitational space would include dining rooms, baths and libraries.\textsuperscript{127}

Similar to the peristyle in Roman houses is the \textit{atrium}. Often linked with the \textit{vestibulum}, this space was frequently described as crowded with guests and clients in Latin literature, providing literary witness to Vitruvius’ statement of the area as public space.\textsuperscript{128} As public space (\textit{communia}), these areas should be decorated according to the rank and status of the individual homeowner. Thus farmers need no decoration as most of there rooms will be for storage or animal care, while those of a high socio-economic status \textit{faciunda sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristyliam amplissima, silvae

\textsuperscript{126} See Dickmann (1997), 124-125. Neudecker speaks of the Roman aristocratic desire to decorate these peristyles with \textit{ornamenta}, as Cicero exemplifies (\textit{Fam}. 7.23.3). Such a desire is attested as early as Plaut. \textit{Mostell}. 22, 64. See Neudecker (1988), 8-30.

\textsuperscript{127} Leach (1997), 59. She suggests that it may have been L. Licinius Lucullus who first began this architectural use of the peristyle, based on curious architectural elements in his villa and his promotion of competition among the wealthy for luxury in villas. See Plut. \textit{Vit. Luc}. 39.3. Dickmann (1997) would see the peristyle as a distinctively Italic feature, though based on Hellenistic public architecture. He views the peristyle as an addition to the traditional architectural units of a house and so is not a structuring element in the way that the \textit{atrium} is. Thus he sees the living rooms around the peristyle as being “private”, though their decoration is stressed. Perhaps these areas should not be thought of as “private” in the modern sense, but more akin to the invitational areas of a Roman house.

\textsuperscript{128} For \textit{atria} overflowing with guests, see Ov. \textit{Met}. 1.168; Sen. \textit{Ep}. 76.11.6; \textit{Ad Marc}. 6.10.1. For the public nature of \textit{atria}, see Vit. \textit{De arch}. 6.5.1-2.
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Interestingly, commoners spend their time at other houses so need not decorate their homes, implying that much of the impetus for decoration was with an eye to the external viewer and not to the personal tastes or desires of the individuals living in the home. Though such tastes surely factored into the decoration of one’s home, this attitude may indicate why the ancestral portraits (imagines) should be placed on the lintel above the doorway to the atrium: so that a family could advertise their glorious past to the maximum number of outside visitors.

Although aulaí may have been important in the Greek world, their prominence in the Roman world is uncertain. By the Roman period, aula had come to designate the whole of a royal palace and not an individual courtyard as is sometimes assumed. Nor was it synonymous with atrium, though the two have a complex relationship in the literary sources that may rely more on literary models and whether a particular author wishes to stress the royal character of the atrium or not. Vitruvius uses the term twice, the first time suggesting that the middle door of a theater stage should have the decoration of an aula regia or royal palace. In the second instance, he uses the term to describe a passageway that links the two sections of a house in a two peristyle. Here the mesaula would mark a liminal space between the public and the invited space for visitors to a Roman dwelling and act as a means of regulating traffic flow through the

---

129 Vit. De arch. 6.5.2. Like atria, peristyli are seen as common areas within the domus.
130 Vit. De arch. 6.3.6.
131 See Tamm (1967), 169-190, 234-235 with analyses of individual authors.
132 Vit. De arch. 5.6.8. ipsa autem scaenae suas habent rationes explicitas ita, uti mediae valvae ornatus habeant aulae regiae, dextra ac sinistra hospitalia. It is interesting that he opposes the “royal” middle door with the two on the sides for “guests”. Hospitalia is a term applied either to the entrance or to the whole guest apartment in more lavish Greek homes (δόξων, στυγών). See Vit. De arch. 6.7.4 for similar phrasing, where such hospitalia in Greek homes are located dextra ac sinistra.
133 Vit. De arch. 6.7.5. Inter duo autem peristyli et hospitalia itinera sunt, quae mesaulae dicuntur, quod inter duas aulas media sunt interposita; nostri autem eas andronas appellant.
Although no decoration is mentioned in association with *aula*, as an area with high traffic flow it would provide a perfect locale for the type of decoration visitors were meant to see.

### 2.4 Conclusions

What becomes clear is that the Romans, though they had domestic spaces that served the same functions as among the Greeks, used different terminology for these areas. Most clearly this occurs in areas traditionally thought to be used for sleeping or dining. While the terms used by the Romans are more varied than the Greek, the social functions of many of these areas remained the same. Like the Greek *περιστύλος* or the *αὐλή*, Roman *atria, porticus* and *ambulationes* provided large open areas that could be used to entertain guests or act as traffic thoroughfares. Either way, these spaces provided an ideal location in which to place decorative material to impress one’s guests. Likewise, *ἀνδρόνες* and *triclinia* were not only areas of high decorative potential, but the activities associated with dining could add another dimension to the art in these rooms. Beyond reflecting the status of the homeowner, they could become conversation pieces that would highlight the statues themselves or provide a greater depth of appreciation for the homeowner.

Beyond the specifics of the terminology, however, the general locations reserved for domestic decoration and sculpture remain the dining rooms and courtyards of the wealthy and powerful. The general homogeneity is surprising and suggests that private art, that is art displayed in more private areas within the home such as second stories or

---

134 See Rowland *et al.* (1999), 263, fig. 97.
bedrooms, was less a concern than public displays in the home in the Hellenistic period. With this in mind, one may now check the ideas from the literary evidence against the archaeological remains. Precisely when and where are the earliest domestic sculptures found? What are their architectural and display contexts? Do associated archaeological assemblages have anything to say about the function of these statues? These and other questions will be addressed as the archaeological material from the Hellenistic world (Greece, Asia Minor and Italy) is analyzed with the social, decorative and architectural issues presented by the literary testimonia in mind.
CHAPTER 3

THE ARCHAELOGICAL EVIDENCE FROM GREECE AND ASIA MINOR

The literary and epigraphical evidence for domestic decoration shows that such decoration served a very public function. The testimonia reveal that domestic art, be it painting, sculpture or some other medium, was used in order to decorate the more public areas of houses, such as dining rooms, reception areas and courtyards. This in turn suggests that such art was set up within the home with a clear sense of “display” and that both the members of the household and those guests visiting these public areas of the home were meant to view these pieces. Though heavily slanted toward the decoration of the homes of the social and economic élite, the literary evidence does present a picture of the manner in which such individuals presented their artistic possessions. Given that mostly the social and economic élite could have afforded such statuary in their homes, this literary bias should be noted, but not be of great concern. Thus the literary evidence provides a template upon which one can map the manner in which such art was displayed, but if “display” was an important characteristic, then it follows that the architectural space in which this material was placed was of great importance. Art is both framed by and frames the space that it inhabits and so an examination of this space is key to help determine what meanings domestic art may have had.
In this chapter a general exploration of known domestic statuary from the Hellenistic Greek world (mainland Greece and Asia Minor), along with their associated archaeological and architectural contexts, will be offered. The main sites examined are Olynthos, Eretria, Priene and Pergamon, with brief explorations of Pella, Vergina, Rhodes, Eutresis and Tel Dor for reasons explained later. Only those homes that contain sculpture will be examined in detail, with a special focus on those areas where the statues were found or on the areas known from the literary sources to have had statuary on display, chiefly andrones and courtyards. In certain instances, other domestic structures from the site in question will be included in order to provide as clear an understanding as possible for the architectural norms and variations particular to that site. Individual sites, however, often have an archaeological value beyond a given home or statue and can be studied in order to examine general architectural patterns and decorative practices. To this end, some sites offer a “big picture” view of domestic architecture and decoration, while others allow for a more detailed analysis of individual homes and their decorative material. Both types of evidence help in the overall understanding of the display contexts for Hellenistic domestic statuary and luckily both types of sites have yielded domestic statuary in their excavations. The earliest known and securely dateable piece of domestic sculpture comes from the ancient city of Olynthos, a site that allows for a general macroscopic analysis of domestic architecture and its decoration.

3.1 Olynthos

The most extensive remains of domestic architecture in Greece come from the city of Olynthos, located on the Khalkidiki peninsula in Northern Greece. Excavated
between 1928 and 1938, this site has yielded over one hundred domestic structures in total, of which over fifty have been published with relatively well-documented assemblages excavated from within specific rooms. The houses are present in two primary residential districts spread over two small hills, referred to as the North Hill and the South Hill, with the prime period of occupation dating from the late fifth century until the destruction of the city by Philip II in 348 BCE.¹ The city was designed using an orthogonal plan with rectangular blocks of space divided by alleyways providing five equal plots of land distributed on either side for houses. This division of land provides a standardized form for city blocks and apparently for houses as well, but variation does occur as one plot of land may be used by more than one house, individual space may be enlarged by taking over a neighbor’s plot or reduced by the presence of shops.² Although these houses were not identical in their form, statistical analysis has shown that a general plan and spatial layout held for these houses.³ In general, the “typical” Olynthian house had a single courtyard that was at the center or southern end of a home and was enclosed

¹ The city’s population rise in the late fifth century and its concomitant construction boom seems to have derived from an *anoikismos* of Khalkidian communities in 432 B.C.E., in fear of Athenian hostility at the outset of the Peloponnesian War. See Thuc. 1.58; Robinson and Graham (1938), 14-15. Cahill (2000) puts this new construction at about 360 homes with a population of 2000-3000 (497, esp. n. 3). For a general historical overview of the city, see Cahill (2002), 34-49. The destruction of Olynthos and the following enslavement of its citizens is recorded in Dem. 9.26. There is some debate as to whether or not the city was occupied after this destruction, based on literary sources (Diod. Sic. 19.52.2, 19.61.2), some inscriptive evidence and the presence of coins that postdate the destruction. For a summary or these arguments and relevant references, see Cahill (2002), 49-52. His recent examination of these issues, however, is convincing and leads to the conclusion that some habitation, primarily in the Northwest quarter of the city did occur, but that it was on a very small scale. See Cahill (2002), 52-61. None of the material under consideration here comes from that sector and so a *terminus ante quem* of 348 BCE will be assumed.

² The apparent similarities among the houses and blocks at Olynthos have lead to some misunderstanding, both in terms of analysis and reconstruction. See esp. Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 42-50, 82-89, 208-212. For the problems associated with the assumptions associated with *Typenhäuser* at Olynthos, see Cahill (2002), 82-84. The variation that does occur among the houses is noted by Nevett (1995b), who suggests that this may illustrate a difference in economic class among the houses excavated (90-91). It may be that a difference in economic use, rather than class, is being illustrated.

³ See Nevett (1995b), 91; Nevett (1999), 61-64. For the difficulties associated with such statistical and analytical methods at Olynthos, see Cahill (2002), 72.
by rooms. Entrance to this courtyard was provided via the street door or an approaching corridor and from this courtyard one could then access the rooms of the home. Occasionally bases were found in the courtyard to suggest that there were steps leading to a second story. There was usually a colonnade, or *pastas*, on one side of the courtyard that provided shade and access to rooms that opened from it. Present also were a kitchen-complex, an *andron*, occasionally with an anteroom, and an area with an opening to the street that has been interpreted as a shop.4

This typical plan illustrates a general concern for the close control of interior space inside the home. First and foremost, physical and visual control was maintained by having a single entrance that often blocked sight lines and immediate access to the home. Second, internal control was maintained through a central design. Once inside, one entered into the courtyard, which acted as the central communication and traffic hub for the home. With rooms radiating from the courtyard, it was possible to control the division of space inside the home in any way one wished.5 From the courtyard, one could move on to the more private rooms of the *pastas* and kitchen complexes or to the more public area of the house, such as the *andron*.6

---

4 For the general layout of an Olynthian home, see Nevett (1995b), 91-92; Cahill (2002), 74-82.
5 Such a centripetal design allows for ease of control, not so much of the space, but how that space was used. Archaeological assemblages make it clear that the various rooms in the house were multi-functional, but the house plan allows for the separation and control of differing elements, whether male and female, free and slave or guest and host. See Nevett (1999), 74. For the multivalent nature of the archaeological assemblages at Olynthos, see Cahill (2002), 148-193.
6 Nevett (1999), 183-186, provides the chi square and phi square values of her cross tabulation analysis of the rooms in Olynthian houses. Her work indicates that both the courtyard and pastas had low access values (indicating that they were far from the main door) and high openness values (indicating that other spaces opened off of them). See Nevett (1999), 64-65, 68-69. Though possible that neighbours could have overlooked a courtyard, access to the courtyard was often controlled through one entryway with a screen-wall and lobby (House A v 10; House A vii 4) or through a single, narrow and angled passage (House A v 3; House A vi 7). See Nevett (1995b), 91.
Andrones at Olynthos tend to be located adjacent to an outside wall and are frequently placed at one corner of the house. This seems to have been done in order to light the area through an exterior window, though this window may also have allowed passers-by to listen to, observe or participate in elements of the symposium. A door leading from the andron directly onto the street would then be a possibility, but such a door was never actually created. A conscious decision was taken that forced an individual to travel through the court in order to get to the andron. This has the effect of placing the two most public areas of a house on display when guests arrive for a sympotic event and so it is not surprising to find courts and andrones to be the most decorated areas of a house. Mosaic, colored plaster, terracotta and metal adornments are all present, which contrasts sharply with the plain, unadorned features of the other areas in the home. As Cahill notes “Public display played an important role in the symposium: the architecture of the rooms, the fancy mosaics, furniture, and drinking vessels; the food, entertainment, and company proclaimed the wealth and taste of the host”.

Several houses at Olynthos have such elaborately decorated andrones, in addition to other rooms. Aside from the embellishments of small items, such as appliqués, many houses had cement or mosaic floors in one or more rooms, while painted walls were also

---

7 Thirty-four andrones were excavated at Olynthos and of these twenty-one are adjacent to an exterior wall. Those that are “interior” andrones tend to be later additions. Windows were found in House A 10 and House A vi 5, while other examples are known from Eretria, Piraeus and Delos. See Graham (1953), 199-203; Cahill (2002), 80, 192.

8 Almost all of the andrones had painted plaster walls with some having cement floors and platforms that were painted as well. Nine of the thirty-four excavated andrones contained floor mosaics. Cahill (2002), 180. For the andron at Olynthos in general, see Robinson and Graham (1938), 171-178. The public nature of the andron is also evident in Nevett’s statistical analyses. See Nevett (1999), 66, 70.

common. The most elaborate decoration comes from the houses in the villa section of the city. Most famous are the figural mosaics from the Villa of Good Fortune, but other houses had figural and decorative mosaics as well. For the most part, these figural mosaics are found in the public areas of the house, including courts, pastades and, most frequently, andrones. In addition, many houses had painted plaster in one or more of their rooms. Again, the more public areas of the house most often received this painting, though in some instances areas like a kitchen-complex could receive a painted wall. Red is by far the most used color and decoration is simple, often with the main section of the wall and a baseboard being the only two painted elements. More ornate examples, however, did exist. The House of Many Colors was the most elaborately painted house on the site. Almost every room was painted, with red, yellow and blue the predominant colors. The andron was especially noteworthy as the walls had a yellow baseboard divided into panels by incised lines, followed by blue bands that separated the baseboard from the red upper walls. Fragments of a floral band with palmettes also survive, one of the few attested examples of painted figural decoration from the site.

Beyond the larger decorative material retrieved, the primary importance of Olynthos lies in the total domestic material excavated and recorded. The actual

---

10 Cahill’s distribution charts and cluster analysis show that, in general, the houses at Olynthos are more or less similarly appointed within the individual blocks of the city. See Cahill (2002), 213-214.

11 Many of the houses at Olynthos had some type of mosaic paving, though not necessarily figural. See Cahill (2002), 215 for a distribution chart of these floors. Aside from the Villa of Good Fortune, the following houses had figural mosaics: House A 1, House A vi 1, House A vi 3, House A vi 4, House A vi 6, A vi 8, House A xi 9, House B v 1, and the House of the Comedian. See Robinson and Graham (1938), 281-290 for the mosaics uncovered at Olynthos, esp. 290.

12 See Cahill (2002), 217 for a distribution chart of painted rooms in the houses. For an analysis on the painting at Olynthos, with an accompanying chart of mural decoration distribution, see Robinson and Graham (1938), 291-303.

13 For the decoration of the House of the Many Colors, see Robinson (1946), 183-206. For an analysis of the House’s rooms and assemblages, see Cahill (2002), 85-97. The only other house with evidence of figural painting is House B i 5. See Robinson (1930), 109; Robinson and Graham (1938), 301.
assemblages of artifacts recovered allow for a possible reconstruction of the use of the spaces inside a Greek home. Though one must be wary, in that such assemblages provide only a snapshot of domestic life at Olynthos and cannot provide infallible documentary evidence for activity, they are a key source for attempting to reconstruct domestic life.\textsuperscript{14} What the material at Olynthos shows is a wide range of functions and use in any given area of the home.\textsuperscript{15} This runs contrary to the literary record and to the notion of \textit{Typenhäuser} at Olynthos, both of which can lead to assumptions concerning a normative use of space. The architecture of a home need not determine the use of space and any ideal presented in literary texts is necessarily altered by the needs and functions of actual daily living.\textsuperscript{16} Thus the assemblages from courts, kitchen-complexes and other rooms will vary from house to house based on the needs of the individual household – the makeup of the \textit{oikos} unit, the economic activity of the household or the season. In addition, courts, \textit{pastades} and those rooms adjoining these areas were often used for numerous tasks, such as weaving, agricultural processing and cult activities, whether for the house alone or as a commercial enterprise.

The distribution of artifacts uncovered presents a diverse use of architectural space over the whole of the house, with the most diverse material coming from the courtyard. As the largest space and that open to the sun and air, this is not surprising. This diversity does not apply to all rooms, as the \textit{andron} and the kitchen-complex both appear to have been used for specialized purposes. Although a family could have used

\textsuperscript{14} For a brief overview of the difficulties associated with these assemblages and their interpretation, see Nevett (1999), 57-61.
\textsuperscript{15} Aside from the excavation reports and Cahill (2002), one should consult Cahill’s on-line database of artifacts uncovered throughout the entire site of Olynthos. The URL is www.stoa.org/olynthus/
\textsuperscript{16} Cahill (2002), 150.
another room for dining purposes if they did not have an *andron*, there is little in the assemblages to suggest that anything other than dining took place in such a room when it existed.\textsuperscript{17} This also seems to have been true of the kitchen-complex, where only rarely do items unrelated to cooking or washing appear in the assemblages.\textsuperscript{18}

The large number of excavated buildings at Olynthos allows the scholar to evaluate the big picture of domestic spatial relations and use at this site. Several conclusions about the general nature of Greek domestic space may then be drawn from the site. First there are rooms in the home, specifically the court and the *andron*, which are more public in nature than other areas of the house. As such, these areas receive the most attention when it comes to decoration. Second, the archaeological assemblages uncovered reveal a varied use of space in the home. Areas such as the courtyard were host to many domestic and economic activities, though the kitchen-complex and the *andron* seem to have maintained a specialized purpose. Such general patterns provide paradigms for spatial usage, but in addition to these generalized patterns, one should also

\textsuperscript{17} One of the more curious elements of the assemblages at Olynthos is the lack of dining material that came from identifiable *andrones*. Several large decorated kraters were found on the site, though the total is small compared to other domestic contexts in Greece, and the small number of red-figure cups, nine in all, is remarkable. In addition, these were not all uncovered in *andrones*. The spatial distribution of this material is wide, with dining sets, including red-figure bell kraters and other decorated sympotic wares, found in the kitchen of House A 8, in the *pastas* of the House of Many Colors and from a storeroom in House A iv 5. It may be that the distribution of these assemblages suggests that the material was used in less formal or daily dining contexts outside of the *andron*, or that such material was simply stored elsewhere. That little was uncovered in *andrones* proper suggests that the bulk of the sympotic ware may have been metal and so carried off by Philip’s troops as booty. Williams (1996), 232, n. 17, would place this transition from red-figure pottery to metal ware in the mid-fourth century. Very few complete metal vessels were uncovered at Olynthos, though fragments attest to their use. As examples, see Robinson (1941), nos. 506, 571-585, 633-649 and 658-666. For the assemblages in the *andrones* at Olynthos, see Cahill (2002), 180-190.

\textsuperscript{18} The kitchen complexes at Olynthos are architecturally unique. Other Greek sites have rooms associated with bathing and cooking, though none have the Olynthian pillar partition nor evidence of cooking in a flue. The assemblages varied among houses, but it is clear that cooking was the key activity. In some cases, such as the House of Many Colors and House A iv 9, the flues were not used for cooking but for other activities such as storage. Other, non-cooking domestic activity assemblages were rare. Only House A xi 10 had evidence for weaving in the kitchen, while only House A viii 4 had a kitchen with grindstones. For this complex at Olynthos, and the possible ramifications of the assemblages on such notions as gendered divisions of space, see Cahill (2002), 153-161.
be concerned about the specific findspot of any given piece. Thus a brief evaluation of two excavated buildings where domestic sculpture was found, follows.

House A 6 rests along the far western block of houses that lie against the city’s wall. In plan, this house conforms to the single courtyard type with a pastas at the northern end of the court. The northern half of its southern neighbor, House A 7, was incorporated, creating an especially large courtyard. Unlike many of the homes at Olynthos, the andron here is located off of the pastas and not the court, placing it in a closer connection to the pastas complex of rooms. In addition, this pastas complex contained a separate entrance onto the street, suggesting that a shop may have occupied the northern room e. Certainly by the time the house included House A 7 as part of its complex, evidence shows large scale processing of grain was taking place. Twelve upper grindstones comprising seven hopper-rubbers and five saddle querns, along with a series of lower grindstones were all uncovered in the courtyard area of the house, suggesting craft activity that could have been associated with a shop. In addition, a cement strip in the west of the courtyard may have served as a press bed, while other finds throughout the house suggest agricultural processing.

It is also in this courtyard area that a small marble head from a statuette was uncovered. This head, circled by a diadem, is only 0.24 m high and is broken at the neck and no associated fragments have been found. Little may be said of the head, other than it may have been an attachment for a herm or small statue, though the diadem suggests a

---

19 For the architecture and assemblages uncovered from House A 6, see Robinson (1930), 68-78; Robinson and Graham (1938), 75-76; Cahill (2002), 211-213, 241-244.

20 See Robinson (1930), 69-71; Robinson and Graham (1938), 326 nos. 1-7, 333 nos. 3-7; Cahill (2002), 244.
divinity. The findspot is reported as being “in the Southeast corner of the court only a few inches below the modern surface”. This would possibly place the head near the entrance to the home, perhaps by the stairs to the second story - a place appropriate for herm.

These finds, a front door wide enough for a cart and the surviving ground plan, all indicate that this was a “professional establishment”, with a ground floor used almost exclusively for commercial activity. It may then be of little surprise then, that such a functional use of space limited decoration. No fitments, appliqués or other decorative finds were unearthed, while undecorated cement lined the floor in only a small section of the court and the andron. No traces of paint were uncovered. This seems to be in line with the majority of houses at Olynthos that engage in commercial activity, which tend to be at the low end of the decorative scale when compared to the houses at the site on the whole. The small statue head may have been decorative after a fashion, but the fragmentary nature of the piece, the poor depositional record and archaeological context all limit analysis. That this piece was located near the entrance of the home with a

---

21 Harward (1982), 196, cat. no. 85. Robinson’s original suggestion was that this was a representation of Artemis and possibly from a small-scale statue. Harrison more convincingly suggests that the head represents an Apollo and was most likely from a herm. For this head in general, see Robinson (1929), 67-68, fig. 15; Robinson (1930), 74-78, figs. 195-197; Robinson and Graham (1938), 76; Harrison (1965), 128-129.

22 Robinson (1930), 74. The location would also seem secure, though Harrison (1965) sees the possibility of the piece being dragged to the site as a fragment given that no other associated fragments were found (128).

23 Cahill (2002), 244. A stair base uncovered near the main entrance into the courtyard indicates that there was second story, which may have provided a more private area for the house’s family.

24 Cahill’s Cluster 4 “Houses with Shops” numbers eleven houses, of which only House A iv 9 and B vi 9 possess some moderately decorated elements. In general, coherence of decoration exists within the blocks at Olynthos, rather than among house types. The Villa Section and Block A vi are the most decorated, while the houses along Block A seem to be more modest. Within Cahill’s two clusters of houses that are of the “regular” type (the typical house plan), Clusters 1 and 5, those with a higher number of specialized areas, such as andrones and kitchen-complexes, tend to be more decorated with mosaics, cement floors and painted walls. See Cahill (2002), 204-222, esp. 208-214.
prominent display location is significant and suggests an important function. Although what this function was is open to debate, a herm by the door to a commercial establishment would not have seemed out of place.  

In contrast to this Spartan decoration in House A 6, House B vi 7 is much more lavish. One entered the house from the north with a single courtyard at the far southern end of the house. There was a *pastas* to the east, along with its associated rooms, and an *andron* complex to the west.  

Several small finds were unearthed in the central court that speak to the overall wealth of the home. Chief among these were several bronze items, such as bosses, a doorknocker and a palmette. The *andron* was the smallest uncovered at Olynthos, measuring 3 m x 2.6 m. The walls of this room were covered in red stucco, as were its anteroom d, opposite room a and two walls in the eastern room e. The stucco in room a is noteworthy, as it is painted in various colors and incised in parallel lines in order to imitate the masonry of an actual wall, what in painting might be referred to as a type of “Masonry Style”.  

In this room were found a painted amphora, a square terracotta stand with Ionic volutes that may be an altar, the head of a terracotta figurine and various other small finds. Among the assemblages uncovered in the rest of the home, a few decorative pieces were found including, a fine red-figure bell krater,

---

25 This is entirely conjectural and would make more sense if this piece were Hermes rather than Apollo. While there are representations of Hermes wearing a crown as a herm (*LIMC* V (1990), s.v. “Hermes” 302, no. 113 (G. Siebert) – Hermitage B 4543), he usually wears the *petasos* and *pilos* as headgear in sculpture. Unlike the Olynthos head, the representation on the krater from the Hermitage also represents a bearded Hermes. The overall modeling of the piece, especially the carving of the hair with its central part, along with associated images on coins from the Khalkidic League found at Olynthos (see Robinson and Clement (1938), pl. 3, nos. 4-8; pl. 11, nos. 74-77; pl. 15, nos. 114-118a) make an identification of Apollo fairly secure.  

26 For House B vi 7, see Robinson (1946), 125-142.

27 The paint is in two yellow bands, one thick and one thin. The bands are separated from one another by an incised line and above these two bands the upper wall was painted in the same red as the *andron*. Robinson (1946), 139, refers to this as “Incised Line Style”. On “Masonry Style”, see Bruno (1969).
decorated with Dionysos and his cortège, another red figure pot, and several bronze items, including two palmettes.\textsuperscript{28}

It is also in this home that the first clear archaeological insight into domestic sculpture may be found. This house is also referred to as the “House of Asklepios” based on a small statuette of Asklepios that was found there.\textsuperscript{29} The statue is only 0.31 m in height and is in reasonably good condition with only the head, feet and left forearm missing. The statue can be identified as the god Asklepios based on the small snake’s head at the base of his staff and by similar pieces found at Kilkis and Potidæa.\textsuperscript{30} Based on these examples, archaeological context and style, the sculpture has been dated to the mid fourth century.\textsuperscript{31} The statue shows the god clad only in a \textit{himation} and in a relaxed pose. The left forearm was originally dowelled and the piece is equally finished on all sides. No associated base was found. Though not \textit{in situ}, the piece was found in the entrance of the house’s \textit{andron}. As was observed, this matches well with the literary testimonia that link small statuary in domestic settings with \textit{andrones} and suggests that this may have been the original location.\textsuperscript{32} If the statue were standing by the door to the \textit{andron}, it would most likely not have been visible to those dining inside, but it would have been visible to those passing through the corridor into the main courtyard of the

\textsuperscript{28} See Robinson (1946), 137-142 for the list of finds by room. The specific findspot of the bell krater (inv. 38.534) is unknown. It consists of Dionysos, maenads and a satyr on the obverse and two or three youths on the reverse. See Robinson (1950), 88-89, no. 35; Cahill (2002), 183; \textit{ARV²} 1425, 1427.
\textsuperscript{29} Harward (1982), 197, cat. no. 86. On this statue, see Robinson (1946), 130-137, pls. 115-116, 118-119.
\textsuperscript{30} Robinson (1946), 130-131.
\textsuperscript{31} Aside from the context, which assures a date that is earlier than 348 BCE, Robinson distinguishes among several types of Hellenistic Asklepios statues, of which the type in question, with a staff on the left side and the right hand on the hip, is less frequent and appears earlier than other types. See Robinson (1946), 131-137 with references to others in the typology. The piece does seem earlier and less well executed than the Asklepios from Eleusis, whose dedicatory inscription allows for a dating of ca. 320 BCE. See \textit{LIMC II} (1984), s.v. “Asklepios” 882, no. 234 (B. Holtzmann).
\textsuperscript{32} “This statuette, which was found about 0.50 m below the modern surface in the entrance of the andron at the west side”. Robinson (1946), 130. This may suggest that the original location was just inside or, given spatial limitations, more probably just outside the \textit{andron} in the corridor before Room a.
house. It could also have been visible to those entering and exiting room a. This room, identified as a “living room” by the excavators, may not have served as a more public room like an andron or court, but it may have been viewed by non-household members on their way to the andron. These three rooms, andron f, room a and the courtyard, were the three most decorated areas in House B vi 7 with two of the three rooms being open to non-household members. The Asklepios statue was seemingly placed in an area that would maximize viewing potential on the part of those individuals who would be coming into the home from the outside, suggesting that the display of the statue on the part of the homeowner was of importance. What meaning this display meant to convey is uncertain. Robinson suggested that the statue had a religious connotation, believing that it could be either a votive offering or a cult image, noting that Asklepios had become a household divinity by the fourth century. The statue could then simply be a cult image, but no associated religious paraphernalia or domestic cult items were uncovered with the statue suggesting another use for the sculpture. If there was a religious association, it may have been that

---

33 Robinson (1946), 138-140. There seems to have been a small partition wall extending from the northwest of the courtyard that may have partially blocked the view, but one could still see the piece from the corridor and on the way to the andron and Room a. One had to pass the door to Room a before reaching the door of the andron and so visitors could have seen the decoration inside the room, barring a door or screen.

34 Robinson (1946), 131. He notes that small statues such as this were left as votives in sanctuaries, suggesting that this is also the case in this instance. Likewise, he suggests that the statue may imitate some cult statue such as one from Kos, though he does not provide any reasons why. While there may have been a connection between Asklepios and the snake as household protector, the reference to Soph. Phil. 1327 seems misplaced. The god’s presence as a household deity in the fourth century is still in question, though the analysis by Edelstein and Edelstein (1998) of the literary testimonia of the god and his worship lays stress on temple activities for worship and incubation. The possible religious connotations of domestic sculpture will be discussed in Chapter 6.

35 One would generally expect certain material to show up in the archaeological record as evidence of household cult activities, such as portable altars, miniature vessels, or louteria. See Cahill (2002), 158. Such material has been found at Olynthus, but not with this particular statue. In this home, the closest such
the statue was meant to convey the general piety of the homeowner, or it could have been that the statue possessed no religious elements at all and that it was simply decoration, noting the wealth and taste of the owner. The two need not be mutually exclusive, but the lack of associated religious or cult finds, in concert with the conspicuous and carefully chosen place of display are suggestive of the latter.

One other piece of statuary within an Olynthian home should be mentioned, though its poor context limits evaluation. The statue represents a small draped female figure of unidentifiable subject from a house on the South Hill. The excavators at the time were examining the prehistoric remains on this hill, but note that a Hellenistic house of the fourth century existed in extremely fragmentary condition. The function of the room in which the statue was found cannot be determined, but the piece was uncovered with a fourth century red figured krater, perhaps suggesting the wealth of the home. Though little more may be said of this statue, it does provide another example of domestic statuary from Olynthos.

Olynthos then provides the earliest known examples of domestic sculpture in Greece. The number of pieces is small and while the diademed head from House A 6 is of interest, only the Asklepios statue from House B vi 7 provides an appropriate locative context for examination. In this instance, the statue was uncovered outside of an assemblage would seem to come from Room a, where there was a head from a terracotta figurine and a terracotta stand with Ionic volutes that was tentatively identified as an altar by the excavators.

36 Harward (1986), 196, cat. no. 84. The piece was found in Trench 3. For the excavations of this area, see Robinson (1929), 54-56; Mylonas (1929), esp. fig. 3 for a plan of the house’s remains. For the sculpture itself, see Robinson (1930), 3-4, figs. 29-30.

37 For the krater, see Robinson (1929), 56, fig. 7; Robinson (1933), 120-123, pls. 86-LXXXVII. Robinson (1930), 4, suggested that both krater and statue “formed part of the ornament of this fourth-century Greek house”.

38 There was also a small lead statue group that was excavated in the courtyard of House B vi 7 representing a male and a female herm, possibly Priapos and Aphrodite. See Robinson (1946), 127. A
andron, an area that the literary sources suggest is appropriate for a sculpture. This location also provides appropriate viewing possibilities for those entering the house to proceed through the corridor to the more public areas of the house, the andron and the courtyard. The surviving remains at Olynthos, however, do illustrate how pervasive domestic decoration was, even if only on a rudimentary level, and suggest its importance. From its inception, domestic statuary seems to have formed a minor type of domestic decoration but one in keeping with the general precepts of domestic decor.

3.2 Priene

The Anatolian site of Priene provides an overview of Hellenistic architecture much in the same way that the site of Olynthos does. Approximately seventy houses were excavated in the late nineteenth century indicating that, like Olynthos, the city was organized using the “Hippodamian” method of town planning, with regular sized lots measuring 35.35 m x 47.14 m. As at Olynthos, this general regularity of size and plan has given rise to the notion of Prienian Typenhäuser. The difference in type, however, lies in the lack of pastades in the houses at Priene and the inclusion of a colonnaded similar double herm set was found in the north room (kitchen complex?) of House A 8. See Cahill (2002), 126-127. For such lead herms at Olynthos, see Robinson (1941), 6-14, nos. 2-7, pl. II-III. In addition, a bronze eyelash was discovered in Room a of House A v 1. See Robinson (1941), 17-18, no. 12. Another was also found on site in a non-domestic context. See Robinson (1941), 17-18, no. 11. Mattusch (1988), 183-185, provides calculations that Cahill (2002), 321, n. 57, then uses to suggest that the eyelash came from a statue 1.68 m in height. A statue of this size would be out of place in the corpus of domestic statuary at this early date. Cahill (2002) suggests that this eyelash was carried home from a sanctuary as a souvenir (123). It may then have come from a sanctuary after the sack of Olynthos, or perhaps before if the inhabitants wanted to bring some of the sanctuary’s valuables inside the walls of the city. It most likely does not reflect a piece of domestic statuary.

The standard sized building plot was 120 x 160 Attic Feet, with one Attic foot equaling 29.46cm. For the initial excavations of these houses, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 285-468. The initial interpretations were flawed, however, believing that there was a single phase to the houses’ construction. Recent work has shown two distinct building phases in the city prior to a fire that destroyed the western residential district in the third quarter of the second century BCE. See Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 208-225.
forecourt or antechamber to a main back room. Thus Priene is held as the primary example of the *prostas* type of house, in the manner that Olynthos is viewed as the primary example of the *pastas* house. This distinction of architectural plan, however, belies the fact that the spaces created are very similar in nature and represent two ways in which to address the same spatial requirements. Thus both types represent a single entrance, single courtyard home, with rooms connecting off of the courtyard, while an entrance to a given set of rooms is accessed via a colonnade. The courtyard, as in the *pastas* house, is the central feature of the home and the area that provided access to all rooms. It was frequently entered directly from the street by an entranceway, though a corridor from the street door to the court could also be present. Thus the courtyard was as public a traffic area in a *prostas* house as it was in a *pastas* house. Similar rooms also existed in *prostas* houses, including andrones, oikoi, and kitchen-complexes. Perhaps because the layout of the housing plots at Priene demands long and narrow houses extra space was created vertically. There is greater evidence for second stories at the site in the form of cuttings suitable for support beams at the tops of surviving walls and in surviving bases for stairs, the taller remains perhaps owing to the slope of the site.

Unlike the houses from Olynthos, however, the evidence for overall decoration in the homes from Priene is less forthcoming. The *andron* remains the most decorated area of the home. As elsewhere, the *andrones* at Priene were accessed directly from the

---

40 For convenient definitions of the types of houses, see Nevett (1999), 22-23. For the two terms and the house types, in general see Drerup (1967); Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), esp. the brief notes at 322-323.
41 Nevett (1999), 123. Vitruvius refers to the general architectural feature that is called by some a *pastas* and by others a *prostas* (*De arch. 6.7.1*).
42 Because a residential block was made up of two rows of four houses each, the outside houses had entrances directly from the street into the courtyard, while the two inner houses were reached via a small alley that led to an entrance for a small corridor that led to the courtyard.
43 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 302-303; Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 218.
courtyard or from the prostas, though they tend to be of the smaller, three couch variety.\footnote{The apparent length of the couches was greater than usual, however, allowing for more diners The andrones could accommodate couches up to 2.05 m long, while the standard length was 1.80 m. Donatas et al. (2000), 182. On couches at Priene, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 378-383.} Seven and nine couch andrones are present but they tend to date from the later Hellenistic phase of the city. No figural mosaics were uncovered while patterned and plain mosaics are very rare.\footnote{A mosaic floor with a central “square in circle” pattern was uncovered in the southern andron of House 8. Given this decoration, the fact that it is a seven couch andron, unusually large for Priene, and that the room had a separate entrance from the street and was architecturally isolated from the rest of the house, it is suggested that this was not a domestic andron, but one that was rented out to others. Rumscheid (1998), 101. Another such patterned mosaic, this time with a wave pattern, was found in a sanctuary building (House 22, the so-called “Alexandreum”) in the western residential area.} Traces of paint are also not as abundant as at Olynthos, though there are some fine examples of “Masonry Style” wall painting at the site.\footnote{The andrones from House 23 and House 32 had very elaborate wall paintings of the “Masonry Style”, with several bands of solid color, egg and dart motifs, imitation marble and relief semi-columns. See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 314.} Other wall and architectural decoration, such as plaster moldings, revetments, appliqués, and painted forms, do attest to what may have been the wealth of domestic decoration within individual homes.\footnote{See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 308-319. The small finds from the various houses also attest to what must have been the decorative wealth of the city. These include numerous terracotta figurines, bronze candelabra and pottery with painted motifs and molded decoration (including one pot with a molded Eros for a handle – Vas.-Inv. 3775, Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 410, no. 56). On the various small finds from the domestic houses at Priene, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 329-468.}

Priene affords the opportunity to examine material on a large scale and, like Olynthos, provides an overview of spatial relations within a given type of home. Unlike Olynthos, however, the unfortunate state of preservation of the remains, along with the out-of-date analysis of much of the material, does not allow for an extended study of given homes and particular situations. A prime example of this state of affairs is House 33, one of the largest houses at Priene.
House 33 was formed in the later phase of construction at Priene by the merger of the earlier, smaller House 33 and the dwelling to its immediate east.\textsuperscript{48} This then formed a type of house more common in the later Hellenistic period, the double-courtyard house, though the western portion of the house maintained its \textit{prostas}.\textsuperscript{49} From the street one entered into the western courtyard, which was paved with marble slabs and surrounded by columns. The \textit{prostas} was Doric with a triglyph-metope frieze. Wall paintings survive from the northwestern most room including painted panels and bands that could be another variant on the “Masonry Style”, while architectural forms and associated decorations were added in relief.\textsuperscript{50} Off of the peristyle court, the \textit{andron} was particularly large and offered space for nine couches. One would then hope for a more elaborate analysis of the decoration and spatial arrangements within the house, but a paucity of surviving material negates such a possibility. The house itself presents the spatial arrangements of a normal home, if on a large scale, for both a \textit{prostas} home in its early phase and a double-courtyard home in its later phase. The wall paintings and architecture, let alone the size of the house attest to the owner’s affluence and the probable decorative wealth of the home.\textsuperscript{51} This situation becomes even more frustrating by the tantalizing discovery of a cache of statuary from this house.

\textsuperscript{48} The earlier phase of the west house seems to belong to the third century BCE, while the later phase where the two houses were joined dates to the second century BCE, perhaps after the great fire. See Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 225.

\textsuperscript{49} Such houses began to spring up in the fourth century, but were more common in the later Hellenistic period. For a brief overview of this type of house in the fourth century, see Nevett (1999), 107-114.

\textsuperscript{50} See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 312-317.

\textsuperscript{51} The wealth of the homeowner is also suggested by an altar uncovered in the peristyle court dedicated to Zeus Olympios, indicating that one of the owners was a \textit{a stoiasophos}. These individuals would be in charge of all sacrificial processions for the state for one year and pay the costs of all festivals themselves. See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326; \textit{IvP} no. 191; Akurgal (2001), 203-204.
In the eastern section of House 33, in the southeastern most room, numerous terracotta figurines, over a hundred vessels and numerous other objects were uncovered in an architecturally non-descript room. Among these were several marble statuettes of deities and humans of a size and type that would fit small-scale domestic statuary. Included were a statuette of Dionysos, a group of Aphrodite and another figure, an Aphrodite leaning on a pillar, a “generic” Aphrodite, a woman wearing a peplos and a group of four other statuettes including a headless female and three torsos, two female and one male. Given their findspot, little may be said contextually about these statues, though some general observations may be made.

The nude Dionysos is a fairly standard piece in a generic post-Praxitelean pose, with a small animal at the god’s right foot. The base and plinth are preserved. Two features, however, should be noted. First, the front surface of the piece is highly polished, while the back is not. Similarly, the definition of the animal diminishes at the rear suggesting a primary frontal view. Such treatment would be in line with a placement of the piece against a wall, possibly in a peristyle courtyard or by the entrance to an andron. One element that may cast doubt on this, however, is the hair of the god, which is pulled back in a bun. This hairstyle is usually associated with female statue

52 See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326-327, in addition to individual entries. The most famous piece found alongside the sculptures was a small terracotta figure of a satyr pulling a thorn from his foot. See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 357-358.
53 Aside from Wiegand and Schrader (1904), Linfert (1976), 20-22, discusses several of these pieces but he is more concerned with issues of dating for early sculpture in Asia Minor.
54 Berlin, Pergamon Museum, Sk. 1532. Harward (1982), cat. no. 93; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326, 368-370, Abb. 463-464. The animal is incomplete, but may be a panther. Bieber (1961), 104, would compare the piece to the Hermes of Andros and notes the Praxitelean elements.
55 Harward (1982), 203.
types rather than male, but may refer to the god’s androgyny.\textsuperscript{56} This feature, so noteworthy and therefore of primary iconographic and viewing significance, could be seen from a three quarter view, as the head of the god is tilted to the right, or from the back. As the piece is 0.71 m high, depending on the height of any support below the plinth, one could conceivably have looked down upon the piece to see this feature. The play with iconography and viewing is significant, altering what at first appearance seems to be a generic figure into something more, placing an emphasis on viewing and visual interpretation, and thus a concomitant importance on display and, presumably, discussion.

The other statues uncovered were of a similar size and type compared to the Dionysos. The three Aphrodites represent two almost complete pieces and one fragmentary work. One work presents the goddess, nude to the waist, looking and gesturing to her right.\textsuperscript{57} On her right, there is a smaller cavity in the base with a dowel hole and a pour channel to receive the plinth of another smaller statue. The strong contrapposto is again reminiscent of a Praxitelean vocabulary, while the polished front and visible tool marks on the back of the drapery, along with the composition, suggest a

\textsuperscript{56} Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 370. The other possibility is that this piece doe not represent Dionysos at all. Personifications of Pothos are known to have this hairstyle, as in a Roman statue in Florence (Uffizi inv. 165 = \textit{LIMC VII} (1994), s.v. “Pothos I” 502, no. 15 (J. Bažant)). See Shapiro (1993), 121-124. The character of Pothos would fit well with the Aphrodites uncovered, as he was seen as the son of Eros (Pl. Sym. 197d; Eur. \textit{Hipp}. 525-526) or as the son of Aphrodite (Aesch. \textit{Supp}. 1038-1040). In art he is associated with Aphrodite as well, as statues of Aphrodite and Pothos were set up on Samothrace (Plin. \textit{NH} 36.25) and statues of Pothos, Himeros and Eros were erected in the sanctuary of Aphrodite Praxis in the Agora of Megara (Paus 1.43.6), both groups by Skopas. See Stewart (1977), 107-110, 130, esp. 144-146. Usually representations of Pothos look up and away, however, a stance symbolic of the character’s “longing”. A similar statue to this in Cyrene (Mus. inv. 14230 = \textit{LIMC III} (1986), s.v. “Dionysos” 435, no. 119a (C. Gasparri)) shows Dionysos with the down turned head, panther at his feet and his hair up, though with a fillet and not in a bun. The statue in Priene more than likely represents Dionysos, though a syncretic representation is possible as Pothos is also a Dionysiac character responsible for the longing associated with ecstasy and pleasure (Eur. \textit{Bacch} 414).

\textsuperscript{57} Berlin, Pergamon Museum, Sk. 1533. Harward (1982), cat. no. 94; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326, 370-371; Abb. 465.
frontal view. On the other hand, the statuette of the goddess leaning on a pillar is remarkable only for the number of dowels used as attachments and the unappealing support between the goddess’ feet. The tooling and polish also make it clear that this piece was meant to be viewed frontally. The fragmentary “generic” statuette of Aphrodite is preserved from the waist to the knee and shows the goddess lifting a red painted mantle from her legs, perhaps to cover the rest of her body. These statues illustrate the overall importance and popularity of the goddess of love as a subject for domestic statuary. Just as the goddess increased in popularity in larger scale public and civic dedications over the course of the fourth century and Hellenistic period, so too was she a popular subject in the private realm.

The other marble statuettes in this group consist of a woman wearing a peplos and 4 other statuettes, one of a headless female with a chiton and mantle, two female torsos with chitons and one male with a mantle preserved from ankles to the waist. The woman wearing a peplos is small, only 0.40 m in height, with a very large base and many joining pieces. The other four works reveal little, but are of a size and type that reaffirm the general characteristics of the statues from this house – small, in a generic post-Praxitelean pose and with an emphasis on frontality for viewing purposes.

80

---

58 Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, no. 1052. The right arm and left wrist were joined by dowels, as was a finial attached to the pillar. Harward (1982), cat. no. 95; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326-327, 370-372, Abb. 466.
59 Harward (1982), 205, cat. no. 96; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 327, 371.
60 Brinkerhoff (1978) illustrates how a “more naturalistic and personal representation of the deity” began in the fourth century, possibly with the Aphrodite of Knidos, and thus was well suited for a more private (domestic) setting. See Brinkerhoff (1978), esp. 25-34. Harward’s (1982) catalogue lists 12 examples of Aphrodite statues, the largest single number of examples for identifiable statue subjects.
61 The woman wearing a peplos is Harward (1982), 205, cat. no. 97; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 327, 372-373. The four other statuettes are listed collectively as Harward (1992), 206, cat. no. 98; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 327.
House 33 is an illustration of a grand dwelling of the Hellenistic period. Once the adjoining house was absorbed into the architecture of the original, the final spatial layout presents a large, but typical version of a double courtyard house. The surviving material remains hint that this was a wealthy house with prominent domestic decoration in the form of wall painting and reliefs. The small-scale statuettes uncovered match the size and type at other Hellenistic sites. Though their findspot precludes any spatial analysis, several characteristics internal to the pieces can be analyzed to help understand their viewing potential.\(^{62}\) These statues may have belonged to House 33 but been in storage, they may or may not have been part of a cohesive collection or they may have been in a storeroom ready to be sold or shipped.\(^{63}\) Whatever their original context, they do conform to a domestic statuary typology in their small size and concern for frontal viewing and help in our understanding of viewing possibilities.

One example that does provide a slightly better circumstance for evaluating the context of a domestic statue comes from House 13 in the western residential area. In a room just off of the prostas, a statue of the Aphrodite Anadyomene type was uncovered.\(^{64}\) Like the others, this piece is small with a height of 0.46 m including its plinth and, while conforming to the overall anadyomene type, was rather poorly

\(^{62}\) Bieber (1961), 104, notes general Praxitelean elements for all the pieces, but suggests that they are “more advanced in movement” than fourth century Praxitelean types.

\(^{63}\) Rumscheid (1998), 145, states that these pieces may have been part of a private collection, suggesting that they belonged together and perhaps should be analyzed collectively. He also suggests that the pieces could have fallen from a second story room, but this matters little given that either the first or second story room would not have been the original display location, but rather a storage room.

\(^{64}\) Ist. Arch. Mus. no. 1053; Harward (1982), 209, cat. no. 102; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321-322, 372, Abb. 467.
executed. The findspot and the associated archaeological assemblage suggest that the room in which the statue was found could have been an andron. Along with the sculpture, two feet from couches were excavated, along with “Masonry Style” stucco wall painting. Architecturally, the room is located where one would expect an andron, just off of the prostas, and it does have an off-center doorway. This architectural arrangement is not conclusive, but it does suggest that this room may have been a dining room, possibly an andron, again singling out a more public area within the home for decoration. The statue would then have formed part of this room’s decoration and it is interesting to note that this is an example of a specific and established type found in large-scale sculpture, here reproduced in smaller form for the homeowner.

Three more examples of domestic statuary from Priene may be examined, though again their archaeological context precludes spatial analysis. Two statues were uncovered in the remains of House 29 in the western residential district. The first is a statue of a youth leaning on a column. The youth stands 0.765 m tall and exemplifies two elements already encountered in the domestic statuary of Priene. The first is the

---

65 The piece was cemented at the waist with a visible join line that should have been hidden by the drapery. Also, two marbles were used, a whiter, finer grained marble for the nude torso and a gray-purple for the bottom. This was presumably done to highlight the naked torso, though the result is rather unspectacular.

66 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321-322. The excavators refer to the room as a “thalamos”, seemingly based on Vit. De arch 6.7.2, but they admit that “Der Thalamos zur Seite der Prostas wurde aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach als Speisezimmer verwendet.” (391). Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 216-217, identify such rooms as andrones. The area of a three-couch andron would have been small and packed with furniture. The small scale of the piece would have allowed it to stand on a table or in a niche in the wall.

67 For the “half-draped” type of the Aphrodite Anadyomene, see Brinkerhoff (1978), 58-63. Following others he would place the origins of the type in the mid third century BCE. Most of the western residential district at Priene was destroyed by a fire in the late second century BCE, thus providing a rough terminus ante quem for the statue. This suggests that there may not have been much of a lag time between the “original” creation of the type and its adaptation in smaller scale for the home.

68 The two statues are simply listed as having been found “im Untergeschoss”. Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321.
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“Praxitelean” quality of the piece’s contrapposto stance and overall contour. The second quality is a marked preference for frontal or three-quarter viewing for domestic statues. The rear of this statue is not as polished as the front, while remnants of the tool marks are still visible. The hair is only roughed out at the back, while the individual strands and groupings of hair have been delicately carved at the front. The second statuette is one of a woman seated on a rock. The piece is 0.34 m in height and again demonstrates an emphasis on frontality. The hair of the woman is only roughed out at the back, while the rock upon which she sits is flat at the back, suggesting the piece was to be placed against a wall. In addition, the carving of the back of the torso and the drapery are done in simplified flat planes. Finally, in the house to the west of House 29 was uncovered another statuette of a woman seated on a rock. This piece is different from that of House 29 in that it is more stable with less implied motion in the drapery, while her right arm is extended, pointing outward. The seated woman is slightly larger with a height of 0.46 m and demonstrates the same emphasis on frontality by the flat planes and visible tool marks at the rear. This example was located in the westernmost of three ground floor rooms on the southern wall. The ground plan for this building is complex, but there is a stairway in this room leading from the “basement”. If the statue were against a wall, it would have had a prominent viewing location, being the first/last image one saw upon ascending/descending the stairs.

---

70 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 367. Bieber (1961), 104, would compare the youth to the Hermes at Olympia, though in this instance a generic similarity is to be preferred to a specific parallel.
71 Harward (1982), 207.
72 Ist. Arch. Mus. no. 746; Harward (1982), 207-208, cat. no. 100; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321, 327.
73 Harward (1982), 207.
74 Ist. Arch. Mus. no. 1003; Harward (1982), 208, cat. no. 101; Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321, 372.
75 This is the findspot as listed on the original excavation plan of the area, with the house seemingly labeled as House 27b. The plan is reproduced as Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), Abb. 186.
Like Olynthos, Priene affords the opportunity to examine domestic architecture on a large scale. The remains survive in slightly better conditions at Priene, though the recording of the small finds was not as careful. Unlike Olynthos, however, several more examples of domestic sculpture survive from the site. These sculptures help to provide a better understanding of how these houses would have been decorated and illustrate that the locations of the examples seen at Olynthos were not out of the norm. Dining rooms, courtyards and the areas in and around these rooms receive the most decorative attention. Unlike Olynthos, enough domestic sculpture survives to suggest some broad commonalities. What the material from House 33 shows is that domestic sculpture tends to be small, have primary frontal views and often have as subjects characters from the natural and amorous realms, like Aphrodite and Dionysos. Still, the poor context for these statues precludes more in-depth studies. Such is not the case, however, with the material from the site of Eretria.

3.3 Eretria

The Euboian site of Eretria has yielded several examples of houses from the late Classical period, including several large structures originally labeled as palaces by the excavators. Renewed excavations in recent years along with reinterpretations of these structures have led to more moderate conclusions.\(^{76}\) While the sites of Olynthos and

\(^{76}\) Throughout this work, the numbering system adopted by the current excavators will be used. For the following summary only, their system will be labeled as Ex.(cavation) House. The conclusions drawn by Auberson and Schefold (1972) led them to label the remains of Ex. House I as Palace I, and those of Ex. House II as Palace II. Later, alternative interpretations of these and newly excavated buildings led to Krause (1977) suggesting a total of four structures he labeled as Houses I-IV. Upon further excavations, this numbering system was subsequently changed by the latest excavation team with the following results: Krause’s Houses I and II are combined = Ex. House I, Krause’s House III = Ex. House IV and Krause’s House IV = Ex. House II. This new system thus has Houses I, II and IV, but no House III. Recent
Priene allowed for the analysis of domestic remains on a large scale, the fine state of preservation of the material at Eretria allows for a more in-depth examination of singular examples of domestic space, decoration and sculpture. In total the remains of seven domestic structures have been uncovered in two separate excavation areas. The eastern excavation area has produced one complete house, the famed House of the Mosaics, along with parts of two other houses. Some 300 m to west, a larger grouping of five structures was found, labeled by the current excavators as Houses I, II and IV and Buildings III and V.

With the exception of the two partially excavated houses and the two “Buildings”, each of these structures will be discussed individually, but one common factor may be mentioned. Like House 33 from Priene, these structures seem to represent examples of the double-courtyard type of Greek house. The House of the Mosaics, House I and House II all have two courtyards, one main peristyle courtyard and one other, more inwardly oriented open space. Such an arrangement segments the house into two primary areas, each with its own focus and area of spatial communication (courtyard), though the purpose of each area remains uncertain. Such a division of space also occurred in House IV, but in two phases. The first, western section with a single courtyard was excavations have uncovered two other buildings to the immediate northeast and south of House II (labeled by the excavators as Gebäuden III and V) that may prove to be domestic in nature. See Reber (1998), 16, Abb. 2, “Plan des Westquartiers”.

77 The type of house segmentation represented by the double-courtyard type closely parallels Vitruvius’ description of a “typical” Greek house (Vit. De arch. 7). The excavators of the fourth century double-courtyard house at Maroneia in Thrace have thus interpreted the two primary areas as an andronitis and a gunaikonitis. See Karadedos (1990), 279. Not all of the house remains, however, and such a spatial arrangement makes supervision of work within the house more difficult to maintain. While Vitruvius may present his view of a “typical” Greek house, Nevett (1999), 108, is quick to point out that the arrangement presented in the Maroneia house is, in fact, atypical. See Reber (1998), 166-169, for a “Vitruvian” reading of the three houses at Eretria with a double courtyard. In general, this type of gendered reading remains problematic as no architectural evidence survives to support such a division. See Nevett (1994); Nevett (1995a).
constructed in the first half of the fourth century. The eastern section was also an
independent structure in the early fourth century, but it was added to its neighbor and
integrated into one unit in the early third century. Though one structure at this time, the
spatial arrangement of the house seems to indicate two separate and distinct functional
units. It could be that such an arrangement indeed focused on a more public and a more
private area, but each case must be taken on its own.

Among these houses, the earliest constructed was the House of the Mosaics, likely
built in the early fourth century and in use for over one hundred years before being
destroyed by fire. The dwelling covered an area of approximately 625 m² and was most
likely only a single story dwelling. The spatial layout of the house represents a double-
courtyard arrangement and illustrates a wealthy but architecturally typical domestic
building. One enters the house from the south, passing along a corridor that leads to the
central peristyle courtyard (a-c) for the western section of the house. This section of the
house seems to have had a very public function with an emphasis on dining and
entertainment as indicated by the numerous andrones off of the courtyard. Rooms 9 and
7 can confidently be identified as andrones from the raised benches for dining couches
uncovered. Room 9 could accommodate seven couches, while the larger room 7 had
space for eleven couches. Room 5 has also been identified as a small andron, with
enough space for three couches, while the adjoining room 4 has been interpreted as a

---

78 For the most recent excavations and interpretations of House IV, see Reber (1998), 67-93.
79 Nevett (1999), 113.
80 In general, see Ducrey et al. (1993) for publication of the House of the Mosaics, especially the general
section concerning the house (31-51).
81 For the interpretation of these rooms, see Ducrey et al. (1993), 47.
cloakroom for guests. The remaining rooms in the western section of the house seem to have served as storage areas, though the function of room 2 remains uncertain. This section of the house is separated from the eastern section by a long dividing wall, whose ruinous state precludes the discovery of a doorway. This section of the house, again centered on a courtyard (13), represents the more private area of the home, with rooms 10, 11 and 12 interpreted as the living quarters. Room 10, the antechamber to the adjoining rooms 11 and 12, may have served the general function of a pastas, after the type discussed at Olynthos, but this is uncertain. In light of ancient stone robbing, the interpretation of the southern rooms remains tentative, though the courtyard has been interpreted as a garden, for there is little evidence for extensive paving in the area. It may well be that that room 16 was a bathroom, given the watertight mosaic floor and presence of a canal that may have led water from the room to the street outside, but the interpretation of room 14 as a kitchen-complex by analogy is difficult in light of the limited evidence. It is likely that such activities took place in this section of the house,

---

82 For Room 5, see Ducrey et al. (1993), 45-46. For the interpretation of Room 4 as a cloakroom, see Ducrey et al. (1993), 44. This suggestion is based on the presence of a marble table and an emplacement for an amphora in the room suggesting public use, though not as an andron. Nevett (1999), 111, suggests that this also may have been an area for guests to relieve themselves using a chamberpot, as there are no other obvious facilities in the home and the well head in Room 3 could have provided a ready water supply.

83 See Ducrey et al. (1993), 47. See Reber (1988), 664 for the interpretation of the rooms as the house’s living area.

84 See Krauss (1977), 167.

85 Ducrey (1991), 27 uses the term “garden”, though Ducrey et al. (1993), 47, refers to a court simply augmented by “quelques plantations”.

86 There is, for example, no evidence for a hearth or a flue and the finds remain inconclusive. See Ducrey et al. (1993), 48. The parallels cited are also questionable as room B in House 1B is later interpreted by the excavation team as a storeroom/pantry off of room U, the “actual kitchen” (Reber (1998), 56-57), and room A in House II is one of a series of rooms totaling a kitchen complex containing definitive finds such as a stone fireplace (Reber (1998), 101-102).
but precisely where in this section remains open. A well in the courtyard attests to a separate water supply.\textsuperscript{87}

What is most remarkable about the House of the Mosaics is less the architecture and spatial arrangement than the remains of domestic decoration, described by the excavators as “exceptionnellement luxueux et particulièrement bien conservés”.\textsuperscript{88} This decoration, though present to a minor extent in the eastern section of the house, is almost exclusively present in the western section of the house.\textsuperscript{89} Most noteworthy are the mosaics after which the house is named, but the decoration covers all facets of architectural and decorative forms. Although the entire western section may be seen as public, the decorative material centers on the most public rooms - the \textit{andrones}. Room 9 contains the most elaborate of the mosaics. In the \textit{andron} proper, the mosaic is of a central star motif, surrounded by a figural band of Arimasps fighting griffins with lions attacking horses. This panel in turn is surrounded by an outer band with a maeander pattern. There is another mosaic of a Nereid riding a Hippocamp just past the threshold of room 9, while a rectangular mosaic depicting sphinxes and panthers surrounded by garlanded palmettes runs the length of room 8, the \textit{andron’s} antechamber.\textsuperscript{90} No other significant finds were unearthed in this room, but the emphasis on decoration continued in the architecture, with two Doric columns in place of a solid wall that flanked the doorway between rooms 9 and 8. These columns dramatically opened the area of the \textit{andron}, with the effect of incorporating a fairly unobstructed view of the anteroom and

\textsuperscript{87} Nevett (1999), 111.
\textsuperscript{88} Ducray \textit{et al.} (1993), 31.
\textsuperscript{89} Non-decorative mosaic pavements covered the floors of four of the six rooms in the eastern section, while traces of painted wall plaster were uncovered in Rooms 11 and 12. See Ducray \textit{et al.} (1993), 36–38.
\textsuperscript{90} See Ducray \textit{et al.} (1993), 86-96; Dunbabin (1999), 8-10.
its mosaic and providing wider sightline angles for the diners as they sat on their couches looking through the open spaces between the columns, through the anteroom door and out into the courtyard. Such architectural embellishments and concerns for viewing were also incorporated into room 7.\textsuperscript{91}

Although the remnants of a mosaic floor were found in room 7, it is impossible to tell whether this mosaic was decorated or not, as a later tomb was built into the center of this, the largest dining room.\textsuperscript{92} Small finds were numerous, however, and attest to the decoration of this room. Though the most abundant finds were small terracotta figurines, several terracotta appliqués were also uncovered, among which were a Gorgoneion, heads of a satyr and a silen, a snake and two rosettes.\textsuperscript{93} In addition, there was a window that contained a richly carved, fluted Ionic stone mullion in the southern wall, facing into the peristyle court.\textsuperscript{94} This arrangement, much like the columns in room 9, would have maximized viewing potential and allowed for greater visibility onto the courtyard for those seated in the \textit{andron}. Finally, room 5 appears to be the smallest of the home’s three \textit{andrones}, one large enough for only three couches. No significant finds were uncovered in this room.\textsuperscript{95} The room does, however, contain another floor mosaic. This small mosaic is separated into two panels by a guilloche band, with one panel containing an

\textsuperscript{91} This may be a reflection on a smaller scale of what Pollitt (1986) has identified as a “theatrical mentality” in Hellenistic architecture, though he analyzes public and not private buildings. This opening of the interior wall to the anteroom, with its concomitant emphasis on sight lines and viewing, does seem to reflect “an increased interest in the manipulation of interior space for emotional effects” (230). See Pollitt (1986), 230-242.

\textsuperscript{92} For the Hellenistic tomb, see Ducrey et al. (1993), 159-170.

\textsuperscript{93} On these terracotta small finds, see Ducrey et al. (1993), 118-124, cat. nos. 89-105. Based on parallels uncovered in the small sanctuary to Demeter, the excavators suggest that many of the terracotta statuettes may have been associated in some way with the local Thesmophoria celebrated at Eretria (124). On this festival and the parallel statuettes from the sanctuary, see Metzger (1985), 23-43, 69-93.

\textsuperscript{94} Ducrey et al. (1993), 47, 61-63.

\textsuperscript{95} Finds included some roof tiles and several small ceramic beehives. See Ducrey et al. (1993), 46.
eight petal rosette and the other a Gorgoneion surrounded by six large flowers. The whole is surrounded by an outer band of ivy leaves. This rich decoration provides an unequaled opportunity to examine the House of the Mosaics in its totality, analyzing the decoration, its themes and its spatial reference in a holistic manner.

The one piece of domestic sculpture from this House was found in situ. The plinth for the statue, along with the sculpture itself, was excavated in the courtyard, immediately outside of room 4, the cloakroom for room 5, the smallest of the andrones. The statue itself stands 0.72 m tall, with a height for the base of 0.06 m. The preserved elements include the two feet and calves, plus a drapery covered pillar that supports the left elbow. The style is typical of late fourth century types, with the excavators noting at least a cursory resemblance in form to the Hermes with baby Dionysos from Olympia, though the foot positioning more closely parallels that of the so-called Sisyphos I from the Daokhos monument at Delphi. This would suggest a date in the last quarter of the fourth century, slightly later than the Asklepios at Olynthos. Stylistically, the post-Praxitelean nature of the piece and the overall scale match what was uncovered as domestic sculpture at Olynthos and Priene. The piece more than likely represents a nude male, possibly an ephebe.

Whether this piece is an ephebe or just a youth, it is noteworthy that the sculpture plays well against the rest of the decorative elements in the home. While Ducrey saw

---

96 Ducrey et al. (1993), 85-86.
97 Eretria Museum, M644; Harward (1982), 195, cat. no. 83; Metzger (1979), no. 9; Ducrey et al. (1993), 44-45, cat. no. 106, Abb. 201. The base was found in situ, with pieces of the statue found in the courtyard and in Room 3.
98 Metzger (1979), 17; Ducrey et al. (1993), 124. Harward (1982), 35, notes the similarity to Sisyphos I. Auberson and Schefold (1972), 171, n. 168, compare this piece to a male torso uncovered at Eretria and dated to 330 BCE. This would generally be in line with the Daokhos Monument.
99 Metzger (1979), 17, makes the suggestion that it is an ephebe. The drapery, if it represents a chlamys, is perhaps indicative, but not all nude males were ephebes.
little cohesion among the themes of the decorative material, suggesting that they were part of a general decorative vocabulary of the late Classical period, Metzger and Salzmann saw in the material an overall Dionysiac theme revolving around male transitions. A better interpretation would see a general agonistic theme unifying the subject matter of the mosaics and appliqués, though an apotropaic quality cannot be ruled out. The mosaic representing the battle with the Arimasps, the several gorgoneia, the monsters in mosaic and terracotta all evoke the realm of the heroic, along with the battles and contests it took to overcome them. General agonistic themes and associations with male heroics would suit the overall nature of symposia and perhaps support the specifics of the home.

Several Panathenaic amphorae, most notably with scenes of wrestling, and dating to the time of the house’s occupation were uncovered both in the peristyle court and to the immediate south of the House. This has lead to the suggestion that one of the home’s owners may have been a champion wrestler, which would explain the agonistic nature of the home’s decoration. These amphorae, perhaps even displayed in the home, would fit well the agonistic subject matter of the rest of the house’s decoration and perhaps suggest why a youth/ephebe was chosen as subject matter for the sculpture, given its associations with the gymnasium. Indeed, the House of the Mosaics was situated near

100 Ducrey et al. (1993), 179; Metzger (1980), 45-47; Salzmann (1980), 47-52.
101 Ducrey et al. (1993), cat. nos. 36-39. The name of the archon ΧΑΡΙΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ appears on two of the four vases from the House of the Mosaics, dating them to 363/362 BCE. Fragments were also uncovered of Panathenaic vases attributed to the period under the archon ΚΑΛΙΜΗΔΗΣ, and dating to 360/359 BCE. See Ducrey et al. (1993), 105. Nine other Panathenaic amphorae were excavated in a pit along the processional way, just south of the House of the Mosaics. The depositional context is such that they may have belonged to the House of the Mosaics (see Ducrey et al. (1993), 105, n. 25). Three each of these vases have the inscriptions of ΧΑΡΙΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ and ΚΑΛΙΜΗΔΗΣ. For these amphorae, see Themelis (1969); Themelis (1974). One of the vases (cat. no. 39) from the House of the Mosaics has a representation of wrestlers on one side, while two of the vases from the pit also have representations of wrestlers.
102 I thank Kevin Glowacki for this suggestion.
the Stadium and Upper Gymnasium, while it was also on the main road that led down to
the Lower Gymnasium. What is particularly interesting is the possibility that that the
statue may be a “familial” monument, given the chronology of the decoration. The
Panathenaic amphorae date to the late 360s BCE, while the mosaics have been dated to
either 360 or 350-340 BCE, suggesting that the same individual may have won the
amphorae and commissioned the mosaics. The statue seems some 20 to 30 years later
and so could have been commissioned by the same individual at a later date, or
perhaps by a younger relative. Given the links between the statue and the Daokhos
monument, it would be intriguing if the piece were a commemoration of “ancestral”
glory, indicating that themes and intentions found in public monuments could also be
found in domestic contexts.

In addition to linking the material thematically, there may have been a concerted
effort to link the material visually. Any decorative material in the courtyard would have
maximum viewing potential for those in the rooms radiating off of the court. Given the
findspot of the statue, it is noteworthy that it would have been possible for those in
andrones 9 and 7 to actually see the statue with an unobstructed view. Diners reclining
on the eastern couches of the rooms would have had sight lines that ran between the
columns of the courtyard, remembering that there was an open wall in andron 9 and a
large window facing the courtyard in andron 7. The piece would likewise have been
visible to those entering the home and to those entering andron 5. Thus the piece could
have acted as a foil to the decoration lying at the feet of the diners.

---

103 Ducrey et al. (1993) support the earlier date for the mosaics and Salzmann (1982) supports the later.
House II also presents a double courtyard plan, though this house is larger than the others, with an area of over 1000 m², and contains more rooms in a complex arrangement. Reber notes two separate construction phases, dating to the beginning of the fourth century and the beginning of the third century respectively.\(^{104}\) Changes in the larger rooms are minimal, though the major work appears to be the division of room x into three smaller units and the walling off of the western and southern porticos of courtyard n.\(^{105}\)

One enters the house through a single door/corridor u/t directly into the peristyle courtyard n. This courtyard, like the others, forms the central communication and traffic flow “hub” of the house, but here many of the rooms communicate with each other as well. Most notable of these rooms is the complex of rooms i, m, e, and g/f. Room i is a forecourt for this complex of rooms, which is interpreted as being a large dining area with three separate andrones. Room g possesses an anteroom f in an arrangement that mirrors that of rooms 9 and 8 from the House of the Mosaics.\(^{106}\) The floor for both rooms is covered with a non-figural, multicolored pebble mosaic and there is no threshold between the two. Thus a seven couch andron is reconstructed in a manner similar to that in the House of the Mosaics, with a similar emphasis on open views through room g into room

\(^{104}\) See Reber (1998), 111-112.
\(^{105}\) For Phase 2, see Reber (1998), 105-111. The new construction separates the house into two very distinct units, suggesting to the excavators that they may have functioned as separate units. Hence they discuss the structure as House IIA and House IIB. This division, however, seems to follow the older spatial arrangement from Phase 1 and, with the exception of the southern rooms w and x, most likely had little impact on the day-to-day spatial arrangement inside the dwelling.
\(^{106}\) Column capitals found in this complex also match the profiles of those found in rooms 8-9 of the House of the Mosaics. See Reber (1998), 98-99.
Likewise, based on architectural form and parallels in the House of the Mosaics, room e is interpreted as an eleven couch andron and room m as a small three couch andron.¹⁰⁷

Like the House of the Mosaics, House II provides an excellent example of domestic sculpture found in situ. At the northern end of the peristyle courtyard n, just before the door to the anteroom i of the dining complex, a base, arms and head of a herm were uncovered. The trapezoidal base is 0.22 m in height, while the head is 0.206 m in height. Based on stylistic arguments and the archaeological context, the piece is dated to the end of the fourth century.¹⁰⁸ It is clear that the representation is of a youthful Hermes. It is in fact the oldest known non-bearded Hermes herm. The piece is similar to the material from Priene, in that the back of the head is not as finished as the front and one can detect certain “Praxitelean” elements in the facial features.¹⁰⁹ The herm itself does not seem to fit within an overall decorative scheme in the manner of the youth from the House of the Mosaics. The mosaic in andron f is patterned, though non-figural, and although numerous decorative elements such as two bronze appliqués were found, no overall theme to the decoration can be determined.

¹⁰⁷ Alongside brickwork, nails and other small finds, a decorative bronze instrument with an animal head in relief was found in room e. Found also were fragments of two “skylight” tiles, suggesting the need for lighting in a room that was not directly off the peristyle court. See Reber (1998), 98. The parallel for room m is the small andron in the House of the Mosaics, room 5. The assemblage of finds from room m is typical, though the presence of loom weights may suggest that some craft activity may have taken place here at some time. Fragments from a “skylight” tile were also found. See Reber (1998), 99. On skylight tiles, see Reber (1998), 126; Wikander (1983).
¹⁰⁹ Gard (1974), 51-54. He perhaps goes too far in his analysis of the specific Praxitelean elements to be found in the Eretrian head, but it is interesting to note that several of the controversial elements from the Hermes and Baby Dionysos from Olympia, the roughed back and high polishing for example, are found to some degree in the herm. In general, the Eretrian piece does exhibit some mid to late fourth century qualities, such as the deep eye sockets creating a pronounced forehead-nose bridge, the full, slightly parted lips and the smooth facial features.
It may be that this herm served simply as a marker between rooms or areas of the home, but that such a piece was located this far into the home and not beside the entranceway is unusual. One should perhaps recall the story of Xenokrates where such a herm was mentioned in a sympotic context. Euboulos notes that prayers were addressed to Hermes before a symposium and most vase painting representations of herms show religious activity, suggesting possible religious functions. Placing the herm in an area of maximum access and traffic flow, however, emphasizes display and at least suggests a partial decorative quality. Room w has tentatively been identified as an andron, from which one could have seen the herm and while it may have been possible to view the piece from room e, this seems unlikely, given the herm’s position against the wall. One could certainly see the piece upon entering into the courtyard, and one would have passed the herm on the way to the dining complex. It may be that the herm was acting as a boundary marker, though not between inside and outside space, but rather between sympotic and non-sympotic space.

The functions of the three rooms to south of the courtyard remain obscure, especially as these rooms are severely altered in the building’s second construction phase. The finds suggest that in the first phase, room v may have been a workroom and room w a side-room, while the function of room x is uncertain, though it carried the house’s water

---

110 See supra, 29-30.
111 Ath. 11.460e. See LIMC V (1990), s.v. “Hermes” 295-306, nos. 9-187g (G. Siebert).
112 Gard (1974), 57-58, views this sculpture as having several portrait elements, though his analysis is questionable. Based on the association between herms and gymnasia, he also makes the tentative, but unsupported, assertion that the owner of this house may have set up the courtyard as a palaistra (58). For the function of herms in general, see Wrede (1985), esp. 33-34; Rückert (1998), esp. 181-184. Both stress the religious and protective/apotropaic function herms by doors and in the home. Reber (1998), 98, would see this herm as “protecting” the series of rooms i, e, f/g and m.
pipe from the outside into the courtyard. In the second building phase, when these rooms are cut off from the courtyard by a dividing wall, rooms w and x were converted into *andrones*, each with a non-figural pebble mosaic floor (w and x3), and both served by x1 as a cooking area. Most important among the finds in this phase, were a series of twenty-one small bronze figures uncovered in room x2. These figures, including a youth pouring a libation, several animals, a caduceus and miniature weapons, have been interpreted as ordered by the owner and thus intended for this house originally. These bronzes, along with two fragments of two bronze appliqués, attest to the wealth of the owner and the decoration in this area.

To the east, off of a large open room l, lie the more domestic rooms of this house. These include a kitchen and bath complex a, a1 and a3 and living quarters in rooms b-c-d. Thus, like the House of the Mosaics, this dwelling divides its space into two areas around two open spaces. The one is more public and decorated including several *andrones*, and the other is more private and less decorated. Such a division of space suggests a distinction between the public and private activities of the house and that these

---

113 See Reber (1998), 103.
115 See Reber (1998), 265-270. This hypothesis is suggested by the excavators as the pieces seem to have few parallels in form and the homogeneity of manufacture, both in casting and polishing, suggests one workshop that both sculpted and cast the bronzes. Though perhaps not intended for this room, this suggests that the owner of the house was the original purchaser of the bronzes and that they were intended for this house.
116 These bronzes are interpreted as religious in nature and evidence of Hellenistic domestic religious practices, though they note that several of the pieces are also apotropaic in nature. Reber (1998), 267-268. This may well be the case, but any religious function is not mutually exclusive to decoration and the number of bronzes does attest to the wealth of the owner.
117 See Reber (1998), 100-103, 108-109. The interpretation of the kitchen complex is secure from the remains, including the presence of a hearth. The analysis of complex of b-c-d is probable. In these rooms were found loom weights, spindle whorls, and lamps, suggesting domestic activity, while fragments of a clay statuette were found in Room c. The functional assignation of "Schlafzimmer", however, is based more on the similarities of this complex with similar constructs in the House of the Mosaics (10-11-12), House I (o-p-q) and House IV (M-M1-M2 and 4-4a-4b). Though a precise identification is questionable, one can suggest that domestic activity took place here.
could have acted independently of one another. What is clear is that the more decorated areas of the house were those open to the largest number of viewers and that such decoration functioned as a display device for those of the household.

House I is perhaps the most complicated of the domestic structures so far unearthed at Eretria, as its position on site led to an odd arrangement of rooms and the house went through numerous building phases. Phase 1 represents the earliest and smallest of the structures, with 9 rooms and a triangular courtyard to the east running parallel with the main western road. This phase has been dated to the early fourth century, probably no later than 380 BCE. Phase 2 sees this structure maintained with some clearing of older material and light construction carried out to the south. The stratigraphy of this phase is complex, with materials and finds that run from the fourth to the second centuries. In the end, a date of the fourth to the early third centuries is suggested. Phase 3 sees this structure expanded south until it abuts House IV. One large structure is created, though the two areas centered on each courtyard are set off from one another, suggesting two independently functioning households referred to by the excavators as House Ia and Ib. Based on both archaeological and historical grounds, this phase is dated to the first half of the second century, some time after 170 BCE. The final phase, Phase 4, saw minor construction to the interior of the house in the south and seems to have occurred not too long after Phase 3, most likely in the second
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118 Nevett (1999), 113.
119 Hence the confusion among the excavators as to whether this is one building or two, a palace or a house.
121 See Reber (1998), 42.
122 See Reber (1998), 42.
quarter of the first century BCE. The only piece of free standing sculpture to have come from this building has been dated to ca. 150-125 BCE and came from the destruction debris that was excavated in Courtyard r. For the present study’s purpose, this dating allows for a consideration only of Phase 3 of the home, as changes in Phase 4 were minimal.

Phase 3 represents the largest and most extensive phase of House I. The plan shows two distinct housing units, with the larger, newer section to the south added on to the pre-existing structure to the north. As one enters this southern section (House I B) through corridor z, one can turn right and enter courtyard r or turn left and enter into courtyard K. Thus House I B represents a different layout of a double courtyard plan, with the southern section of rooms centered on courtyard K seeming to be reserved for some economic activity rather than used as a dwelling. In the northern section, the excavators do not present as strict a division between the public and private realms as in the House of the Mosaics, for extending from courtyard r are rooms of both a private and a public nature. Rooms o, p and q form the house’s living quarters, while A, B, u and n are a kitchen/bathroom complex. Room v is a large, eleven couch andron, while

---

125 No evidence is presented for assigning such a date, but one assumes that it is dated on contextual grounds. The torso was uncovered in the destruction debris of the peristyle, which dates on ceramic evidence to the third – second centuries BCE See the convenient chart in Reber (1998), 202.
126 The excavators interpret this southern section as a “Gewerbetrakt” based on the finds from the area. A separate drain for a water supply was found in courtyard K, room N has been interpreted as a possible storeroom/workroom and numerous fragments of storage jars were uncovered throughout the area. Precisely what activity took place here is uncertain, but the excavators state that “Diese Räume wiesen keine charakteristischen Merkmale von Wohnräumen auf”. Reber (1998), 63. For the excavation of this series of rooms in the house, see Reber (1998), 57-59.
127 These rooms are all described in Reber (1998), 48-57, 62-63.
128 Fragments of a marble Nike figure were uncovered in room p. The statue remains unpublished and receives a cursory mention in the excavation report. The subject matter is interesting for this date, as no other domestic Nike is securely identified in the record. It is unlikely that a Nike alone would have any religious functions, suggesting a more decorative quality, but that this piece was found in the private rooms.
room i, along with its antechamber k, appears to be a small dining room. The function of rooms w and y is uncertain, but they may have been associated with room v. Uncertain also are the functions of rooms t and x. They are associated with courtyard r and corridor z respectively and may well have been storerooms of some sort.

As for the sculpture, a small torso of a male was uncovered in the debris of courtyard r. The piece is preserved from neck to knee with head, bottom legs and arms missing. The height of the sculpture is 0.20 m. Given that this piece was uncovered in the destruction debris of the courtyard, little may be said of context, other than it seems likely that the piece was originally set up in the peristyle. The statue has some elements typical of domestic sculpture in its size, type and style that is generically “Praxitelean”, but the statue is unusual in that it is equally finished on all sides. The subject matter is uncertain, though a satyr is possible given the small hole at the rear of the statue, just above the buttocks. Also found in the destruction debris of the courtyard was a small fragmentary relief sculpture of Artemis, suggesting that courtyard r may have been highly decorated with sculptural pieces.

of the house and not in a more public context is unusual. Room p is, however, immediately accessible from and opens on to courtyard r. The statue could then have been deposited in room p from the courtyard at a later date, or come from room p and still been in the immediate vicinity of the courtyard and the other sculptures. See Reber (1998), 52-53.

Finds in room w include lead loom weights, a mortar and a small olive press. These would attest to the type of small craft activity one would expect in a Greek home. The excavators, however, believe that these artifacts belong to the fourth phase of House I’s construction and that such activity did not take place in this room until then. The function of these rooms during Phase 3 is therefore unclear, but is thought to associate with andron v. See Reber (1998), 54-55.

This seems most likely, though no storage vessels were found. The finds in room t include 5 lead clamps, a plain bronze ring, and an arm from a terracotta statuette. The excavators simply refer to these rooms as “Nebenräume”. See Reber (1998), 53, 63.

Harward (1982), cat. no. 80. For the briefest of mentions, see Schefold (1968), 92, Taf 26.6; Auberson and Schefold (1972), 171. Oddly enough, the torso is not mentioned in the latest excavation reports.

Harward (1982), 193, believes that the hole is too small for an attachment.

Harward (1982), cat. no. 81; Schefold (1968), 92. The piece may have been a votive relief.
Little can be said about the spatial arrangement of House I. The peristyle courtyard is again the main interior feature of the non-working area of the house, off of which all rooms branch. As such, it is the focal point for the interior and the central communication and traffic area. Members of the household would use it on a daily basis when traveling to the living quarters or the kitchen, and both dining rooms plus rooms w and y look onto the courtyard providing guests both personal and visual access to this area. Unlike the House of the Mosaics, little in the way of domestic decoration has survived from this house. No mosaics were present and on the whole the finds and architecture of House I seem to illustrate owners that were less concerned with decoration than with craft and economic activity. Alongside the loom weights, olive press and storage jars, however, terracottas, numerous bronze coins, a Phoenician glass beaded necklace, free standing and high relief sculpture, a bronze signet ring and a golden diadem were all found in this house and attest to its wealth and possible vanished decoration.\textsuperscript{134}

House IV contained no domestic sculpture, but should be mentioned briefly to illustrate the continued spatial divisions as in the previous Eretrian houses. House IV had two separate building phases. In Phase 1, the unit was originally two separate houses, one to the east and one to the west. The eastern house was constructed first, some time in the early fourth century, while the western house was begun a little later. In Phase 2 (with three subsections), the western house was added to its neighbor with the result of creating one unit with two courtyards (10 and B), though the structure seems to have maintained a functional division based on the original separate structures, the eastern

\textsuperscript{134} Although many of these finds were scattered throughout the house, the most notable are from the destruction debris of courtyard r. See Schefold (1968); Dunant (1968).
section being for manufacturing and the western for living. This second construction phase dates from the late fourth/early third centuries with work done in 268/267 BCE and the end of the third century. The house was destroyed by the Roman sack of Eretria in 198 BCE.\(^{135}\) Like the other houses at Eretria, the “domestic” section of House IV had an emphasis on public entertaining. Though the remains are poor, during the first construction phase the building has one secure andron, room 2, located off of the open area to become courtyard 10, while rooms 3 and 4 are possible andrones based on the off-center door in room 3 and their comparable size and shape to room 7 in the House of the Mosaics.\(^{136}\) Room 2 had a non-figural mosaic floor and this complex emphasizes the importance placed on public entertaining by the Eretrians. During the second building phase, room 2 remained an andron, while the function of room 3 is unclear, though it may have been used for storage.\(^{137}\) Room 4 was divided into three sections and room 5, 5a and 5b is interpreted as a kitchen-bath complex.\(^{138}\) The probable wealth of the home is suggested by several of the finds, such as a bronze chest, decorative pottery and inscriptions, but in general decorative material is lacking.\(^{139}\) The architecture of the first building phase, however, with its numerous andrones and large courtyard, suggests a

\(^{135}\) For this building in general, see Reber (1998), 67-93, esp. 72-73, 87-89 for the dating of the various building phases.

\(^{136}\) Room 2 has space for seven couches, while room 3 has space for eleven. Finds from room 3 are inconclusive, though in the latest phase fragments of two large pithoi suggest that the room could have been used for storage at this time. Should room 3 be an andron then the cuttings for the two doorways in its northern wall would be odd. Although both rooms 3 and 4 have separate entrances onto the open area, they do seem to have some connection with each other in the first construction phase. In light of the poor evidence, Reber (1998), 69 suggests, “Da beide Räume von der Form und von der Grösse her als Andrones zu interpretieren sind, haben wir hier einen erweiterten Repräsentationstrakt vor uns, der für Symposia und Versammlungen von grösseren Gruppen benutzt werden konnte”. See Schefold (1974), 72; Reber (1998), 67-69.

\(^{137}\) By phase 2, the entrances between rooms 3 and 4 are closed and room 4 is segmented into three smaller rooms. See Reber (1998), 73-74.

\(^{138}\) In the passage between rooms 5 and 5a a bronze signet ring was uncovered. See Dunant (1968); Reber (1998), 75.

\(^{139}\) Reber (1998), 67-93, lists the finds room by room.
strong presence of non-household members to this home, whom the homeowner may have wanted to impress, much as in the other houses at the site. This seems less secure during the second building phase, where household craft and production becomes more important.\textsuperscript{140}

This house illustrates the remarkable emphasis on dining and entertainment that seems to be characteristic of Eretrian homes. While the home is not as decorated as others from the site it does make clear that the Eretrians had a particular love of entertaining that can be seen in their architecture. This penchant that reveals itself in the several \textit{andrones} in the various homes may also be why the decoration in the House of the Mosaics was so lavish. Unlike the previous sites examined, the House of the Mosaics provides the best case for studying the impact of sculpture on the decorative scheme of an entire home. The detailed analysis of the material of this house makes clear that a level of sophistication and cohesion not usually associated with the Greeks at this time did indeed exist and that the complexities normally associated with public sculpture can as easily be found in sculpture from private contexts.

3.4 Pergamon

The site of Pergamon has yielded several examples of domestic architecture from the Hellenistic period. The initial investigations on the acropolis uncovered the first quasi-domestic remains in the form of the Attalid palaces. Most of the literature on these remains has focused on the two primary excavated palaces, the so-called palaces of

\textsuperscript{140} See Reber (1998), 92-93.
Attalos I (Palace IV) and Eumenes II (Palace V).141 These structures were necessarily different in size from the domestic structures of non-royals, but their architectural layout and decoration provide interesting parallels for the large-scale residences of the Hellenistic period. In addition to these palaces, several houses were uncovered at various locations in the city, mostly as accidents while excavating the citadel’s public buildings. These included some remains near the Great Altar and the Upper Agora, though most of the domestic buildings were unearthed in the area south of the Lower Gymnasium and by the Lower Agora. Many of these houses were originally constructed in the third and second centuries BCE, but had major renovations completed in the Roman Imperial period. The most famous and complete example is the House of the Consul Attalos, whose ground plan and mosaics date to the Hellenistic period, but whose interior architecture and wall painting date to the Imperial period.142 This situation makes determinations of interior spatial relations and analyses of decorative cohesion difficult, but a general investigation into the surviving Hellenistic architecture should prove helpful. The number of surviving examples of domestic statuary is small and the contexts poor, so this general and brief examination will help illustrate how the Pergamene material fits with the rest of the evidence from the Hellenistic period.

---

141 The older tradition asserts that these two buildings were separate and that each acted as the “palace” for their respective monarch. See Kawerau and Wiegand (1930), 25-39, 65-69; Hansen (1974), 274-275; Kutbay (1998), 6-18. The latest interpretation for these buildings suggests that they are contemporary and associated with one another. Given that an unused coffer block for the Altar of Zeus was uncovered in the socle of the back wall of the eastern portico of Palace V, its date is contemporary with the reign of Eumenes II. It is therefore suggested that, based on Macedonian parallels, Palace V was the official building of the monarch, while Palace IV was his personal residence. See Nielsen (1999), 102-111; Radt (1999), 63-78. Another group of buildings at the northern end of the citadel, building complex I, may have been the palace of Attalos I. See Hoepfner (1996-1997), 35-40.

142 For the House of the Consul Attalos, see Dörpfeld (1907), 167-189; Radt (1981), 416-417; Radt (1999), 95-101; Wulf (1999), 168-169.
The domestic architecture of Pergamon, in both its Hellenistic and Roman phases, has been a major focus of recent study at the site. Renewed examinations of older material, in addition to new excavations in the heart of the city, have revised our understanding of the city’s domestic remains. Although scattered remains of domestic architecture have been uncovered throughout the site, the two primary areas of excavated remains have come from the area just west of the Lower Market and that to the north and northwest of the Upper Gymnasium along the Main Road. The area to the west of the Lower Market was examined first and revealed several large peristyle houses with rooms arranged along two or three of the court’s sides. The largest example of these courtyard houses is House I, though a total of five were uncovered in this area. What one notices immediately from these houses is their large size in general and the size of the courtyard in relation to the rest of the house in particular. House I had an overall size of ca. 1500 m\(^2\) with the courtyard occupying 32% of the overall groundplan. House II is significantly smaller in area at 675 m\(^2\) but has a similarly large courtyard accounting for 45% of the overall area. These two houses are of the “L” shaped courtyard type, each with a series of three rooms to the north of the court and a hall-like room off the entranceway connected to a series of other, smaller rooms. Both of these features seem to be derived from Hellenistic palaces, such as those from Pergamon itself and Vergina (Palatitsa).

143 These are the so-called “city excavations” for which annual reports have been provided in AA. For the domestic remains at Pergamon in general, see Pinkwart and Stamnitz (1984); Wulf-Rheidt (1998); Wulf (1999).
144 For the initial excavations in this area, see Dorpfeld (1904), 116-120. For a reinterpretation of the domestic architecture in this area, see Pinkwart and Stamnitz (1984), 25-36.
145 For the dimensions of these houses, see Wulf (1999), 162-163, Tab. 2.
146 Wulf-Rheidt (1998), 308; Heermann (1986), 345-362. As opposed to the “U” shape, where rooms are arranged on three sides of the courtyard. See Pinkwart and Stamnitz (1984), 36-42. This typology has been rejected at Pergamon by Wulf, who sees the architecture defined by number and combination of rooms rather than by strict plan. See Wulf-Rheidt (1998); Wulf (1999), 149-190.
Given the size of the peristyle in relation to the rest of the home, this would suggest that the courtyard was a particularly important area within the Pergamene house.

The identification of rooms as andrones within the houses at Pergamon is problematic, owing to the lack of appropriate archaeological assemblages, such as furniture or dining ware. Nonetheless, Wulf-Rheidt has argued for an identification of andrones at the site based on certain architectural forms and parallels. Several courtyard houses have been unearthed in the city excavations just off of the main road. These include houses with a peristyle courtyard (Peristyle House I) and those with a courtyard possessing a colonnaded hall to one side (Courtyard Houses I, II and III). From the architectural plans of these houses, it is clear that they owe a certain indebtedness to the pastas and prostas forms of Greek housing construction. As at Priene, there are small rooms off of the prostas to the east that parallel Hoepfner and Schwandner’s identifications of andrones. Similarly, the House of Attalos, though of mixed Hellenistic and Imperial date, provides an interesting archaeological parallel for dining facilities at Pergamon itself.

A large hall-like room is present to the east of the peristyle courtyard in the House of Attalos. This room, the foundation of which is Hellenistic in date, has an undecorated border running around the central opus sectile area of the floor. This led to an early

---

147 In addition to successive periods of re-building and later robbing of the architecture and its contents, the steep slopes of the Pergamene citadel are prone to erosion. This erosion not only wreaks havoc with the architecture, but either will wash away archaeological assemblages or redeposit them in secondary contexts, as with the famous Roman copy of Alkamenes’ Herm that was found in the debris of House I, but was most likely washed down the slope from the House of Attalos. This steep terrain, coupled with Byzantine building that destroyed much of the earlier material, means very little from stratified Hellenistic contexts survives. See Wulf-Rheidt (1998), 302.


identification of the room as an *andron* with an undecorated area for couches.¹⁵⁰ This feature of a large square room near the home’s entrance or courtyard is common to several of the homes at Pergammon and illustrates an importance on placing dining facilities near the more public areas of the home, as seen more clearly elsewhere in the Hellenistic period.¹⁵¹ Often, these halls are placed opposite the main entrance to the home, providing a clear axial view from the entrance to the largest room in the house. Based on the evidence from other Hellenistic sites and the parallel from the House of Attalos, it seems likely that this dining room would also have been among the most lavishly decorated, thus providing a direct and immediate view of the home’s wealth upon entrance. In addition to these halls, Wulf-Rheidt identifies other smaller rooms radiating off of the courtyard as *andrones*, based on their offset door and general architectural parallel to *andrones* at Priene.¹⁵² This suggests that, in spite of the paucity of the material record, one can infer that dining played a central role in Pergamene domestic life and that the dining room and courtyard were key public areas within the home.

This importance placed on dining would seem to be in line with more recent interpretations regarding one of the “palatial” structures on the Pergamene acropolis. Palace V, previously thought to be the palace of Eumenes II, is now interpreted by archaeologists as the “official” building of Eumenes II, while Palace IV was the king’s

¹⁵⁰ Dörpfeld (1907), 183, Tabs XIV-XV.
¹⁵¹ Wulf-Rheidt (1998), 311. Other houses with such a hall or similar hall-like rooms include the Hellenistic Peristyle House under the Heroon for the worship of the Pergamene Kings, House I, House II, House III and Building Z. Interestingly, the hall from the House of Attalos opens onto the courtyard with a pair of columns rather than with a solid wall and doorway. This house, along with Building Z, also have rooms that open onto an antechamber by a balustrade of two Doric columns, as was the arrangement at Eretria in the House of the Mosaics, Rooms 9 and 8 and in House II, Rooms g and f. See Wulf-Rheidt (1998), 311-312.
private residence. “Official”, in this case, may be viewed in many ways as “public”, for this building seems to have been the royal dining hall and it was here that the monarch held state banquets and royal receptions. A total of seven andrones have been reconstructed around the central peristyle courtyard, ranging in size from a room to hold seven couches to one that could hold twenty-two. In all, the dining complex could have been used for a dinner of over one hundred guests, with a total of ninety-nine couches. Such large and lavish parties would have served several social and political functions, not the least of which was to illustrate the munificence and splendor of the Pergamene kings. To this end, Palace V is one of the most richly decorated Hellenistic buildings, with architectural embellishments, wall painting, mosaic and sculpture all surviving in the archaeological record in spite of heavy robbing in the Byzantine period.

Among the more noteworthy decorative elements from Palace V are a series of five fragmentary sculpted panels that seem to have been installed between the columns of the upper story of the peristyle court. These panels had as their themes three

---

153 See supra, 103, n. 141.
154 This number is significant, as it seems to reflect the number of dining spaces for Alexander’s famed festive pavilion. See supra, 34-35. Many of the andrones from Palace V are identified based on architectural parallels found at the palace at Vergina, again suggesting an architectural link with Macedonia. See Hoepfner (1996), 24-25. Nielsen (1999), 110-111, also sees a link with Macedonian architecture, but prefers the palace at Pella as a possible inspiration. Certainly the palace at Vergina (Palatitsa) is noted for its large number of possible dining rooms, nine or potentially more. See Andronikos (1984), 43; Kutbay (1998), 18-28; Nielsen (1999), 83-84. Alongside the architecture, this focus on dining as an especially important social/political function for the ruling élite may have spread from Macedonia. Thus Tomlinson (1970) would see the Macedonian palace as primarily a banqueting facility. For banqueting as a social practice in the time of Alexander, see Borza (1983). Palace V also served as inspiration for a later ruler, as Augustus seems to have used it as a model when he built his house on the Palatine Hill. The width of Augustus’ peristyle court is the same as the Pergamene banqueting hall. See Hoepfner (1996-1997), 37-38, 172, n. 64; Caretonni (1983), 10; Nielsen (1993), 212-216.
155 See Winter (1908), *AVP VII2*, nos. 356-358, Beiblatt 36, 39. The panels were found in several contexts in the area of the market/Byzantine Wall of the upper terrace, suggesting use in the area. See Winter (1908), *AVP VII2*, 282-284. Schober (1940), 160-168 believed that the panels were placed on the propylon to the Athena terrace. Their findspot certainly allows for such a placement, though decorated panels between upper story columns on propyla tend to be panoply reliefs, as on the stoa of Attalos II and the propylon, both for the precinct of Athena on the citadel. Ridgway (2000), 31, muses on the possibility that
identified subjects: the story of Telephos, the Trojan War and the Gigantomachy.  

These themes would have been extremely familiar to an audience at Pergamon and on their own carried all the meanings here that they did on the Great Altar. In addition, they also served to establish a visual and conceptual link between the public hall of the King and the Great Altar. Having walked past the Great Altar on the main road, a visitor to the citadel would then have passed the temenos for the cult of the Pergamene rulers on his way to Palace V. Upon entering the courtyard of the palace complex, the viewer would see the panels and not only recall the sculpture on the Altar, but also the immediate impact of passing through the sacred area of the Altar’s dedicants. In the “home” of the King, the visitor would have the visual manifestation of the Kingdom’s (and its monarchs’) place in the Hellenic world, though here in a non-religious setting.

Nothing else of decorative importance was uncovered in the courtyard.

From the peristyle courtyard, individuals would have been lead to particular dining rooms, and the andrones in Palace V illustrate the emphasis placed on decoration in andrones elsewhere. Several mosaics were found in the hall, the most famous being the so-called “Hephaistion Mosaic”. Found in room K, the mosaic is well noted for its

these may have belonged to the propylon of the Altar Terrace. Hoepfner (1996-1997), 39, 172, n. 65 is probably correct in his placement of the reliefs, though wrong in suggesting that the subject matter is too “dignified” for placement on a gate.

The Gigantomachy (Winter (1908), AvP VII2, no. 356) and the Trojan War (Winter (1908), AvP VII2, no. 357) are secure as subjects from the iconography of their panels. The story of Telephos (Winter (1908), AvP VII2, no. 358) is less secure. The relief shows a heavily muscled man leaning with one foot on a rock standing before a seated female figure. Winter (1908), AvP VII2, 285, originally suggested that the figures could be Odysseus before Athena, and though a shield is present at the foot of the female, she has no aegis. Winter also suggested the possibility of Hephaistos before Thetis, though again there is no iconography to identify positively either figure. These suggestions would place the image in the tale of the Trojan War. Ridgway (2000), 32, seems to follow Hoepfner (1996-1997), 39, who identifies the scene from the tale of Telephos, but provides no reasons. The seated female is reminiscent of the seated Auge from panel 8 of the Telephos frieze on the Great Altar, suggesting that the representation is from the tale of Telephos. Thus, with the presence of the shield, the scene could represent the newly arrived Telephos receiving arms from Auge, as on panels 16 and 17 on the Telephos frieze.

multiple decorative bands of guilloche, garlands inhabited by erotes and grasshoppers, waves and a meander done in perspective. Several central panels are poorly preserved but one represents a curled parchment with the inscription ΗΦΑΙΣΣΙΩΝ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ laid therein. In addition to this mosaic, evidence suggests that the room was paneled in multicolor white and blue-gray marble to provide an interesting visual effect. Also in this room was found a statuette of a dancing woman that seems to match the size and type found in other domestic contexts.

The dancing woman depicted is conceived in a broadly archaistic style, though with heavy torsion and movement. The piece stands 1.10 m with the left arm, both feet (and its associated drapery) and the plinth all restored. The piece was not found in situ, so little may be said about the spatial context for certain, though two possibilities for the piece exist. If the statue was originally in the andron with the mosaic, it seems unlikely that the piece would have been in the center of the room. The Hephaistion Mosaic, more so than many others, demands active viewing. Amid the garlands, Erotes and grasshoppers play, while other points of visual interest and action abound. To place the statue on a plinth/base in the middle of the room would possibly detract from the ability to view the mosaic, in addition to eliminating space for furniture and possibly causing problems of traffic flow during a symposium. No remains survive of the walls of the room, though a niche could have existed in which to place the statue. Such a singular

---

158 For the mosaic, see Kawerau and Wiegand (1930), 63-65, pls. XVI-XIX; Salzmann (1991), 436-437; Dunbabin (1999), 28-29.

159 Pergamon Museum inv. no. 43. Harward (1982), 200, cat. no. 89. On this piece in general, see Winter (1908), *AvP VIII*, 63-65, 67-69; Heidenreich (1935), 687-689; Schober (1951), 144-146; Fullerton (1987), 267; Ridgway (2000), 314-316. The archaeological context for the sculpture, coupled with Fullerton’s stylistic analysis of the statue, date the piece to the second quarter of the second century BCE, during the reign of Eumenes II.

160 The mosaics from Pergamon are noted for their use of tromp l’œil and their status as valued “pictures” laid on the floor rather than the wall. See Dunbabin (1999), 26-30.
arrangement, however, runs counter to one view, which holds that the statue was part of a multi-figural group of dancers.161

A second possibility is that the statue found its way into the ruins of the andron at a later time and was originally set up elsewhere, such as in the courtyard. As has been shown, such material was displayed in courtyards, especially in the immediate vicinity of an andron’s entrance. Though not in the immediate vicinity of the andron, but visible from its door in the middle of the western wall of the courtyard, foundations for a large rectangular structure were uncovered. Measuring 6.70 m x 2.60 m, this structure was most probably the foundations for an altar or some sort of base.162 Such a grand altar may have fit the ostentation of the Attalid kings, but courtyard altars tended to be smaller, portable affairs that could easily be moved. It should also be noted that no small finds or debris associated with permanent altars or cult activity were found.

The small northeastern-most room of the structure, however, has been identified as a small shrine. Inside the room a mosaic of patterned bands and figural panels was uncovered, along with the socle for an altar. Such elaborate decoration would suggest that the room was used publicly for worship, perhaps for the dynasty’s patron deity

161 Winter (1908), AvP VIII, 65, suggested that the piece was part of a group set up in the Attalid palace, while Heidenreich (1935), 689-690, added to this by suggesting that the statues were part of a Charites group by the sculptor Boupalos set up at Pergamon and mentioned by Pausanias (9.35.6). Boupalos is known to be a sculptor from the 6th century BCE, but the notion that the dancer was part of a multi-figural group has held. The piece most often associated with the dancer is a torso from Bergama (Ist. Arch. Mus. Inv. no. 481) uncovered in a mosque. See Winter (1908), AvP VIII, 65-67, no. 44. Schober (1951), 145-146, is misleading when he states that the two were found together, as the Bergama Torso was uncovered two years earlier and at a distance. The pieces are, however, usually discussed in the same context and seen as a group based on multi-figural parallels found in relief sculpture. See Fullerton (1987), 268-272; Ridgway (2000), 314-316.

162 Kutbay (1998), 14; Radt (1999), 68.
Dionysos, whose appropriateness for this building is obvious. Such an elaborate and permanent worship area within Palace V, along with the lack of any other finds suggesting cult activity, would favor the interpretation of the foundations as those for a base.

If the dancing female from the *andron* were part of a multi-figural group, then such a base would have been large enough to support the suggested three figures. The Pergamon Dancer is also described as having a back that is “nur flüchtig angelegt”. This lack of attention to the back and a deeply carved and active front suggests a primary frontal view, something that could be arranged on this base in a paratactic composition. The base would also be in a prime location for viewing. Diners would have to pass the group on the way to any of the northern dining rooms, while the base would have been visible from the doorways of any of the other dining rooms in the complex. If the statue was part of a multi-figural group then the foundations for the base would be an ideal candidate for the group’s location, with the dancer ending up in the *andron* at a later date. Otherwise the piece would likely have been singular and placed in a niche in the *andron* wall.

For this altar room in general, see Ohlemutz (1968), 94-96. Based on the holes in the threshold, Kutbay (1998), 15, posits that the room was closed by a lattice gate, suggesting that even when not in use the ability to see the room’s contents and decoration was still an issue.

At 6.70 m in length, the foundations would seem too large for three statues on the scale of the dancer. It may be, however, that an associated base would not be as large as the foundations. Such an example would be the base for the Nike of Samothrace, whose waves and ship’s prow are tiered with the Nike alone at the top. It is also possible that more than three statues were present or that they were arranged in such a way as to minimize the spatial disjunction, such as staggered to visually highlight the dancing effects. The foundations do seem likely for a base and one that held some sculptural monument if not the dancer and her group.

Winter (1908), *AvP VIII*, 64.

This is also suggested by Ridgway (2000), 316, who asserts that the piece displays the Archaic “law of frontality”, in spite of its suggested motion. This would then necessitate a frontal viewing. Whether the frontal viewing of the piece was established via a paratactic display or in a circular pattern to mimic certain dancing reliefs on round bases, any base associated with the monument would likely have taken up too much volume to be placed inside the *andron*. 

111
There are several other statues that have been uncovered at Pergamon that more than likely come from domestic contexts. Unfortunately, their precise contexts, ancient and modern, cannot be recovered so careful spatial and cultural analyses cannot be offered. These pieces should still be mentioned, however, if only to illustrate the wealth of domestic decoration and statuary that probably existed in the Hellenistic city. The first is a small, 0.20 m in height, marble head of a female that was uncovered “auf dem Boden nahe dem Eingang” of room 2 in House II.\textsuperscript{167} While the piece has been dated by the excavators to the late Hellenistic period, House II has several phases ranging from the late Hellenistic to Imperial times suggesting that the piece could have been original or an heirloom displayed in a later context.\textsuperscript{168} It is noteworthy, however, that room 2 is a primary display area within the home. The room was the middle one of a series of three rooms arranged to the immediate north of the peristyle court, an arrangement that was visually emphasized by having a columnar opening that looked onto the courtyard in room 2, rather than having a door.\textsuperscript{169} The walls of this opening are Hellenistic in date but the opening itself may have been created when the house underwent extensive remodeling in the second century CE. During this remodeling phase, the visual importance of this area was emphasized when several lavish mosaics and painted stucco were placed in several of the rooms, including room 2.\textsuperscript{170} This interior arrangement and lavish decoration may reflect the spatial and decorative situation in the house during the Hellenistic period, though this remains uncertain. If so, then the piece represented by the 

\textsuperscript{167}See Pinkwart and Stammnitz (1984), 109, S2.
\textsuperscript{168}House II is a peristyle house located to the west of the Lower Agora. For the house and its late Hellenistic through post antique phases, see Pinkwart and Stammnitz (1984), 2-13, 25-33, 42-55, 67-72.
\textsuperscript{169}“This suite of rooms consequently leaped to the eye of every visitor entering the house”. Wulf-Radt (1998), 314. In many respects, this arrangement parallels the architecture of room 9 of the House of the Mosaics at Eretria, though there is no anteroom at Pergamon.
\textsuperscript{170}For the decoration of House II at this time, see Pinkwart and Stammnitz (1984), 81-86, 98-105.
marble female head would have been placed in an important display area, visible from several vantages through the courtyard for all to see.

Next are three famed pieces whose depositional contexts complicate their interpretation and analysis. They are three bronze statues, one a Herakles Farnese, one a Satyr possibly holding a wine jar, now missing, and one a soldier in cuirass, lance and helmet. The figures range from 0.184 m to 0.35 m and their small size may indicate that were intended as small, tabletop pieces. Though the statues have been dated to the late Hellenistic period on stylistic grounds, they were uncovered in room 4b of Peristyle House II, located below a destruction layer above the ground-level of Roman building phase 5. Thus their archaeological context is no earlier than the late second century CE. During building phase 5, room 4 was a dining complex capable of accommodating nine couches, and decorated with a lavish patterned mosaic. The room itself is very similar architecturally to the aforementioned room 2 of House II. It is the central of three rooms with a columned opening instead of a door that looks out onto the peristyle courtyard. Here too the walls are of Hellenistic date, but re-used in the Roman period. This architectural arrangement actually pre-dates phase 5, so that the spatial dynamics of the room and courtyard had not changed significantly from the first century BCE. Though speculative, this arrangement suggests that the pieces could have been displayed similarly in their original context. The statues may have been heirloom pieces as well, suggesting a long display life within the home. Certainly they more than likely

---

171 For these three statues, see Pinkwart (1972), 115-139.
172 It is for this reason that Harward (1982), 201, n. 8, dismisses the pieces noting that original context is unrecoverable. He feels that they represent a late cache.
173 For this house in general, see Wulf (1999), 23-70, and for phase 5, 61-67.
belonged in room 4 during the second century CE, with a familiar display context: in a lavishly decorated dining area.

The rest of the possible domestic statuary is from such poor contexts that they may be mentioned, but hardly analyzed. Uncovered “in einem der Häuser oberhalb der Wegkrümmung der Straße an der Nordostecke der Agora”, was a statuette of a small nude child, 0.154 m in height with a base of 0.022 m, which seems to have been finished equally on all sides and so displayed in the round.\footnote{Harward (1982), 201-202, cat. no. 93. See Winter (1908), AvP VII2, 193, cat. no. 200.} Also found in a domestic context was a statuette of Aphrodite, 0.30 m in height, of the Venus Genetrix type. The piece was “gefunden beim Bau eines Hauses in der Unterstadt” and so the context could be either Hellenistic or Roman.\footnote{Harward (1982), 202, cat. no. 92. See Winter (1908), AvP VII2, 58, cat. no. 39.} Lastly, there is a bronze statuette of a Satyr, 0.15 m in height, whose pelt and left hand are worked flat at the rear.\footnote{Harward (1982), 200-201, cat. 90. See Winter (1908), AvP VII2, 369-370, cat. no. 469. Given that the Satyr is virtually complete and that the height is only 0.15 m, the piece may have been for a tabletop display. This would perhaps explain why there were no attachments for a base, though the piece could have been part of a multi-figural group as well depending on the size of the lost “backing”.} This fact, coupled with the bronze dowel protruding from the pelt at the back, suggests that the piece probably was attached to some background or fixed in place at the rear rather than through pins at the feet. Such an arrangement would necessitate a frontal view, which, along with the small size, is a general characteristic of domestic sculpture. The piece was uncovered among the foundation walls of several Hellenistic houses, so the original context cannot be reconstructed.\footnote{The Satyr was found “beim Abräumen des Terrains südöstlich vom Altarplatz auf Grundmauern hellenistischer Wohnungen” (Winter (1908), AvP VII2, 369). Harward (1982), 201, is correct to note that the excavation context is such that the piece could well have washed down the slope, making a domestic connection more uncertain. By the publication date of 1908, however, the Hellenistic houses uncovered southeast of the Altar platform were those under the Upper Market. The slope between the Altar and the Upper market is fairly steep, but the houses date to the third century BCE and so predate the construction of the Altar and its terrace. Underneath the Altar were also found houses of the same date, suggesting that if}
The stratigraphy at Pergamon is such that any analysis of the domestic remains will be problematic. Often it is difficult to distinguish between Hellenistic and Roman levels and so there are few houses that could be examined as Hellenistic. Even fewer are the number of sculptures that came from domestic contexts, but again those analyzed were of subjects and sizes typical of domestic statuary. What was particularly illuminating was the material uncovered in the Attalid palaces. These palaces and halls were heavily decorated, had entertaining as a prime function and architecturally seem to form a type that will be used for later large Hellenistic residences. It is likely that the Attalids set decorative and architectural trends that were followed by their people just as had happened earlier among the fourth century kings and tyrants. Indeed, it was among the Macedonians that a fondness for dining and a concomitant interest in decorating their palaces and dining rooms seem to have taken a foothold and set a trend for the rest of the Hellenistic period.

3.5 Other Evidence from the Hellenistic Period

The sites of Pella, Vergina and Rhodes will not receive as detailed an exploration as the others owing to, in general, the small number of domestic statues uncovered or their poor depositional record. Their inclusion is primarily meant to develop the picture of domestic statuary as fully as possible, both from a sculptural and an architectural standpoint. In the case of the objects from Rhodes, the difficulty lies in the poor publication of the statues, which amount to little more than a brief mention in annual

the statue had washed down the slope, it would have done so from an area with domestic remains. See Schrammen (1906), 85-87; Wulf-Reidt (1998), 300. The only other possibility is that it was a votive that had originated in the upper sanctuary.
reports, and the inadequate state of preservation of the domestic architecture on the island. Given the importance of the island in late Hellenistic sculptural production, it is unfortunate that the paucity of appropriate contexts could not help in understanding the relationship between public and domestic consumption or large-scale and small-scale sculptural production.

The northern Greek site of Pella is noteworthy for two reasons for the study at hand. First and foremost, the site has yielded two renowned statues that were uncovered in domestic contexts. The second reason is more general and cultural: the architecture and decoration of the ancient Macedonian palaces, as well as the importance dining seems to have played in these buildings, may have influenced later architecture. This architectural influence, and the culture that may have given rise to it, is perhaps the more important of the two issues. In addition to this royal architecture at Pella, several non-royal residences were uncovered that attest to the wealth and decorative luxury of the city. As such, the architecture of the Macedonian élite will be examined at a greater length than the sculpture, the two examples of which may be examined briefly.

Of the two statues that were uncovered in a domestic context, the first and more archaeologically clear of the two is the famed bronze Poseidon of the Lateran type. The statue is 0.52 m in height, of which 0.08 m was an accompanying base made of a grey limestone. It is complete, save for the support beneath his right leg, part of his left index finger and his trident. The piece is equally finished on all sides and has a shiny black patina. The statue is described as having been found near the outer door of an

---

178 Pella Museum, inv. no. M 383. Harward (1982), 198, cat. no. 87. See the catalogue entry in The Search for Alexander, 179, cat. no. 154. The origins of the type, the date and whether first executed in large or small-scale is still debated and not relevant here. See Ridway (1990), 125-126, 145, n. 39.
antechamber to a possible shrine in a house just south of the Thessaloniki – Edessa road in sector IV. It is unclear whether the statue was found in the room or outside in the courtyard, and even the identification of the inner room as cultic is problematic. The excavators describe the room as being a “καθημένος λατρευτικός Πορτετής” and having a “λατρευτικών χαρακτηρίσμα”, but do not fully explain their evaluation. Alongside the statue, a round, stone table decorated with floral motifs was also uncovered. Though this could be a sacrificial table, this is not stated and it could have performed any number of functions. No altar, terracottas, louteria or other “religious” finds were uncovered in the room, casting doubt on a possible religious context for the statue. The house itself was only partially uncovered and suffered from despoliation, though it was once a two courtyard home that may have been lavishly decorated as fragments of polychrome painting and well carved column and pilaster capitals suggest.

A second piece that may be domestic in origin, though the archaeological context is inconclusive, is a marble statuette in the Pella Museum usually identified as Alexander the Great represented as the god Pan. The height of the sculpture is 0.375 m with the legs from the knee down, the right arm and left forearm now missing. The head was found separately. The statue was removed from the eastern baulk of Sector I while probing the western limits of a wall. The wall forms part of an unexcavated insula and the wording of the findspot suggests that the piece could have originated in street 3, the

179 For the original publication of the find, see Δελτ., 16 (1960), 79-80, pl. 65a. For the context of the find, see BCH 83 (1959), Chron., 702-704. While the piece is listed simply as being “Late Hellenistic”, Rolley (1983), 190, notes that the house was destroyed during the Roman sack of Pella in 168 BCE.
180 Δελτ., 16 (1960), 80, pl. 65a.
181 Pella Museum, inv. no. ΠΑ 43. Harward (1982), 198-199, cat. no. 88. See the catalogue entry in The Search for Alexander, 179, cat. no. 153.
road to the immediate east of Sector I. From such a context it is clear that little may be said of the statue, other than that the size and greater attention paid to the front than the back are both characteristics of domestic statuary. If indeed this piece is domestic, then it would represent a category otherwise un-represented at this time, namely portraiture. It would be understandable for residents of Pella at this time to have a portrait of their deceased king in their home, though the representation of the famed monarch as Pan is curious. A date of the late fourth to early third centuries BCE would place the statue in the formative years of Alexander’s worship as a god, which may justify the odd iconography and quasi-divine representation of the king in this piece that would be more allusive to immortality. Without a more secure context, little can be known.

These two statues represent the total number of domestic pieces from Pella, but the decorative wealth of the houses of the Macedonian capital is clear from the finds from other early Hellenistic residences. Most famous are, of course, the two large residences

---

182 For the initial excavation of the statue, see Δέλτα 18 (1963) B’, Chron. 205, pl. 242; BCH 89 (1965), Chron. 800.

183 The head itself is not an exact replica of any known Alexander head, but the features fall within the traditional iconographic parameters. The identification with Pan is secured by the presence of two small horns projecting from a fillet on the head, pointed ears and a goat tail. The association between Alexander and Pan is curious, but the Antigonids, at least, seem to have carried on the tradition. See Pollitt (1986) 31; 305, n. 23. In discussing the role of Pan in Macedonian devotional practices, Ridgway (1990), 124-125 seems skeptical about the identification of syncretic ruler-Pan images. While the tail and pointed ears may secure the identification of Alexander-Pan, Ridgway is concerned about the lack of large-scale representations of Hellenistic ruler portraits as Pan and the belief that the fillet with the horns is a royal headband. She suggests that the horned fillet could simply be something like a marker of function or rank and that certain comparisons to ruler portrait typologies are problematic. She even states “I wonder whether even the Pella marble would have been considered Alexander had it not been found in Macedonia, and especially in the capital city; the facial traits could easily be no more than an expression of contemporary style” (125). This would suggest that the piece could be a generic mythological piece and not portraiture at all, but the statue was found in the capital city and the facial physiognomy fits Alexander portrait types.

184 The piece can be dated to the late fourth/early third century BCE. See Ridgway (1990), 124. Whatever the nature of the piece, its links to cult practice is unsure given the depositional context. On the ruler-Pan iconography in general, see de Paulignac (1984); Laubscher (1985).
just to the south of the Agora called the House of Dionysos and the House of Helen.\textsuperscript{185} Other houses have been uncovered, but their state of preservation is such that they will not be discussed.\textsuperscript{186} These two houses have received much attention given their early date and the mosaics that were uncovered in the ruins. They have been dated to the late fourth century BCE and so are concurrent with or slightly postdate the palace.\textsuperscript{187} The House of Dionysos is a large rectangular house with three courtyards running north to south. The southernmost courtyard and rooms have been little excavated, but the others show an affinity for architectural and decorative grandeur. One entered the house through a monumentalized propylon, with the northern peristyle and its seemingly private rooms on your right and the central peristyle with its \textit{andrones} and more public character on your left.\textsuperscript{188} The mosaics of this house, however, were found in rooms that may be associated with either courtyard.\textsuperscript{189} The house contained three, possibly four, \textit{andrones} whose floors were covered with mosaics consisting of purely geometric patterns as well as the more famed figural mosaics. These figural pieces, some of the earliest in the pebble technique, are beautiful and carefully laid works of art that represent Dionysos

\textsuperscript{185} Nielsen (1999), 84-85, refers to these houses as “palatial houses” owned by the king’s official Friends and serving some official purpose. Her criteria for “official” seems to be size and the presence of dining rooms, leading one to wonder how she would differentiate between official and rich. These wealthy Pellans may well have served in “official” military or civic posts, but dining seems to have served a more broadly cultural purpose rather than specifically political. The term “palatial house” would seem too prescriptive and should be viewed in a more descriptive light.

\textsuperscript{186} The better preserved houses all come from excavation sector I (House of Dionysos = Pella I.1; House of Helen = Pella I.5), though seemingly domestic remains have been excavated in sectors II-VI. House I.3 is excluded because of its poor state and uncertain function (see Heermann (1986), 66-104).

\textsuperscript{187} The date is based on a stratigraphic sequence, which had uniform material under the mosaics, providing a \textit{terminus post quem} of 350-320 BCE. See Makaronas and Giouri (1989), 157-168; Touratsaglou (1975).


\textsuperscript{189} The walls of the rooms off the central court are only preserved to their foundations, making the assessment of doorways difficult. The rooms that run between the two courtyards are in the same state so it is impossible to tell whether the door of the central room (an \textit{andron} with mosaic floor and \textit{kline} beds) faced the northern or central courtyard.
riding a panther, a griffin killing a stag, a lion hunt and centaurs. The lion hunt was a favorite sport among the Macedonian élite and if, as has been suggested, the panel does represent the same hunt of Alexander as commemorated in the Krateros Monument at Delphi, then this would perhaps be another instance of portraiture in domestic decoration as with the statue of Alexander/Pan. Aside from these mosaics, other decoration in the form of elaborate interior Ionic columns, half-piers and engaged columns, painted sima blocks and other architectural features were found that speak to the splendid appearance of the home.

The House of Helen was no less lavishly decorated even if the majority of the home is beyond recovery. The northern wing of the house has survived and a series of mosaics were uncovered in three of the home’s andrones. These mosaics include depictions of a Battle of Amazons, the Abduction of Helen by Theseus and a Stag Hunt. The Stag Hunt mosaic is of particular interest, as it is the first known Greek mosaic signed by its artist, something upon which the homeowner and dinner guests may have remarked. The mosaic depicting the Abduction of Helen is also of interest as it has been associated with the famed tomb painting of the Rape of Persephone from Vergina. Vergina was the burial place of Macedonian royalty and so the common pictorial tradition of these pieces suggests that homeowners hired artists who knew the styles current in royal circles and wished these styles reproduced in emulation of their

---

190 On these mosaics in general, see Makaronas and Giouri (1989), 133-140; Salzmann (1982), 28-30, 104-106, nos. 94-99; Petsas (1965); Dunbabin (1999), 10-15.  
191 The relationship between the two monuments remains unsettled, though there is little likelihood that there was any relationship between the two. The mosaic simply represents an aristocratic pursuit. See Willers (1979); contra Vasic (1979).  
192 See Makaronas and Giouri (1989), 54-123.  
194 On these mosaics in general, see Makaronas and Giouri (1989), 124-132; Salzmann (1982), 106-108, nos. 100-104; Petsas (1965); Dunbabin (1999), 10-15.
monarchs. Like the House of Dionysos, the House of Helen was also replete with carved, painted and moulded architectural decoration. Where might this fondness for decoration and dining have come from? An answer may lie in the Macedonian palaces and the practice of the culture’s “first citizens”.

The palaces of Macedonia, whether at Pella or Vergina (Palatitsa), show architectural elements and decorative practices that were to become popular in non-royal Hellenistic domestic architecture. These features, in turn, were more than likely influenced by architectural and decorative practices from palaces in the Near East, especially those at Vouni and Sousa, but were used and added to in order to create something purely Macedonian. The Palace at Vergina is the more completely preserved of the two and is more than likely the older. It was entered via a monumental propylon with a two story pedimented façade that was reached by a ramp and was flanked by stoas. The first story of the façade was Doric, while the upper had Ionic half-columns. The layout of the palace was a series of rooms centered on a large peristyle court to the east, with a smaller court and service rooms to the west. Keeping in mind that the western section of the palace was a later addition, the architecture of the palace clearly resembles Classical peristyle houses, simply on a much larger scale. The other element to note is the number of rooms that may have been reserved for dining/entertainment purposes. Though not all of the rooms can be identified for certain, if all of the rooms suggested to be for dining are accepted, then a total of seventeen out of

\[196\] In general, see Nielsen (1998), 81-99; For the palace at Vergina, see Andronikos et al. (1961); Kutbay (1998), 18-28. For the palace at Pella, see Kutbay (1998), 40; Siganidou (1996), 144-147.
twenty-six ground floor rooms are reserved for this purpose. Even at a modest estimate, the number of dining rooms for the palace is large and prompted one scholar to suggest that the primary function of the building was as a banqueting hall. The ancient Macedonians were famed for their symptic habits, and the hosting of banquets for honored guests seems to have been an integral part of their social customs. It may be that the large number of rooms reserved for dining was needed to reflect different dining occasions, with the difference in size and positions of the rooms reflecting the number or social statuses of the invited, but on at least one occasion Phillip II hosted a large enough gathering that would have required the use of several rooms. This affinity for a large number of dining rooms becomes a characteristic of wealthier Hellenistic houses, as has been seen at Eretria, Pergamon, Pella. The same probably holds true for the palace at Pella, but not much has survived of this building beyond the foundations.

The Royal Palace at Pella is a huge complex that, when fully excavated, may well turn out to be over 60 000 m². Of the two main sections of the building, the eastern area seems to be that of the palace proper, with four courtyards with rooms arranged around, while the smaller rooms in the western and northern sections may have been for personal,  

---

197 This number is derived from Travlos’ plan in Andronikos (1984), Abb. 18, including the suggestion by Cooper and Morris (1990) that the Tholos may have been for dining purposes as well. The large number consists of suppositions for the functions of rooms based on the presence of off-center doorways and drains. While these features are good indicators, only the presence of “kline bands” around the outside of a room is a positive indicator. This would reduce the number of andrones to nine, while the other rooms may have been multi-functional, used for dining and other purposes. See Kutbay (1998), 28; Nielsen (1999), 83-84. It should be noted, however, that Ath. 1.18a states that some Macedonians ate while seated on stools and not reclined, suggesting that one need not have klinai for dining purposes.
198 Tomlinson (1970), though he does not deny that “palatial” functions were also a concern.
199 Ath. 4.128a-130d. For the symposium and Alexander, and so possibly reflecting general Macedonian practices at this time, see Borza (1983).
200 The difference in size may not be a reflection of social status, but simply of practicality and number of guests. Preparing for the war against Persia and in celebration of his daughter’s wedding, he “ἀμα ὅταν τοῦ θεοῦ τιμᾶς τους τυμάνας ὡς πλείστους τῶν Ἐλλήνων μετασχήμα τῆς εὐσχίας ἁρίτες τε μυστικοῖς μεγαθυμητεῖς ἐποίει, καὶ λαμπρὰς ἀστίασεις τῶν φύλων καὶ τιμής. Εἶπε τῇ ἀσπίσει τῆς Ἕλληνος μετατύπωσε τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ἑαυτῶν φύλων παρατίθεμεν παραλλαγὰς ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς γραμμήν ὡς πλείστους.” (Diod. Sic. 16.91.5-6).
administrative and service purposes. As at Vergina, one entered the Pellan palace through a monumental propylon with two stories, the lower in the Doric order, the upper in the Ionic. One entered into Persityle Court I, which had at its northern end a series of three rooms, the middle of which probably had a colonnaded front and no doorway, as seen in the Palace IV and the large peristyle houses at Pergamon.\(^{201}\) This emphasis on the axial placement of a main room group illustrates a new importance placed on room position, if indeed the room group was an audience/dining room for the Macedonian monarch.\(^{202}\) The interior walls of this group seems to have been singled out for decorative purposes, as fragments of well-carved stone columns and a stone plinth were uncovered. Immediately to the east and west of this northern portico, flanking one’s entrance to the three room group, are two semi-circular rooms, which may have been used as shrines or to display dynastic statues, though no statue bases were found \textit{in situ}.\(^{203}\) A semi-circular structure that included a water supply and a drain, with a facing altar, was found halfway along the western colonnade of peristyle court I. This may have been the base for a fountain or fountain-statue, though the suggestion that these were part of a garden in the peristyle is conjectural.\(^{204}\) It does, however, illustrate the visual and ritual importance of the court as a public space.

\(^{201}\) As reconstructed by Heermann (1986) and understood by Nielsen (1999), 91. See \textit{supra}, 103-106.

\(^{202}\) Nielsen (1999), 91. There was little that survived from the palace itself to properly identify function due to generations of robbing and the re-use of material. That this was an audience hall is a possibility, though Nielsen notes that Plutarch mentions a library in the palace, which also could have been stored here (Plut. \textit{Vit. Aem.} 28). The Greek, however, could either mean “library” or just “books”.

\(^{203}\) Heermann (1986), 369, emphasizes the parallel from the Palace of Ptolemais. In this palace, several statues were found, including a group of Dionysos, Ariadne and a satyr, a philosopher and several others. Such apsidal displays for sculpture seems to be an invention of the late Classical period, and one need only think of the Philippeion at Olympia for a cultural parallel to Pella. In general for this display context, see Schmidt-Colinet (1991), esp. 43-50. In no case, however, were any cult or ritual assemblages uncovered with these displays.

\(^{204}\) Nielsen (1999), 91; Siganidou (1996), 146.
These two palaces illustrate several important common features that most likely had an impact on spatial arrangement and display in larger Hellenistic homes. The first is with regard to architectural plan. Both structures probably had the same basic floor plan, as we understand them, by the mid to late fourth century BCE. It is at this time, or shortly after, that large peristyle houses with several andrones appear at sites like Pella and Eretria. This suggests that the particular importance placed on hosting dining and drinking parties in the unique socio-political culture of the Macedonian monarchy may have spread after its conquests. Similarly, this architectural innovation increased the role of the courtyard as an area through which non-household or “public” traffic would flow. To this end, its entrance was monumentalized with a propylon, it and its associated rooms received decoration in stone, painting and mosaic, and axial alignments for audience halls became important. All of these were realized in order to increase the prestige of the king. Both palaces had monumental façades, which may well have been painted like the façades of Macedonian tombs, such as the one at Lefkadhia. In the palace at Vergina, the public areas, such as the andrones, had mosaic floors of colored pebbles, while rooms S and E both contained fragments of painted plaster. If the semi-circular niches in the palace at Pella did contain sculpture, then such an abundance of

---

205 Owing to the poor state of preservation, the Palace at Demetrias will not be dealt with here, other than to say it followed the same basic plan, with courtyard and large number of (probable) dining rooms, as Vergina and Pella. For the palace at Demetrias, see Milojcic and Theocharis (1976); Marzolff (1996); Nielsen (1999), 93-94.

206 The palace at Vergina had a predecessor, while the palace of Archelaus that was decorated by the painter Zeuxis (Ael. VH 14.17) more than likely lay beneath the current structure at Pella. The palace at Pella was in turn enlarged under Philip V. See Nielsen (1999), 81, 88.

207 This is not to suggest that such practices were not important elsewhere in Greece or prior to the fourth century or to deny that symposia became increasingly popular with non-élites from the fourth century onward, simply that these activities held a special place in Macedonian culture and that as its “culture” spread, so too may have the importance, especially for the ruling élite. See Nielsen (1999), 97.

material wealth, displayed for all to see, must surely have made an impression on the visitor and sparked emulation. The architecture and decoration of these palaces drew from many sources, both from Greece and Asia Minor, but fused them into something purely Macedonian. While the correlation between palace architecture and decoration and similar practices in domestic homes was most likely not directly linear, these palaces must surely have set the standard in the fourth century for what was to follow.

Another site that has yielded examples of domestic statuary from the Hellenistic period is the island of Rhodes. The site is not included in Harward’s catalogue, though that may be because of the poor state of preservation and because the sculpture remains largely unpublished. For most examples, the findspots and setting of the pieces are unknown, while several others were recovered from salvage excavations that unearthed several Hellenistic and early Roman houses. For these reasons, little may be said contextually of the pieces, but a brief summary of the finds and their characteristics is in order.

The size and type of the sculptures discovered fit with the format established for domestic statuary. They are small in size, often have more finished fronts than backs or a single, primary view and frequently have as their subject matter divine personages like Aphrodite. Any number of these sculptures could have come from domestic display contexts, whether in the home or in the famed outdoor displays of Rhodes, such as

210 For the Rhodian sculptures in general, see Gualandi (1976); Merker (1973), esp. 15. Gualandi (1976) also includes sculptures from Kos that he considers to be of Rhodian origin.
grottos, nymphaea and gardens.\textsuperscript{211} Six sculptures listed in a guide to the Rhodes museum
definitely come from domestic contexts. These include an Aphrodite/Nymph, an
Artemis-Hekate/Aphrodite, a female torso, a satyr and a herm.\textsuperscript{212} The female torso, satyr
and herm are all fairly nondescript and within standard typologies for each subject. The
Aphrodite/Nymph and the Artemis-Hecate/Aphrodite, however, deserve some brief
attention.

The Aphrodite/Nymph is a headless and handless female, naked to the waist with
her right leg raised and leaning on a rock. The piece is 0.87 m high and seems to be
equally well carved all around, though there does seem to be less attention paid to the
right side of the figure, which would have been hidden to view if the piece were against a
wall and viewed on a three-quarter angle. The type of statue is known from the
Hellenistic period in only one other version, from Taman, dated on numismatic evidence
to the mid-second century BCE. The Rhodian piece differs slightly in drapery, position
of the arms and in its reversal of pose, which may suggest that the statue was either a free
variant on the type, or perhaps one of a pair of flanking sculptures. If so, then it is more
likely that the piece represents a nymph than Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{213} The Artemis-

\textsuperscript{211} The notion of Rhodian outdoor displays has recently come under criticism and it is suggested that such
display contexts were not specific to Rhodes. See Ridgway (2000), 277-278; Rice (1995). For the more
traditional view, see Lauter (1972).

\textsuperscript{212} See Papachristodoulou (1993), 36. For the Aphrodite/Nymph, see Merker (1973), cat. no. 12; Artemis-
Hecate/Aphrodite, see Διόπτρα 23 (1968), Chron., 439, pl. 405; female torso in chiton and himation, see Διόπτρα
23 (1968), Chron., 439, pl. 405. Merker (1973), 23, n. 89 provides a list of sculpture found in domestic
contexts, though of mixed Hellenistic and Augustan dates. To these may possibly be added a torso, an
Artemis and a small child that come from an area to the east of the acropolis on the slopes of Mount Smith.
This area contained both wealthy homes and public buildings. It is unclear where these statues were
located and so they may be domestic, though little may be said of them. They are small and of subjects
typical in domestic statuary, with the Artemis having some parallels from Delos. On these statues, see
Machaira (2003).

\textsuperscript{213} On the Taman figure, see Merker (1973), no. 12, 26, with references. For the Rhodian sculpture, see
Merker (1973), no. 12, 26-27. She suggests that if the Rhodian sculpture were part of a pair, then they
Hecate/Aphrodite is noteworthy for its type may have associations with cult activity on the island. If the piece is an Artemis-Hecate, then it may be in the tradition of several other versions of the statue type uncovered on the island. The overall series is thought to be funerary in nature and allude to the cult image of Artemis-Hecate, who may have been worshipped in a temple within the temenos of Apollo in the city of Rhodes. Merker objects to the identification of the figure and the poor evidence for the worship of Artemis-Hecate on Rhodes, and while her re-identification of the figure as an Aphrodite is also problematic, it does seem a possibility. Aphrodite is a far more common goddess for domestic statuary and the clingy, almost transparent drapery coupled with the languid pose suggest feminine or erotic overtones that would better suit the goddess of love. Interestingly, a close antecedent for the statue’s Archaizing elements is the Pergamene dancer previously mentioned from Palace V, along with its possible companion piece in Istanbul.

Given the important historical and economic place that Rhodes occupied in the later Hellenistic period, to say nothing of its purported art historical significance in the realm of sculpture, it is regrettable that little has survived to flesh out the domestic architecture and decor of the island’s inhabitants. One large building located near the acropolis of Rhodes does, however, provide a possible taste of Rhodian wealth and decor. The building is a peristyle court complex with numerous associated rooms, including

could have flanked an architectural feature such as a door. While this is possible, such paired sculptural displays, or doublets, were more frequent in Roman houses than in Greek. See Bartman (1991), 79-82. Laurenzi (1939), 56-57; Gualandi (1976), 130-137.
Merker (1973), 27-28. Merker (1973), 27. Harward’s catalogue lists eleven statues of Aphrodite and five for Artemis. All of the Artemis statues save one come, not surprisingly, from Delos where the goddess had a special meaning. The one non-Delian piece is the Artemis in relief from Eretria (supra, 99, n. 133).
The large dimensions indicate the dwelling must have belonged to fairly wealthy individuals over its lifetime. Though initial construction of some areas seems to have begun in the fourth century, the primary phases of occupation are in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods. The decoration of the house is luxurious, with painted plaster and numerous small finds, though the most conspicuous pieces are several patterned mosaics. Included is a tantalizing reference to a bronze sculpture, though the piece is unpublished. If the decoration of this building is any indication, then the houses to which many of the statues belonged would have been as decorative as any known. More than likely a great many of the statues would have adorned the courts and rooms of the Rhodian houses serving to enhance their overall decorative scheme.

Finally, two brief examples can be mentioned for their curiosity more than anything else. The first comes from the Boiotian site of Eutresis. During excavations in the early twentieth century, a spacious villa was uncovered, though the ruinous state of the dwelling coupled with the meager finds allowed for little in the way of interpretation. The house seems to have been occupied in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods, with major occupation occurring in the second half of the third into the second century BCE. The house itself is similar to ground plans from Pergamon and Delos where one entered directly into a courtyard from the street and had rooms allocated in a “u” pattern around three sides of the courtyard, with one side possessing larger, more spacious rooms. In the courtyard, a statue was excavated with small stones used as a support
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218 For this building in general, see Dreliossi-Herakleidou (1996).
219 Δελτ. 42 (1987), Chron., 587.
220 No coins were uncovered, so dating is based primarily on pottery types, especially from four stamped amphorae handles. It should be noted that the excavations exposed no Byzantine material suggesting a well-preserved ancient ground plan. In general, see Goldman (1931), 265-270.
system, suggesting that the piece was purposely placed in this position at some time during the house’s occupation. The statue is a kouros measuring 1.22 m in height and missing its head, both arms, the right leg at the knee and the left leg below the knee. Stylistically, the piece has been dated to ca. 510-500 BCE. More than likely this sculpture was originally a grave marker in the nearby cemetery, though it may also have been a votive set up in the sanctuary of Apollo. This piece remains the only known domestic statue that had both a previous non-domestic function and that is clearly from an earlier time period. The display context, in the middle of the courtyard, is prominent, suggesting that the homeowners wanted the piece to be seen by all that entered the building. The purpose of the display, however, is unclear. Did the homeowner wish to continue the statue’s funerary and votive functions, suggesting a level of piety on the homeowner’s part? Or was the statue simply taken from the largely derelict cemetery or sanctuary and used to illustrate the tastes of homeowner? Certainly a conscious knowledge that the statue was “old” played a part in its recontextualized meaning, but what this meaning was is hard to ascertain. It may simply have been a curiosity or perhaps a case of decorative mos maiorum.

The second example comes from the site of Tel Dor on the Levantine coast. During the last series of excavations, a marble herm was uncovered in a seemingly domestic context. The piece was excavated from a domestic wall in excavation area C0 above the so-called “Phoenician House”. The bearded herm is well carved in marble, with an intricate coiffure banded by a fillet and more than likely represents Dionysos,

\[221\] For the statue, see Goldman (1931), 270-279.
though other possibilities exist. Stylistically the herm seems to be a variant of Curtius’ “Type C” herm, suggesting a date of ca. 140-120 BCE. If this stylistic date is accepted, then the sculpture corresponds well with stratum IVA, coinciding with the period of Seleucid rule of the city and with the occupation of the “Phoenician House” during the excavation area’s phase 4a.

Tel Dor was a vibrant town during the Hellenistic period that both withstood and was conquered by several of the Hellenistic dynasts. The town was well fortified and in the Hellenistic period had a “Hippodamian” plan. It had existed previously as a Phoenician town, however, and so much of the Hellenistic architecture is based on Phoenician models. The houses were long and narrow, with partitions used to separate the large, rectangular rooms into smaller, squarer units. This variation in architectural style, along with the unique cultural perspectives of a mixed Phoenician-Greek population, suggests that the use and layout of domestic space at Tel Dor may have differed significantly from other sites with more purely Hellenic cultures and architecture. Though little can be said about the display setting for the herm, it seems more than likely to have come from a domestic context. It is then interesting that a mixed culture from the Hellenistic period displayed similar material to other Greek sites even if they lived in houses of different architectural styles. This piece perhaps illustrates the

222 Andrew Stewart suggests that both Hermes and a syncretized Hermes-Thoth are as likely as possibilities. See Stern et al. (1995b), 457. I thank Professor Stewart for this reference.

223 Stratigraphically, the sculpture dates to any time before phase 2a of the excavation area, providing a terminus ante quem of ca. 100 CE. For excavation area C0 in general, see Stern et al. (1995a), 90-141 and for an attempt at assigning absolute dates to area C0, 244-245. For Unit I48, from which the herm was excavated, see 127-132. On the “Phoenician House”, see 92-94. Concerning the Hellenistic Hippodamian plan at Tel Dor, see 42-43. The nature of the insulae, or housing blocks, is compared to the insulae at Olynthos, though the architecture of the individual houses differs. For stratum IVA and the Seleucid period at Tel Dor, see 278.

224 For Tel Dor in general in the Hellenistic period, see Stern (2000), 201-260, esp. 247-249, pl. VII.1 for the herm.
importance of the display culture in the home that developed over the course of the Hellenistic period and how far that culture spread with the proliferation of Hellenism in general.

3.6 Conclusions

The material evidence from the Greek Hellenistic period shows a remarkable coherence with the literary testimonia. Of those few statues that were actually found in situ, the primary display context is in the courtyards or near the andrones of the home. Most of the statues that are not in situ have a findspot and a depositional record that suggest that their original context was in or near these two key areas within a Greek house. The statues themselves date from the mid fourth century to the late first century BCE and come from diverse archaeological sites, suggesting a tradition of sculptural display that spanned the whole of the Hellenistic landscape.

The site of Olynthos in northern Greece provided the earliest known example of domestic sculpture, an Asklepios statue excavated outside of an andron. The primary benefit of the site is that it allows for a macroscopic analysis of household spatial relations and decorative practices. The evidence suggests that even before the advent of larger courtyard houses, the areas of the courtyard and the andron were the primary decorative areas of the house and the areas through which non-household members would pass. Also in Northern Greece, the site of Pella contained few examples of domestic sculpture and architecture, but what has survived attests to the lavish decoration of such houses. Painted plaster, decorative architectural forms and stunning mosaics were placed primarily in the andrones of the larger homes, confirming the importance of these rooms.
The large number of *andrones* in these homes, along with the general spatial layout of the courtyard home, may owe some indebtedness to the Macedonian palaces that show similar features. Drinking, dining and entertaining were important social and cultural events for the Macedonians, so it is not surprising that there are a large number of *andrones* in the palaces and that these are reserved for the most elaborate decoration. Though there are no examples of sculpture from either the palace at Pella or Vergina, given the level of decoration in Macedonian private homes it seems likely that such material did exist. As Macedonian and Greek customs spread over the fourth century, it may be that their fondness for elaborate entertaining spread as well. Certainly an indebtedness to these ideas may be found in the palaces at Pergamon. Architecturally, Palace V seems to be reserved almost solely for such entertaining and has been linked in form to both the palace at Vergina and to Alexander’s famed dining tent. The sumptuous decoration in the palace, including sculpture in its courtyard, shows that royal decorative practices were not different from those of non-royals, suggesting a similarity of purpose. As these finds are all in the most public areas of a home, areas that are associated with activities that involve non-household members, the purpose would seem to be decorative, with the intent of illustrating the wealth and taste of the owner.

The sites of Eretria and Priene are valuable more for the opportunity to analyze material on a microscopic level. The House of the Mosaics at Eretria provides a remarkable example of what a complete home from the Hellenistic period would have looked like. The material suggests that there was thematic cohesion among the various decorative elements of the home and that the sculpture of a naked youth was part of this cohesion. The piece was found *in situ* outside of one of the house’s *andrones* allowing
for a study of appropriate sight lines. The statue would have been visible from the entrance of the house and the doorways of the other two andrones, suggesting the importance of the sculpture’s display for the homeowner. The House of the Mosaics was occupied in the early fourth century, suggesting that the lavish decoration of one’s home may have been a general fourth century phenomenon among the élite, a theory that matches the general chronology presented in the literary sources. Like Olynthos, Priene provides a large number of domestic residences with which one can assess general architectural patterns. Though they represent the prostas rather than the pastas type of Greek house, the general spatial layout of the homes follow the practices at Olynthos and suggest that the two typologies are simply two different answers to the same problem of how to delineate space. The cache of sculptures found in House 33 at Priene helps to determine some general patterns for domestic sculpture in the Hellenistic period. For the most part they are small, under 1 m, have fronts that are better treated than their backs, suggesting a frontal view, and are of deities where identification can be secured. Aphrodite seems a particular favorite, perhaps as an appropriate figure for sympotic activities.

Combined, this evidence suggests that in the Greek Hellenistic world domestic statuary served a primarily decorative function. It should be noted that very little in the way of religious assemblages were found with these statues, suggesting that they may have had little to do with organized cult activity, though certain religious acts may have been performed that do not survive in the material record. These types of religious assemblages will be explored more fully in the conclusion, but it does suggest that a religious function for these statues was not a primary concern. The notion for decorating
a home’s most public areas most likely goes back to the fifth century, but it may be that the rise of the Macedonians and the subsequent development of the Hellenistic kingdoms spread the practice more rapidly and prompted especially lavish displays. In order to see if such a reading of the material is valid, especially for the late Hellenistic period, it would be prudent to examine the Hellenistic domestic sculpture from the Roman sphere and analyze their practices to note any similarities or differences and to see if they too had an impact on the practices in the Greek world after their conquests of the second century BCE.
CHAPTER 4

THE EVIDENCE FROM HELLENISTIC/REPUBLICAN CAMPANIA

It has become commonplace to speak of the “Pompeian Premise” when discussing the archaeological material from this Campanian city. One can often have the tendency to use the material from Pompeii as indicative of “Roman” or “Italic” material culture, when in fact it represents only a snapshot of a particular town on a particular day and one must be careful when using this as evidence reflecting larger practices. This difficulty extends itself beyond the borders of just Pompeii, as much of the Campanian coast was covered in the eruption of Vesuvius capturing several architectural types of material culture – a city, suburban villas, country estates – from one entire region of Flavian Italy. The material is thus full of interpretive pitfalls that the scholar must overcome. Compounding these difficulties is the fact that much of the material from Campania was explored before a time when rigorous archaeological method had been invented. Having been explored from antiquity into modern times, “excavations” at Pompeii only began in earnest in 1748 and have continued to this day. This means that the records of stratigraphy, finds and findspots are often sketchy and while much has been written on selective surviving elements, such as architecture and wall painting, it is often only

---

1 On the “Pompeian Premise”, see Ascher (1961), 324; Binford (1981); Schiffer (1985), 18; Allison (1992), 98-100.
through the painstaking reconstruction of earlier notes and notebooks that meaningful assemblage analyses can take place. The original archaeological contexts for much of the material has thus been lost and archaeologists of today are at pains to record the surviving material in detail. Thus there are innumerable collections of essays, exhibition catalogues and general survey works that have been produced on the site of Pompeii, but few are the in-depth archaeological reports that lay out the material, its finds and its sequence in an accessible manner. This makes Pompeii one of the most studied yet least understood sites from antiquity and it has only been in recent years that meaningful assemblage study has been undertaken.\footnote{See as an example, Allison (1992). The scope of re-excavating and re-studying the site would be enormous and so house and area specific studies would be the best solution. This is the case with the House of Menander, which remains the only fully published house from the site, with volumes on its structures and silver treasures already in print and volumes on its decorations, finds and inscriptions forthcoming. See Ling (1997).} This is especially true of the Hellenistic or Republican levels of the site, which have only recently been the object of study.\footnote{See Nappo (1997); Dickmann (1997); Pesando (1997).} All of these difficulties mean that it is exceedingly difficult to examine the Hellenistic levels of the area, let alone decide when a domestic assemblage can be dated to this period. As such, the following relies heavily on a few general studies of various aspects of domestic sculpture at this time and presents a general survey in order to examine what similarities and differences existed between the Greek and the Campanian material.

**4.1 The Houses of Pompeii**

The eruption of Vesuvius on August 24\textsuperscript{th}, 79 CE helped to preserve not only a living Roman town, but also an extensive corpus of domestic architecture. To this end much of the main focus of Pompeian studies has been centered on domestic life, its
architecture and decoration. While this directly impacts the current study, this history of scholarship is also challenging as it necessarily focuses on the snapshot preserved by the volcano, a picture that falls outside the chronological limits of this study. The architecture, paintings, sculptures and material from Pompeii all reflect the domestic life during the Flavian occupation of the town. This is all the more apparent when one realizes that many of the homes in Pompeii underwent extensive remodeling after the earthquake of 62 CE, making many of the spatial arrangements and decorative assemblages only seventeen years old at the time of eruption. This complicates any attempt to fit the site and its material into the present study, but two factors help to place some of the Pompeian material into an appropriate framework.

The first is that Pompeii had a long history prior to the Imperial period. Occupation seems to have begun sometime in the sixth century BCE, with a long and seemingly prosperous period as a Samnite town from the fifth century onward. The Samnites were later defeated by the Romans, with Pompeii becoming an Italic subject for a long period. During this period, the late second and early first centuries BCE, several of the larger houses and villas in the town were built. While a separate people from the Romans, the Samnites aspired to Roman citizenship and so followed many of the architectural and decorative trends that were in vogue at Rome and elsewhere. Demanding this citizenship, the Samnites were on the losing side of the Social Wars, and
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4 The Greeks had been in Campania and colonizing the coast as early as 750 BCE. The famed battle between the Greeks and the Etruscans at Cumae in 474 BCE put an end to Pompeii as a “free port” and may have seen the expulsion of a native Ausonian population in favor of an Osco-Samnite one. Many Campanian mercenaries served the Greek tyrants of Sicily in the fourth century and the Oscans at Pompeii were writing in a Greek alphabet (IG 14 861; IG 14 886) by the third century BCE. This all suggests a strong Greek cultural presence in the region and the town prior to the arrival of the Romans. In general, see Nappo (1999), 8-11. For the earliest phases at Pompeii, see Carafa (2002). For Hellenistic Campania, see Ström (1993). For this phenomenon and its effects on architecture at Pompeii, see Richardson (1988), 67-130; Pesando (1997); Zanker (1998), 32-43.
a victorious Sulla turned the town into a Roman colony after 80 BCE. This means that several of the houses in Pompeii have architectural ground plans that reflect Hellenistic occupation phases. These houses are often marked by the presence of “First Style” paintings and the lack of later styles in subsequent generations. The date of 80 BCE thus marks the presence of Romans in the city, allowing one to determine what architectural and decorative practices may have been brought by the Romans, though it should be noted that both the Romans and Samnites may have shared some architectural and decorative patterns from their contacts with the Greeks. Though it is only recently that Hellenistic Pompeii has become of specific interest to scholars, the presence of domestic architecture and decoration of a culturally Hellenistic people allow for several interesting areas of inquiry.

The second factor that enables Pompeii to be included is that much of the domestic sculptural material suggests that Hellenistic Greek sculpture was a major influence. This view has been expressed mainly with regard to the subject matter and styles of the sculpture chosen. Several of the sculptural subjects, such as satyrs, nymphs and other Dionysian figures, as well as certain Rococo and classicizing trends are seen as particularly popular and derivative of Hellenistic tastes and typologies. This fact, coupled with some of the evidence from the late first century houses on Delos, has led to the suggestion that some arrangements of sculpture preserved by the eruption reflect late
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5 Of interest are several architectural terms that appear as loanwords from Greek to Oscan, suggesting a shared conceptual vocabulary prior to the arrival of the Romans. These include βόλθως, θηραμέας, καστέριον, and most importantly, πατάς and περιστερα. For the Roman colonization of Pompeii, see Zanker (1998) 61-77.

Republican if not Hellenistic decorative practices. While suggesting a one for one relationship between the sculptures found preserved in 79 CE and earlier Hellenistic practices or pieces is difficult, enough circumstantial evidence exists to posit that general trends rather than specific examples influenced the homeowners of Pompeii. The difficulty with this approach, however, is again the poor state of publication of many of these “Hellenistic” homes. Many of these early Hellenistic houses are to be found in Regio VI of Pompeii, an old district and an area that continued to house the wealthiest citizens, though archaeological reports or complete assemblage records are difficult to obtain. As examples, the Casa di Sallusto (VI ii 4), the Casa di Epidius Rufo (IX i 20), the Casa dei Capitelli Figurati (VII iv 57) and the Casa del Labirinto (VI xi 9/10) all possess significant Hellenistic levels, but a lack of complete publications leaves the scholar with little knowledge as to the contents and building sequences of these homes.

These structures may have had domestic sculpture in them, but without access to the excavation notebooks this is impossible to determine. Thus, the following survey will focus only on two houses that have been examined and published in enough detail to warrant an analysis of their sculpture and contents. Following this will be an overview of Dwyer’s study on domestic sculpture at Pompeii.

The House of the Faun (VI xii 2) seems to have been built some time after 180-179 BCE, after a small house that had occupied the center of the insula had been demolished. Towards the end of the second century BCE extensive renovations took
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7 The question of how much Delos influenced Roman practices and vice versa, will be examined in the next chapter. It should be noted, however, that the majority of the Italians that moved to Delos were from Campania.

8 As an example, Laidlaw (1985) has conducted excavations in and made extensive studies of many of these houses, but almost exclusively with regard to the paintings contained therein. For the architecture of these and other homes from the Hellenistic/Republican period in general, see Richardson (1988), 107-130, 154-170; Pesando (1997), 27-198.
place with the major work centering on the *hortus*, which was transformed into a second Doric peristyle, and the main peristyle, which was redone in the Ionic order. Other work included the moving of the bathing area and the construction of a *triclinium* that looked onto the new peristyle. Thus, by the end of the second century BCE, the basic floor plan was that of a Republican *atrium* house, but one that is dominated by the two peristyle courts at the back.\(^9\) In fact, the renovations completed by the turn of the first century BCE created one of the largest private residences known in the Mediterranean world from that time. The *domus* itself takes up an entire *insula* at Pompeii and has a floor area of ca. 3000 m\(^2\). This makes the house of this wealthy Samnite larger than the contemporary palace on the citadel at Pergamon.\(^10\) Surely the owner of this house required less living, functional and entertaining space than did the Attalids, so the size of the home can best be viewed as having the primary purpose of “creating an impression of grandeur”.\(^11\) This impression is created and imparted not only in the size of the *domus*, but also in the architecture that confronts the viewer at the very front of the home.

The façade of the house is marked by several shops that may have belonged to the owner, but whether the space was owned or rented, it proclaimed the wealth of the proprietor. These shops were separated by large pillars made of tufa and decorated with relief carvings in the center. The entrance to the house was also flanked by two large pilasters with tufa capitals and the greeting *HAVE* was laid out in colored *tesserae* on the
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\(^{10}\) Castrèn (1975), 40.

\(^{11}\) Zanker (1998), 142.
threshold. The vestibule was similarly grand, as the floor was inlaid with colored marble in the *opus sectile* technique and the threshold between the vestibule and the *atrium* had a mosaic of *opus vermiculatum* depicting two masks and a garland with fruit. Just inside the vestibule were two small tetrastyle shrines made of colored stucco, each with Corinthian columns resting on a pedestal. The whole is decorated with wall paintings in relief done in the First Pompeian style. This entrance/vestibule immediately proclaims the wealth and status of the individual and creates a type of propylon through which the visitor is to enter. Like propyla, this grand entrance monumentalizes the simple door and threshold and dramatizes the process of crossing liminal space, in this instance from the realm of the public to the realm of the personal. This distinction between the two realms is further underscored by one of the most remarkable qualities of the house, its axial spacing with an uninterrupted view from the entrance, through the *atrium* to the first peristyle court and beyond. This type of manipulation of view was seen at Pergamon, but not to such a precise and grand scale. The alignment teases the viewer through glimpses at the opulence of the home and emphasizes its size, suggesting that the home “goes on forever”. This provides another element in the distinction between the realms of the inside and outside of the home, a fact reinforced by the immediate focal point for this view from the street, the eponymous statue of the home.

The bronze faun from the house has been mistakenly reconstructed in the middle of the Tuscan *atrium’s impluvium*, though it now seems clear that its original setting was on a small base at the rear of the *impluvium*. The piece is 0.71 m in height and, although of no discernable type, represents a dancing satyr in a familiar Hellenistic style.

---

with wild, free and thick hair and lots of movement, torsion and vitality. The piece has been dated to the end of the second century BCE and may be reminiscent of Alexandrian workmanship. A cryptic inscription was found along with the statue that reads \textit{PCIXX}, which at least provides independent confirmation of the statue’s date, as the use of the \textit{P} is Republican. The statue is most interesting for two reasons, the first of which is its location. The statue was placed in such a way as to be the primary focal point for the entrant to the home. The dancing satyr was visible from the street entrance and draws the viewer’s eye inward to the house. Its vitality is inviting and while drawing the viewer in, it also provides the visual focus for the extended view through the home. As the central figure, it “blocks” the axial view making the axis manageable, while also drawing attention to this longitudinal plan. The satyr then acts as the tangible counterpoint to the \textit{HAVE} on the entrance floor – its interest draws the viewer in as it helps manage the architectural view through the door while the statue itself invokes a festive and perhaps mysterious mood, as it may have been veiled by the water of the \textit{impluvium}.

The second point of interest lies in the statue’s connection with the other decorative elements in and around the \textit{atrium}. In the Greek material examined, satyric, or more broadly Dionysian, subjects were popular decorative themes for the home. This trend would seem to continue in this house with the numerous decorative references to the world of Dionysos and his thiasos. The \textit{atrium} itself was painted in the First
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13 Museo Nazionale di Napoli, MAN inv. 5002. \textit{Pompei}, 208, cat. no. 14. See Fuchs (1993), 137; de Caro (1994), 204; Andreae (2001), 203-204, nos. 192-193. The assignation of the piece to an “Alexandrian” style \textit{(Pompei, 208)} is based on two copies from Egypt, but would seem to rest on the misplaced notion that such frivolous subjects (satyrs, grotesques, \textit{et al.}) were specialties of that city. See Stewart (1996). Andreae (2001), 203, sees the piece as coming from a Greek workshop, though perhaps to understand the sculpture as simply reflecting general Hellenistic Greek tastes and styles is best.

14 On this plan in general, though not the statue’s part in it, see Cohen (1997), 177.
Pompeian style, what has previously been referred to as a Masonry Style. Colors were very bright with yellows, reds and greens predominating. Most notable are the mosaics that were laid in several of the rooms surrounding the *atrium* proper. Already mentioned was the mosaic at the entrance of the home that depicted two dramatic masks in a garland laden with fruit. To the immediate right of the entrance is a *cubiculum* with a mosaic depicting a satyr and a nymph engaged in a sexual act, while to the back of the *atrium*, on the right, is a *triclinium* with a mosaic whose central image shows a winged being riding a tiger. The references to the realm of the Dionysian and the erotic/playful are obvious and, while youthful and not bearded, the satyr from the mosaic invokes the statue from the *atrium*. Two other *cubicula* and one more *triclinium* also have mosaics; one shows a cat eating a bird above a band of other animals, another pigeons pecking at pearls in a jewelry box, and the third has a central scene of fish in the sea surrounded by a band of flowers. More than simply connected with the realm of the natural or Dionysian, there may indeed be a more specific and elaborate word play involved among the various decorative elements of the *atrium*.

The dramatic masks at the entrance may reflect the satire (*satura*; *satyrus* or satyr play) when viewed in association with the statue. The mosaic in the *cubicula* makes the only reference to eating, possibly implying a satiated (*satur*) cat/individual, while the display of animals beneath could refer to the variety of food to be eaten as a mixed plate.
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15 On the painting in the House of the Faun, see Laidlaw (1975); Laidlaw (1985), 172-207; Ling (1991), 12-22; *Pitture e Mosaici* V.2 (1998), 80-141.
16 For the mosaics in general, see Leonhard (1914); Pernice (1938), 90-95; Zevi in *Pompei*, 37-57; *Pitture e Mosaici* V.2 (1998), 80-141; Dunbabin (1999), 39-44.
17 The masks themselves simply invoke the dramatic, while the statue would act as the trigger for a specific type of drama. The characteristics of a satire, as espoused by the OCD s.v. “Satura”, would fit this complex “variety, humour, spontaneity, love of dialogue and mimic realism”.
The pigeons pecking at a jewelry box invoke a sexualized and satyrlic picture, as lascivious activity is implied and pearls were an erotic metaphor. In addition, pearl in Latin is *baca*, while pigeon in Greek is *οὐκάς*, providing an intriguing wordplay invoking Dionysos and wine. The mosaic with the fish could be seen generally as fauna, though the garlanded band around the *emblema* has what appear to be orchids among the flowers. An aphrodisiac philter could be distilled from orchids (*satyrion*), while fish were a notorious sexual metaphor. Finally, the mosaic of the baby Dionysos seemingly brings all these elements together. The world of wine is present with the kantharos and thyrsos, while the winged being could be a baby Dionysos, an eros/cupid, or a type of *satyriscus* or *faunus* (woodland deity/deities) and the garland with berries worn by the child can generally invoke the maenadic and Bacchic. Surrounding the *emblema* is a garlanded frieze with pomegranates and dramatic masks, again invoking sexuality, comedy and the world of the satyrlic.
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18 *Satyrion* as both an orchid and the aphrodisiac distilled from it, see Plin. *NH* 26.99, 28.119, 29.96. For fish as a sexual metaphor, see Davidson (1998), 8-11.
19 At best, one can say that the central scene shows a winged boy riding a tiger-like creature with a lion’s mane. Pernice (1938), 159, suggests that it represents the power of Eros and wine to soothe the savage beast. The maenadic/Bacchic reference is also clear given its similarities to a slightly later mosaic from Delos that represents a winged Dionysos, or Dionysos-daimon, riding a tiger. See Dunbabin (1999), 32-33. *On faunus*, see Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.4; Ov. *Met.* 1.193; Plin. *NH* 12.3; Mart. 9.61.11. Similar garlands with berries are often worn by Dionysos, or characters of the Dionysian thiasos. Pomegranates were associated with fertility and female genitalia, while the masks refer to more than simply the dramatic world. It has been suggested that each of the masks represents one of eight character types listed by Pollux in his
distinctive Greek Hellenistic trait and while the general theme within the atrium may be seen as Dionysiac, specific wordplays and associations all seem to hint specifically at satyrs and fauns and could even playfully suggest the homeowners as members of the gens Satrii.22

From the atrium complex one then looks past the window in the tablinum to the garden and first peristyle court of the home. The tablinum itself was beautifully decorated with a figural painted scene of centaurs relaxing at the wedding of Pirithoos and Hippodamia. In the later phases of the house both horti had been converted to large peristyle courtyards, but both seemed to have room inside the court for green space. This makes it difficult to ascertain whether the second piece of sculpture from this home was discovered in the transverse peristyle or large peristyle, as it is simply described as being found in 1832 “nel giardino”. The marble statue is of a naked youth, perhaps an ephebe, standing in a languid contropposto stance. A pillar is to the left, on which rests a cloak and in front of which is a female herm done in an archaistic style. The statue has a total height with base of 0.73 m. The overall style and pose of the piece would seem to be

---

*Onomasticon* (4.143-154). Though Pollux is writing much later, his general work may well reflect long established character types. See de Vos in *Pitture e Mosaici* V.2 (1998), 105. Such specificity would require a high degree of knowledge and *doctrina* on the part of the viewer and suggest generally that the kind of word plays suggested here would not have been beyond some of the mosaic’s audience.

22 This is a known propertied Pompeian family based on inscriptions. See Zevi in *Pompei*, 40-42, though he generally takes the theme as Dionysian. Other theories with regard to program include general Alexandrian traits (de Vos (1991), 46) and references to Egypt and the cult of Isis (de Vos and Martin (1985), 272). On such programmatic readings of assemblages, see Brilliant (1984), 53-89; Warden (1991), 261. Bartman (1991) cautions against such an approach in all instances. The picture is usually complicated by an attempt to include the Alexander mosaic within an iconographic program for the house as a whole. The atrium, however, can be seen as a distinct (Tuscan) architectural unit and so the decoration may be analyzed as distinct as well. The link with the Alexander mosaic is most likely to be within the general realm of Hellenistic appreciation, or what Zanker has described as a “package deal” mentality on the part of Roman patrons and their ownership of Greek art. See Zanker (1988), 25-31; Cohen (1997), 195. As an aside, it should be noted that the homeowner’s clientes would have passed all this material on their way to meeting in the tablinum at the center back of the atrium. Satyrion is a name of a parasite in Roman comedy (Pl. *Per*. 103; [as the name of a play by Plautus] Gel. 3.3.14).
based on the body of the Narcissus type by Polykleitos, though there is no iconographic material, aside from an apple in the right hand, to suggest the subject of the statue. The sculpture generally fits within the paradigm for domestic sculpture, given its height and subject, though little else may be said. Its location in a household garden is important and will be dealt with at the end of this chapter.

The House of the Faun provides one of the earliest homes with domestic sculpture in the Roman world. Two sculptures have been examined as they have the best depositional record, are the most complete and in many ways are illustrative of the other sculptural material found in the house. A total of fifteen other pieces are listed in the most recent catalogue for this house, though many are fragmentary and are not statues, but pieces of sculpted furniture. Such numbers were a rarity in the Greek world and they are illustrative of the general Roman axiom of “more is better”. The locations of these sculptures are not surprising with the atrium and courtyards receiving heavy decoration. Though this may be simply because these rooms receive the most visitation, it may be a shared idea from the Greek. The axial placement of the rooms from the Tuscan atrium is reminiscent of the Hellenistic levels from the House of Attalos at Pergamon and may indicate that such architectural layouts were being explored in domestic homes in the third and second centuries BCE. The integration of the sculpture of the faun into an overall decorative scheme is remarkable. Such a scheme was suggested for the House of the Mosaics at Eretria, but the House of the Faun represents a far more sophisticated program. Such visual and linguistic plays are in line with later

---

23 The statue was originally identified as Paris. Arnold (1968) would associate the herm with the palaestra and the apple in the statue’s right hand as a reference to Aphrodite, perhaps supporting this identification (258, no. 34). On the Narcissus type, see Hafner (1994).

24 See *Pompei*, 271 for a chart with the assemblage material.
Roman material, but this suggests that the Romans again built upon a pre-existing Greek model and added to it.  

Another early home at Pompeii, though again with restorations carried out from the first century BCE onward, is House I x 4, the House of Menander. It does seem clear from the archaeological remains, especially those of the mosaics and floor pavements, that the architectural layout of the house reflects primarily a date in the second century BCE.  

Like the House of the Faun, the main entryway to the home has a vestibule, a Tuscan *atrium*, *tablinum* and peristyle court all on the same axis, though then the sprawling mansion expands to both sides to take up most of the *insula*. This was the main reception area and living quarters for the owners of the house and, while not as decorative as the complex in the House of the Faun, nonetheless was well ornamented. By the second building phase (mid second to early first centuries BCE), elaborately carved Corinthian capitals made of tufa were placed by the front door and three-quarter columns helped monumentalize the entrance to the *tablinum*. Most of the walls were later painted over in the Fourth Pompeian Style, but traces of First Style painting remains in the corridor to the left of the *tablinum* and in the cupboard to its right suggest that the *atrium* was once painted in this style. The last decorative elements of the *atrium* include a *compluvium* with sculpted dolphin waterspouts and palmettes and, to the immediate right of the vestibule, a decorated, marble *lararium*, though today much of it is restored.

---

25 *Supra*, 138, n. 6. It stands to reason that if both sculptural types and architectural spaces have (Hellenistic) Greek antecedents, then their fusion in the realm of decoration may also have such a lineage. Though no direct link between the two specific dwellings is suggested, the idea of decorative cohesion may have been introduced to the Romans from the second century BCE, when much of Hellenic culture was transmitted. Eretria was ostensibly Roman after Flaminius’ sack in 198 BCE.  

26 For this general dating, see Maiuri (1933), 176-177; Pernice (1938), 60; Richardson (1988), 159-161. For the building in general, along with all its construction phases, see Ling (1997), 47-144; Pesando (1997), 53-56.
The *tablinum* itself, along with the so-called “green *oecus*” to its right, were opened to the south in the second building phase (third quarter of first century BCE). This shifted the alignment for these two rooms toward the peristyle courtyard, which was accessed either straight through the *tablinum* or via the small corridor to the left. The *oecus*, most likely a dining room, was lavishly decorated in the Fourth Pompeian Style, though the central mosaic has been dated to the first century BCE. The mosaic is *opus vermiculatum* with a central *emblema* depicting a Nilotic scene with pygmies rowing a boat. A guilloche band and a meander border both frame the central panel. This orientation of the room toward the peristyle is significant, given that a curious piece of sculpture was unearthed in the northern ambulatory of the courtyard, just to the right of the *tablinum*.

The statue is of Apollo and is 1.10 m in height with a small base. The piece is of marble with traces of pigment and, though a pastiche of several styles, is primarily archaistic in character. The statue has been dated to the first century BCE. Two important elements should be noted. The first is that the archaistic style of the statue may well be intended to invoke a generically religious air. Though it would be problematic to conclude this from the style alone, the fact that Apollo was one of Pompeii’s city gods may well support this. This would then provide one of the few cases where a generally religious invocation could be assigned to a statue from a peristyle context. Perhaps contradicting this, however, is the type of statue represented and its location. The

---

27 Ling (1998), 35.
28 Museo Nazionale di Napoli, MAN inv. 146103; See Maiuri (1933), 407-419; *Pompei*, 215, cat. no. 74; *Menander*, 112-114, cat. no. A1.
29 Witness the temple of Apollo in the forum. Apollo was considered the town protector until the Sullan colonists imposed the worship of the Capitoline Triad. See Nappo (1999), 108-112. Aside from Vesta and Janus, domestic religion tends to be less specific in its focus with the Lares and Penates. See Orr (1972), 4-44; Wohlmayr (1989), 35; Muscettola in *Pompei*, 175-179.
identification of Apollo is assured, both by the crown of laurel leaves on the head and by the sphinx at his feet. These attributes are common and are often present in works representing the god as citharoedus. Though there is no attribute in his left hand, the arm positioning of the statue could support a harp.\(^30\) The placement of the god outside the tablinum and near the dining room would presage the evening’s entertainment, as one would have to pass the statue to enter the oecus. The findspot suggests that the statue had its back to a column and, along with a less fully worked back than front, this seems to indicate that it was not intended to be seen from inside the tablinum. The size of the piece, as well, could indicate that the statue was intended as decorative, given that the parameters are within the general size of domestic/garden statuary. While neither of these elements is conclusive, the placement of the piece in such a public locale, with no hint of shrine or religious paraphernalia, along with the reference to music and poetry near a dining room would suggest a primarily decorative function.\(^31\)

Several other statues were uncovered in this home, though their archaeological contexts suggest that they may have belonged to the Imperial period. In room 8 of the home a small herm representing Dionysos was excavated along with finds that suggest

\(^{30}\) This is the generally accepted statue type. Both laurel crown and sphinx are often associated with Apollo Citharoedus. See *LIMC II* (1984), s.v. “Apollon/Apollo” 371, no. 26 (E. Simon).

\(^{31}\) Fullerton (1990) explores the notion of archaism in Roman statuary. For Apollo Citharoedus types, see Fullerton (1990), 163-165. See also Wohlmayr (1989), 33-36. In general, archaism has suggested religious overtones given the reference to “honored antiquity” in the style. This is overly simplistic, however, and archaism’s “meanings” (should it have any) are more likely to be found in viewer response than stylistic determinants. Such responses derive from a host of factors, not the least of which is setting. See Fullerton (1990), 196-201, 202-206. There is no overt religious connotation through location, inscription or external referent, such as a copy of a famous cult statue. Simon’s assertion “daß sie dort im Hauskult verwendet wurde” (*LIMC II* (1984), 371) seems predicated on the inherent religiosity of archaism. That there is a contemporary lararium off the vestibule and a later lararium added at the opposite end of the peristyle, would suggest that this is not the sole or even primary case for this piece. An “abundance of ash” was found in this area, perhaps suggesting sacrificial activities, but it could have come from a nearby brazier or cooking pot. See Allison (1992), 165. Though a religious connotation may have been present, a decorative function seems paramount.
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mixed activity. The walls are painted in the Fourth Style and it is likely that some of the material was moved here between the earthquake of 62 CE and the eruption.\textsuperscript{32} Given that room 8 was a \textit{tablinum} and that the Apollo was right outside in the courtyard, this would not have been an inappropriate place for a herm. In room 35 a small casket was found containing several luxury items of bronze, including a small bronze statuette of an Eros and the base of another statue. Again, it is likely that these precious goods were moved to this storeroom prior to or during the eruption.\textsuperscript{33} In \textit{atriolum} 41 a piece of a marble arm and a possible piece of sculpture were found, as was a small marble statue that was uncovered in an upper stratum near the entrance of the home, possibly moved there by robbers.\textsuperscript{34}

These finds all illustrate that the House of Menander was likely a rich home with numerous statues in bronze and marble to decorate the dwelling in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial times. Their secondary deposits in storage rooms, their probable placement in rooms renovated in Imperial times or their general lack of proper context all illustrate concretely the “Pompeian Premise”. None of these pieces can be securely dated to the second or first centuries BCE whether on archaeological or stylistic grounds. They may well have been in the home in the first century BCE, but then moved and placed elsewhere after renovations or when placed in storage. The complex dating of a room like the \textit{tablinum}, with its basic ground plan dating to the second century BCE, coupled with its Fourth Style walls painted over First Style decoration only complicate matters.

\textsuperscript{32} See Allison (1992), 163; \textit{Pompeii}, 215, cat. no. 73; \textit{Menander}, 119-120, cat. no. A10.
\textsuperscript{33} See Allison (1992), 186-187; \textit{Pompeii}, 22, cat. no. 120; \textit{Menander}, 88, cat. no. K1.
\textsuperscript{34} For the small arm and the piece of sculpture in the \textit{atriolum}, see Allison (1992), 190. For the small statue, see Allison (1992), 196. She suggests that the piece may be that of a boy and that its depositional context in the upper strata of the home suggests that it was moved by later robbers, though it is possible that the statue fell from the upper story.
The occupation of the room and the peristyle, the stylistic dating of the Apollo and its archaeological context suggest that it is the only piece that was likely in place in the first century and so it affords the only opportunity among several sculptures found to examine spatial and social contexts.

It is for this reason that a study like that of Dwyer is of mixed assistance. While the material that he deals with often falls outside the general chronological range of the Hellenistic period, many of the statues and decorative practices that he analyzes reflect those of the Hellenistic period. Similarly several of the houses have architectural material that dates to the second and first centuries BCE, but this material was often remodeled in the first century CE. Still, the study remains fundamental as the only comprehensive analysis of late Republican / early Imperial Roman domestic statuary and several key observations may be addressed.

The first of these is that, like the Greeks before them, the Pompeians used the more public areas of the home as the decorative centers of the domus, chiefly the atrium and peristyle courtyard. Dining rooms as well could be decorated with sculpture as in House VII xii 17, which contained a small Bacchus, though the frequency of such material is not as high as in Greek andrones. Atria included material that ranged from a statue of a faun in the Casa di M. Lucrezio to ancestral portrait busts in the Casa del

---

35 This bronze Bacchus was found in the area of the fullonica of House VII xii 17. The piece is in a generic fourth century pose, with scholars noting similarities to both Praxitelean and Lysippan styles. Two copies exist in Florence and in Cherchell, both of which are life-sized marbles attesting to the figure’s popularity. It is quite likely that this statue had fallen from a dining room in the domestic quarters above, rather than decorating the fullonica itself. See Dwyer (1982), 53-54, 123. A small bronze statue was also found in what seems to be a dining room (EE) of the Casa di Iulius Polibius, though the room may have undergone changes and simply become a storeroom. See Allison (1992), 134-136.
Peristyles could display more frivolous characters such as *amorini* from the Casa della Fortuna or a stately Apollo from the Casa del Citarista. Other areas of the home including *cubicula, tablina, alae* and even kitchens have all been uncovered that contained sculpture, though in these rooms the difficulty of determining whether the material was either displayed or stored here is evident. Often the arrangement of the sculpture took sight lines and dramatic vistas into account. In the Casa di Marco Lucrezio, for instance, a series of marble statuettes and herms were placed in the garden of the home that maximized viewing potential when seen from the head of *atrium* 15 or from the door of *tablinum* 16. This complex arrangement of receding planes shows that careful planning was used in the display of material, as it is only these two vantage points that present an unobstructed “reading” of the sculptures from right to left. Any other view would block several of the statues at the rear. The general theme of these statues is the Bacchic realm, with animals, satyrs and an *amorino* all present. At the back of the garden, along the central axis of the room, was an *aedicula* with a statue of a drunken Silenus. Symmetrically flanking this scene are two double herms of the god Bacchus. The interesting elements are that axial arrangements and specific viewing angles are again of primary importance, while the *aedicula* and flanking herms create a dramatic

---

36 For the faun in the Casa M. Lucrezio, see Dwyer (1982), 24-25. For the portrait busts in the Casa del Citarista, see Dwyer (1982), 86-88, 127.

37 For the *amorini* from the Casa della Fortuna, see Dwyer (1982), 76-77. On the Apollo from the Casa del Citarista, see Dwyer (1982), 88-89. See also *LIMC II* (1984), s.v. “Apollon/Apollo”, 372-373, no. 35 (= “Apollo”, no. 200) (E. Simon). Clearly a classicizing work, this Apollo with cithara of the Mantua type should be viewed as a general retrospective piece rather than a copy of a specific Classical (Pheidian) prototype. See Ridgway (1970), 136-138.

38 All of the houses covered in Dwyer’s survey contained material found in these rooms, though the occurrence is not as high as in *atria* or peristyle courtyards. See Dwyer (1982), 113-120. The distribution and depositional context of much of this material, however, shows that many spaces within the home were used as temporary storage areas for multiple reasons during the period between the earthquake of 62 CE and the eruption of 79 CE. See Allison (1992), 86-100.

39 See Dwyer (1982), 40-48
view and presentation. Indeed the Silenus almost seems raised to the status of cult statue in its own elevated shrine-like setting.  

Small gardens inside the home were another area that provided numerous opportunities for display. Whether a hortus, viridarium or small peristyle garden, these spaces provided an ideal location in which to surround sculpture with a living tableau. It is these spaces, in fact, that seem to have contained the most sculpture in a Roman home. Numerous examples of garden sculpture, from houses to larger villas have survived in the region of Campania and so garden sculpture will be dealt with in a separate section. In addition to the sculpture uncovered, a large number of small decorative finds were unearthed in these homes. Among others, these include the famed painted walls of Pompeii, decorative furniture, painted and relief oscilla, sculpted lamps and peltae. All of these illustrate that the homes of these individuals were richly decorated and furnished.

The second issue is that of the subject and style of the Pompeian domestic sculpture. For the most part these sculptures betray the same preference found in the Greek world for frolicsome and erotic creatures such as satyrs. These individuals belong

---

40 Zanker (1998), 172-174, figs. 95-97; Dwyer (1982), 124. It is highly unlikely that this actually represents a cult statue to the god Silenus or Priapus. The presence of the other characters from the thiasos, along with the herms of Bacchus, suggests that perhaps Papasilenus is being presented as father and teacher of the thiasos. The aedicula would simply present the figure in an elevated and honored position. Perhaps a shrine like setting is meant to be ironic (like Papasilenus himself) or, more likely, simply decorative. Often these aedicula and associated nymphaea are confused with lararia and hence the religious interpretation. See Dwyer (1982), 118. The term “shrine” should not be used.

41 See Dwyer (1982), 123-127. One of the more dramatic examples of using natural surroundings as a backdrop comes from the House of L. Tiburtinus (II i 2; a.k.a. the Miniature Villa) at Pompeii. The extensive garden and terrace at the back included a nymphaeum, an euripus, fountains, pergolas, porticos and numerous plantings to create a living and dramatic landscape in which to place the sculptures of animals, Muses, portraits and other figures. The majority of the statues were small and represented characters from the Bacchic world – animals and satyrs. See infra, 178-179; Zanker (1998), 145-156. This use of landscape parallels that found in Second Style wall painting and could represent a type of idyllic landscape. See Dwyer (1982), 126, 137.
to the realm of Bacchus and indicate that these sylvan creatures were an especial favorite for domestic decoration. Representations of the god himself often accompany those of his followers, whether as statue, herm or bust. Other singular deities are also present, however, and include Mars, Venus, Apollo, Diana and Hercules. The most popular of these are Apollo, who is often represented as Apollo Citharoedus, and his sister Diana. Three statues of each have been uncovered, primarily in gardens, and their popularity is likely due to Apollo’s preeminence in the city. In addition to subject matter, the style of the sculptures should be noted. There is an admiration for styles that hearken back to the Greek past, be it classicizing or archaistic. Two of the more obvious examples are the classicizing Apollo Citharoedus from the Casa di Citarista and the archaistic Apollo Citharoedus from the House of Menander. Whatever the meaning of such pieces and their style may have been, the conscious use of enough traits to identify the pieces as retrospective illustrates the desire to represent a specific aesthetic that references the classical Greek past. The carving styles on many of the pieces also suggests

42 Dwyer (1982), 123-124, though the tradition derives from the Greek.
43 The three statues of the Apollo Citharoedus were found in the Casa dell Citarista, House VI ii 15/21 and the Casa del Centauro. See Dwyer (1982), 124. The three Diana statues were found in House VII vi 3, House VIII iii 14 and House III iv b. See Dwyer (1982), 125. Apollo was one of the city’s chief gods with his massive temple just off the forum square. He was the city’s protector until the conquest of Sulla in 80 BCE, when the cult of the Capitoline Triad was introduced.
44 See Dwyer (1982), 136. In addition, the famed Diana from the garden of House VIII vi 3 is archaic. Richardson (1970), 202, suggests that the statue was uncovered in a shrine. The term seems interchangeable with lararium and is thus confusing. That a small altar was found with the statue suggests that the Diana may have been the object of worship for this home. See Fullerton (1990), 22-29, 34-35, no. IIA1, with references.
45 This would seem the most likely explanation, whether any cult activity is involved or not. Addressing the relative levels of piety among the ancients, from slight to outright worship, is difficult at best and so locative arrangement in assessing such piety becomes increasingly important. The archaistic Diana from House VIII vi 3 seems to have been the object of worship based on the associated altar, while the archaistic Apollo from the House of Menander seems to have been primarily decorative. See Richardson (1970), 202. There can be little inherent religious meaning in retrospective styles beyond the level of piety understood in a concept like mos maiorum, suggesting that these were appropriate styles to use for religious purposes though they need not be exclusively so. Whether religious, pious or decorative, the material is at least referencing the aesthetics, and thus the real or imagined histories, of the Archaic and Classical past.
manufacture in a local workshop. It is interesting to note that while influences for many of these pieces came from elsewhere in the Greek world, there was little importation of figures from Athens, Delos or any other major production center. The styles may have been international, but production was local.\footnote{Local production is difficult to determine, but Dwyer, notes that the marble sculptures are uniform in style and suggests local manufacture. The majority of the marbles are also in rosso antico, though other marbles are found. Dwyer (1982), 26, n. 1. The bronzes, however, are heterogeneous and suggest foreign manufacture. See Pompeii AD 79, 76; Dwyer (1982), 135. Indeed he even ascribes the relief sculpture on several oscilla and peltae to specific local hands, “Local Hand nos. 1-5” (131-134).}

Lastly there is the issue of religious context. While Roman domestic religious practices and their relationship to domestic statuary will be explored in chapter 6, a few remarks should be made here. Unlike their Greek counterparts, several statues were uncovered with seemingly religious material. These range from altars in the same rooms as the statues to incense burners and braziers nearby.\footnote{An altar was found in the same room as the Apollo from the Casa del Citarista, but the exact findspot is unknown and so its relation to the statue is unclear. See Dwyer (1982), 88-89. Altars were also found with two very small bronzes in room 21 of the same house (Dwyer (1982), 100-101). A bronze brazier was found near the Apollo from the House of Menander (Allison (1992), 165), while a brazier and an incense burner were found with the Diana from House III iv b (Dwyer (1982), 125).} Assigning religious purposes within an archaeological context is difficult however, as one is almost always dealing with questions of proximity. In some instances, such as the statue of Diana from the garden of House III iv b, the material was found with the statue suggesting a clear link.\footnote{See supra, 155, n. 47. The impression is that the material was uncovered with the statue, though the precise depositional context is unclear.} In others, the material in question is often on the other side of the room or in a disturbed depositional context, begging the question: how close must objects be to one and other in order to be associated with one and other? Compounding the problem is that often lararia are found near domestic statuary and often have small sculpted Lares within them. These are clearly separate from other types of statues, but these others may be
similar in size and, especially when representing Venus or Hercules, represent household gods or quasi-religious statuary. Again, proximity is an issue.

This brief overview of Dwyer’s work suggests that the people of Pompeii were well within the decorative tradition of the Greeks. The areas chosen are often the same functionally as within the Greek home, being areas open to the most traffic from outside the household unit. This would put the wealth and taste of the *pater familias* on show. Similar types of statues are also preferred with characters from the Bacchic *thiasos* paramount. Differences, however, do occur though these seem to be a question of degree. There is an increase in size of sculpture in a Roman home as compared to a Greek. This extends to size of numbers, in addition to the size of the sculptures. More statues are found in Roman homes and, while the vast majority of these are small-scale (ca. 0.75 m or less), more material over 1 m in height begins to appear. In addition, these sculptures now include material inspired by famous pieces from the Greek past. There are some instances of sculpture having been found either on a second floor or having fallen from a second floor, suggesting that either some material was meant to be enjoyed by the household alone or that not all second story rooms were as private as one thinks.

Similarly, while the Greeks paid attention to notions like sightlines, the axial arrangement

---

49 See Dwyer (1982), 118, 121-122. A *lararium* was uncovered in the courtyard of the Apollo from the House of Menander, though at an opposing end. See supra, 149, n. 31. Dwyer (1982), 124, suggests that many Venus statues uncovered in *lararia*, on account of their large size, were purchased as decorative sculptures and then consecrated as a household divinity. The *lararium* figures tend to be much smaller, in the 0.10-0.25 m range, and so a decorative Hercules found in House VI v 5 is noted as 0.60 m. See Dwyer (1982), 122, n. 3. Though more concerned with Hercules in domestic painting, Coralini (2001), lists Heracles statues that are ca. 0.60 m in the atrium of House I ii 17 (145-146, cat. nos. P.001-002); the garden of House II vii 6 (175, cat. no. P.043); the atrium of the Casa di Sallusto (VI ii 4) (183, cat. no. P.056). Representations of the god in much smaller sizes are more numerous. A Herakles Epitrapezios measuring 0.88 m with a base measuring 0.16 x 0.38 x 0.62 m was uncovered in the suburbs of Pompeii, in a peristyle courtyard of a villa in Sarno. See Neudecker (1988), 242, no. 71.12; Coralini (2001), 240, cat. no. T.001.

50 For example, the bronze Bacchus found in House VII xii 17 previously mentioned. It is also likely that a small marble statuette from the House of Menander was also from an upper story. See Allison (1992), 196.
of a Roman home allowed for far more complex and dramatic viewing possibilities. These factors, coupled with a sense of integration among certain decorative assemblages as in the House of the Faun, suggests that the Pompeians built upon the decorative traditions of the Greeks, but added their own elements to create an allied but reinterpreted decorative habit.

4.2 Villas

Associated with the houses of the larger urban centers are the spacious suburban and country villas. These vast estates of the wealthy Roman followed much the same architectural plan as the smaller house, though on a much grander scale and with added elements such as extra courtyards and natationes. Similarly, the decoration of the villas was equally as grand, as these large dwellings allowed for more areas and larger individual areas in which to display luxury goods such as sculpture. The first of these expansive dwellings seems to have been created at the beginning of the second century BCE. Livy remarks that P. Cornelius Scipio refused to stand trial for bribery in 184 BCE and the people dared not drag him e villa sua, which was at Liternum on the Campanian coast.\footnote{Livy 38.52.1, 52.7, 53.8. Cicero (Off. 3.2) states that Scipio regularly withdrew to the country to escape the mass of people at Rome. For a survey of these early villas, see D’Arms (1970), 1-17.} The famed L. Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus also stayed at several villas in the Lucanian city of Velia between 164 and 160 BCE to unsuccessfully recuperate from an illness.\footnote{Plut. Aem. Paull. 39.1. After celebrating his triumph over Perseus in 167 BCE, Paullus died in Rome in 160 BCE.} These earliest villas paved the way for a host of successive homes that were to be owned by the élite of the day. Paullus and Scipio’s sons both had large villas, as did
G. Laelius Sapiens and Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi.\textsuperscript{53} These may or may not have been working villas, but they are likely the forerunners of the truly luxurious estates which are described in both Cicero and Varro, and which are present by the early 90s BCE with the villa of Marius at Misenum. Indeed, Cicero says of Scipio Africanus Maior that to escape his duties (\textit{negotia}) he \textit{otium sibi sumebat aliquando}.\textsuperscript{54} This is the first instance when villas and villa life are placed within the \textit{negotium/otium} dichotomy and point to one of the chief duties of these spacious country villas – to provide respite from one’s affairs, yet to contain all the amenities of city life. Cicero defines leisure as \textit{verum otii fructus est, non cententio animi, sed relaxio}.\textsuperscript{55} This illustrates how \textit{otium} was not pure sloth, but could incorporate a series of intellectual pursuits and cultural activities. It is within this tradition that domestic sculpture and other villa decoration should likely be viewed. This is not to say that all such material had weighty intellectual meanings, but that an air of “culture” likely surrounded much of what was placed on display within these homes.\textsuperscript{56}

Perhaps the oldest sculptural material discovered in a villa setting belongs to the villa at Fianello Sabino in Latium. There remains little in the way of architecture from the villa, though some of the structure seems to lie underneath a church which itself

\textsuperscript{53} Macrob. \textit{Sat.} 3.16.4 (= Cic. \textit{Fat.} Fr. 5); Cic. \textit{Rep.} 1.18, 1.61; Plut. \textit{Gaius Gracch.} 19.1-2.
\textsuperscript{54} Cic. \textit{Off.} 3.2.
\textsuperscript{55} Cic. \textit{De Or.} 2.22.
\textsuperscript{56} “Philosophers, literary figures, good diners, serious discussions, poetry – all have become standard features of villa life in the time of Scipio Aemilianus, Laelius and Cornelia contrasting sharply with the hardy activities of Scipio Africanus Maior when at leisure at Liternum” (D’Arms (1970), 14). None of the villas mentioned survive, though the dates seem to mesh with what little archaeological evidence there is at this time. At Pompeii, several of the largest houses which seem urban villas, the House of Pansa, the House of Sallustius and the House of the Faun, have significant remains that date to the mid-second century BCE. Precisely why this jump in luxury occurs at this time is unknown, though Polybius stresses the transfer of Greek booty after the battle of Pydna in 168 BCE as the first instance of extravagance and wealth at Rome (31.25.6-8). This reference to the influx of Hellenic material may be important, as philhellenism seems to have been a major component of Roman \textit{otium} and villa life. See D’Arms (1970), 14-15; Zanker (1998), 18, 139-140.
contains some spolia. What has been uncovered, especially the wall construction, suggests that the structure was a *villa rustica* and dates to the late Hellenistic/Republican period.\(^{57}\) The statues associated with this villa were uncovered in a small pit to the eastern side of the remains. With no locative context, little may be said of their placement within the villa and it is likely that this cache was placed together in anticipation of throwing them into a limekiln.\(^{58}\) Therefore, based on stylistic grounds, Vorster has dated the sculptures to the end of the second century to the beginning of the first century BCE. The figures include a mantled dancer, a dancing maenad, a silen, a young boy, a youthful torso, a Herakles torso, an Artemis, a double herm with the undamaged side a representation of Demosthenes, a winged Attis, several unidentified heads and a number of other sculptural fragments.\(^{59}\) The most complete figure is the mantled dancer (h. 0.895 m).\(^{60}\) The figure strides forward on her left leg with a strong turn at the waist to her right. She holds the hem of her dress out to the right just above the knee. The statue’s heavy turn, clingy yet voluminous drapery and triangular spatial geometry would seem to be associated with nymphs and dancers on Hellenistic Neo-Attic reliefs from Athens.\(^{61}\) On the other hand, the dancing maenad (h. 0.61 m), so identified by the panther skin she wears, bears little indebtedness to these reliefs and belongs rather

\(^{57}\) See Facenna (1951), 55-61; Vorster (1998), 17-19.

\(^{58}\) See Facenna (1951), 55, 57, esp. figs. 2-3 for the archaeological context of the sculptures; Vorster (1998), 17.

\(^{59}\) Based on Facenna (1951), the identifications are those of Vorster (1998). A total of 47 sculpted pieces were found, of which 37 belong to statues and 10 belong to sculpted furniture.

\(^{60}\) See Andreae (1962); Vorster (1998), 19-25, 65, no. 1.

\(^{61}\) The dancer seems to be in the tradition of such figures, though not a copy of a particular type. See Fuchs (1959); Touchette (1995).
to a more generic Hellenistic tradition. The silen (h. 0.735 m) is also listed as a dancing figure, based on the spiral torsion and position of the right foot. The figure could be dancing in accompaniment to music or be inebriated and is similar to types found on Hellenistic sarcophagi and may fall within the same cultural tradition as the dancing dwarves from the Mahdia shipwreck. These figures all belong to the world of Dionysos and his cortège and are standard character types to be found in domestic sculpture.

The young boy and the youthful torso are both stock subjects that have been seen in domestic statuary in the Greek world. Of significance, however, is that the youthful torso seems to match the general body positioning of the “Sandalbinder”, though an athlete such as a runner is not out of the question. The headless Herakles (h. 1.10 m) seems to be a typical Roman variant on the Lenbach-Ludovisi type that may have originally been produced by Lysippos or his followers. The Artemis is known from variants from Ostia, Delos and the Mahdia wreck, while the winged Attis is also known

---

62 See Vorster (1998), 25-28, 65, no. 2. She suggests that the figure is indebted to sculptural typologies from the Great Altar at Pergamon and from Artemis types from Delos. One can also see elements from the Nike of Samothrace and the Pergamene “dancers”.

63 Vorster (1998), 28-30, 65-66, no. 3. For the figures on the sarcophagi, see Matz (1968), 57-58, Type TH98, where the silen is a citharode. For the Mahdia dwarves, see Pfisterer-Haas (1994). The link to the Mahdia dwarves suggested is within the realm of the dancing comic other. It is more likely that the silen is simply a member of the Dionysian cortège.

64 For the young boy, see Vorster (1998), 30-33, 66, no. 4. The height of the figure is 0.67 m and is missing both arms past the shoulder and both legs below the knees. A parallel to the figure in face and movement, though far more stooped, comes from the Antikythera wreck and is now in the National Museum of Athens (Nat. Mus. 2774). See Bol (1972), 69-72. For the youthful torso, see Vorster (1998), 33-35, 66, no. 5. The position is possibly that of the “Sandalbinder”, but with the head, left arm, left leg, right calf and right hand missing it is difficult to tell. Ridgway asserts that the type is late Hellenistic in invention and not Lysippan, and that the body type was often used for honorary portrait sculpture. See Ridgway (1990), 81-82; Ridgway (1997), 307-308. The positioning is also close to that of a satyr uncovered in the Mahdia wreck (see Klages (1994), 531-535, no. 1) or the runners from the Villa dei Papiri (see infra, 169, n. 89) and so several possibilities for the subject are possible. The presence of a “Sandalbinder” would be unique in the corpus of domestic sculpture and the body type may simply be an allusion or choice on the part of the sculptor. The other two subjects seem more likely.

from other contexts as the type with a full cornucopia above the god’s head.\textsuperscript{66} Lastly, the Demosthenes double herm also fits into a standard typology and illustrates that the material in the villa was not composed purely of free-standing sculpture.\textsuperscript{67}

The material from the Fianello Sabino villa illustrates common trends in the realm of Roman, especially villa, decoration. The first is that, as in Roman houses and like the Greeks before them, Dionysian characters remained popular subjects. The dancer, maenad and silen are all Dionysian types that are within the sculptural tradition and have contemporary comparanda. Like the Herakles and the youthful torso, which may be variants of popular fourth century types, these sculptures suggest that homeowners were interested in types that may have been popular because they reflected forms from known Greek pieces. The second trend is in the sculptures’ size. The pieces are all small, less than one meter, with the sole exception the Herakles.\textsuperscript{68} This too fits in well with the material from earlier Greek and Roman deposits, which are generally under one meter in height. Lastly, there is the question of locale. While the material was uncovered out of its display context, Vorster has argued that the material was likely ordered specifically for

\textsuperscript{66} For the Artemis, see Vorster (1998), 37-38, 67, no. 7. The height of the figure is 0.572 m. Vorster (1998) sees variants as: Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. no. 108 518 (from Ostia); Mus. Delos A1735 (from Delos); Mus. du Bardo inv. C1176 (from the Mahdia wreck). The last example, however, seems doubtful. See Lehman (1994). The type is within the bounds of a Type D Artemis-Diana, though the precise modeling of the Fianello Sabino figure is not exact. See \textit{LIMC II} (1984), s.v. “Artemis-Diana”, 802, no. 18 (E. Simon). For the winged Attis, see Vorster (1998), 46-48, 67-68, no. 9. The height of the figure is 0.73 m. The typology shows the god with a full cornucopia raised above his head, belly and genitals exposed. See \textit{LIMC III} (1986), s.v. “Attis”, 29, 135 (the Fianello Sabino Attis) and 137 (E. Vermaseren).

\textsuperscript{67} See Vorster (1998), 40-42, 68, no. 12. The height of the head is 0.25 m and, while double-headed portrait herms of philosophers are rare, this piece is not unique. Richter (1965), II, 217, no. 6, where she identifies the other figure as Aiskhines, based on a long lock of hair behind the left ear and the beard type. This side seems too damaged for definitive identifications. In general, see Richter (1965), II, 215-223; von den Hoff (1994), 56, esp. n. 25.

\textsuperscript{68} This is true for the vast majority of the cache, though there are some fragmentary pieces, e.g. an arm or a hand, that seem to fit with material that is over one meter. See Vorster (1998), 69-71, nos. 20, 24, 27-32, 33.
this villa and all from Delos.\(^69\) If this indeed is the case, then it would suggest more than a mere random assortment of pieces but that of a conscious collection. The owner would likely have been concerned with popular types and with displaying them in appropriate contexts. The subject matter and display would then promulgate cultural values, not the least of which, through typologies and center of manufacture, was a reference to the *koinai* of Hellenic culture.\(^70\) This would seem explicit in the double herm of Demosthenes.

The villa *par excellence* that demonstrates just such a “culture” with its collection of domestic sculpture is the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum.\(^71\) Dating to the end of the Hellenistic period and excavated in the mid to late 18\(^{th}\) century, this massive *villa suburbana* is one of the largest private residences known from antiquity. Some 5600 m\(^2\) in total area, the villa included all the usual amenities such as *atria*, *triclinia* and *tablina* but also had an excessively large *natatio*/peristyle attached to the rear of the villa.\(^72\) The villa is named after the large number of papyrus rolls that was found inside and indicates that the owner was in possession of a large library that may well have favored Epicurean philosophy.\(^73\) Even more remarkable for the present purpose, is that the villa has produced the largest known assemblage of domestic sculpture from antiquity with 79

---

\(^69\) The presence of six highly ornate marble lamps, each with an unusually large diameter of 0.50 m, is suggestive that they came from a single purchase and were acquired specifically for the villa. The sculpture would also have been bought specifically for the villa. See Vorster (1998), 49-52, 72-73, nos. 41-46. She makes numerous stylistic and technical comparisons between these sculptures and those from Delos to convincingly suggest that island as an origin. See Vorster (1998), 55-56 and discussions of individual pieces.

\(^70\) Vorster (1998), 56-58 would see the expression of late Republican *otium* in this works, but that this idea was expressed through Dionysiac figures, Greek athletics and references to classical culture. This concern for popular types and displays in appropriate contexts was seen in the Cicero’s letters to his friend Atticus. See supra, 44-45.

\(^71\) In general, see Comparetti and DePetra (1883); Wojcik (1986); Neudecker (1988), 105-114, 147-157.

\(^72\) On villa typologies, see McKay (1975), 100-135, esp. 111-112 for the Villa dei Papiri and its architecture.

\(^73\) See Gallavotti (1941); D’Arms (1970) 57, 173-174, cat. I.5.
bronze and marble statues and busts. This material not only constitutes the largest grouping of domestic sculptures from antiquity, but has been traditionally viewed as a cohesive display unit, reflecting the civic and intellectual values of the Roman élite at the end of the Republican period.\textsuperscript{74} Though much of the sculpture was found in secondary deposits throughout the villa, reconstruction of their original position has been possible in several instances. Beyond the architectural and viewing contexts, the subject matter of the sculptures represents a broad spectrum of sculptural types and allows for the analysis of material that is otherwise underrepresented within the material record elsewhere.

Though by far the most material was displayed around the massive peristyle courtyard at the western end of the villa, several pieces were also found and likely displayed in other areas of the home. To the south lies what was likely the entrance to the home as it contains a traditional axial view through an \textit{atrium} into a square peristyle at the far end. In the \textit{impluvium} of this \textit{atrium} were found several small-scale bronze statuettes all dealing with a Dionysiac theme. Among these are several satyrs in various activities: holding a rhyton, sitting with a panther, sitting with a wineskin, and even riding a wineskin. Several other statues of similar sizes and subject matters were also found in other parts of the \textit{atrium}.\textsuperscript{75} Several reconstructions for the original placement of these pieces is possible, with many suggesting that the statues were arranged around the lip of the \textit{impluvium} with the satyr riding the large wineskin in the middle as a type of

\textsuperscript{74} See Pandermalis (1971); Sauron (1980); Wojcik (1986), Neudecker (1988), 105-114; Conticello (1989).

\textsuperscript{75} See Pandermalis (1971), 208, nos. 62-64; Wojcik (1986), 227-244, nos. L1-L17; Neudecker (1988), 149, nos. 14.9-14.15. These figures are all of a small scale, ranging from 0.195 m to 0.49 m in height, and of bronze.
fountain statue. The small scale of these pieces would allow for a large number of them to fit on top of the *impluvium* border, creating a miniature sylvan vignette around the collected water. These types of scenes are familiar subjects in domestic sculpture and it may be telling that this theme was chosen for the area containing the traditional *atrium* complex, especially if there were any dining rooms off of the *atrium*. The House of the Faun is a parallel. This suggests that the most public area of the home where one would entertain guests contained matching themes, though it may be that the presence of the *impluvium* simply allowed for nature-related material to be displayed.

Complicating this issue is that four portrait busts of famous rulers were also found in this *atrium*. These were placed in wall-niches and include one mutilated bust and representations of Antigonus Gonatas, Antiochos I and likely Seleukos I. The Antiochos and the Seleukos were beside each other as Seleucids, suggesting that the mutilated bust may well have been another Antigonid. This provides an internal cohesion for the pieces, though they have little to do with the satyrs and silens of the pool. This nicely illustrates how one can examine groups of statues together for commonalities, but

---

76 This is a common reconstruction, though the order of the figures around the lip of the *impluvium* may change. The satyr riding the wineskin is always reconstructed in the middle of the *impluvium*. See Comparetti and DePetra (1883), 233; Pandermalis (1971), 186.

77 These figures are variations on but three types. Bartman (1988) has studied similar variations in collecting and display habits. General Dionysian imagery and relations to *otium* are possible as broad themes. See Neudecker (1998), 85-86.

78 These identifications are those of Wojcik (1986). Given the difficulties associated with identifying specific rulers, other possibilities have been suggested. Pandermalis (1971), for example, would see the bust of Antigonus Gonatas as that of Ptolemy II and the bust of Antiochos I as that of Antiochos IV. This would necessarily change the make-up of the group, but not alter the cohesion, as the Antigonids would simply be replaced by the Ptolemies. See Wojcik (1986), 219-226, with bibliography; Pandermalis (1971), 186, 208-209, nos. 65-66. Neudecker (1988) follows the identifications in Pandermalis (149, nos. 14.17-18). Ridgway (2000), 302-303, cautions against many of the assumed identities, but if the owner was as educated as believed, then many of these figures could have been identified by the owner or his audience. Whether these herms and busts actually copy Hellenistic portraits is another matter (Ridgway (1990), 135-136), but they do seem to fall within general iconographic paradigms even if their construction is a Roman creation. Neudecker (1998) notes that the busts create a type of *aula basilike*, as exemplified by the busts found in the Thalamegos of Ptolemy IV (84-85). See *supra*, 40, n. 79.
that between groups one can often find little in common. This eclectic mix of subjects and themes in one setting shows the multivalent possibilities of an architectural backdrop when the context is partly defined by the material that decorates it.

As one moves further inward into the villa, however, the subject matter of the sculpture begins to change. Just beyond the *atrium* complex lies a square peristyle courtyard of moderate size. Around the outside of the courtyard were a series of busts that represent Greek intellectuals and noted Greek sculptural works. Included are a bust of Polykleitos’ “Doryphoros” and his Herakles, an Amazon by Pheidias, a Pythagoras, an Empedokles, a Demokritos, a Thespis-Auleta, a Dionysos-Plato, an Ephebe-Athlete and a man with a chlamys.\(^{79}\) The array of intellectuals is impressive and illustrates what has been traditionally seen as the villa’s connection with philosophy given the subject of the papyri that were found. It is quite likely that the original library of the home was in this vicinity, perhaps in the group of rooms that lies to the north. Beyond any specific relationship with philosophy, the busts of noted Greek sculpture like the “Doryphoros” and the Amazon, all link the material to a great Greek past with noted artists, thinkers and personalities that give the peristyle an air of learned “Greekness” and classic taste.\(^ {80}\) In addition to the general decorative and thematic elements of the sculpture, the findspots and the proposed arrangement of Wojcik would suggest that the general educational


\(^{80}\) This is the general tenet of Zanker (1988), 25-31, who sees most of the Roman decorative practices as reflecting an air of Hellenic learned taste. Neudecker (1998) stresses this Greek cultural and intellectual environment, even at the expense of artistic value (84). Other theories include the distinction between *otium* and *negotium* (Pandermalis (1971)) and its corollary the public and private realms (Warden (1991), 259).
components of a Greek gymnasium are being referenced. The grouping of the great statues of the past on the western side of the atrium and those of the great intellectuals on the east would re-unite the two types of training, or ἀσκείας, of the gymnasium, that of the body and that of the mind, in one decorative program, yet the division keeps the two identifiable to the viewer. Given the links that Cicero suggested between domestic decoration and gymnasia, this decorative arrangement is not surprising, especially in an area where a library may have been.

Lying between this smaller square peristyle and the large peristyle is a small tablinum that opens on to both, creating a transition zone of sorts. Two statues and several busts were recovered in this room, including an Athena Promachos (h. 2.00 m) that faces the larger peristyle and several portraits, especially of noted historical figures. These consist of a Demosthenes, an Epicurus, and a Flaminius, two tentatively identified as an Agrippina and a priest of Isis/Scipio and others that remain unidentified but could be ancestral or family portraits. The arrangement of these sculptures has perhaps caused the most debate among scholars and several hypotheses have been put forward. Though the Athena Promachos would seem out of place, the others may have been arranged simply to show a gallery of notable individuals. In general, most would see a

---

81 Wojcik (1986), 192-201, esp. Tav. LXXXIX. Neudecker (1988), 114, would see influences from the palaestra, but Warden (1991), 259, is correct to note that the distinction between a gymnasium and a palaestra is often blurred. This reference to the gymnasium is supported by Conticello (1989).
82 See Cic. Att. 1.4.3, 1.7, 1.8.2, 1.9.2, 1.10.3.
84 Sgobbo (1972) would line up most of the figures against the western wall with the Epicurus and the Demosthenes out in front “facing” each other. Pandermalis (1971) would have the Epicurus and the Scipio face each other, while Gallavotti (1940) proposes a more linear arrangement. Wojcik (1986) would even see two phases to the decoration but also proposes a linear arrangement. Each reconstruction, however, rests on the idea of opposing figures that creates two “zones” of portraits, those of the Greek world and those of the Roman. For convenient diagrams of these reconstructions, see Wojcik (1986), Tav. LXXXVI-LXXXI.
simple opposition of the Greek and Roman worlds no matter what the specifics of the arrangement. Such an opposition would well suit this area, playing off of the “Greekness” of the small peristyle and the eclectic nature of the material in the large peristyle. The noted individuals also suit the general learned nature of the villa, its library and presumably the owner.

Finally, just beyond this tablinum lies the great natatio/courtyard of the villa. The sheer number of sculptures within this space is staggering, as it is likely that some thirty-nine statues were placed in and around the courtyard. Pieces include portraiture, genre scenes, athletes, divinities and copies of famous statues from the past. Though these sculptures are perhaps to be seen as a testament to Greek culture in toto, many of the groupings and types within the corpus play off of one and other in more specific ways. As if to announce to the viewer that he must be prepared for some form of a mental exercise, the entrance to the courtyard is flanked by four statues of famous orators (from left to right): Aeschines, Demosthenes, Isocrates and Demetrius of Phaleron. Aeschines and Demetrius each represent the type of oratory known as oratio subtilis, while the two flanking the door are proponents of oratio gravis.\footnote{Pandermalis (1971), 182-183, 204-205, nos. 36, 39-40; Wojcik (1986), 39-50, nos. A1-A4, Tav XXIIIB-C; Neudecker (1988), 151-152, nos. 14.31-32, 14.39. In general, see Sgobbo (1972).} Like the atrium, the juxtaposition of the orators at once suggests the totality of oratory, yet the division keeps the two schools separate in the mind of the viewer. Likewise, the orators are presented as full statues and not busts (h. 1.80 m – 1.99 m), providing a certain gravity to their presence, as they announce to the viewer the decorative program that lies beyond. It should also be noted that the two central orators were famous for their denunciations of hegemony and monarchy, while the outer two statesmen were staunchly pro-monarchy. Though one
should not attempt to reconstruct the homeowner’s political leanings from the placement of these statues, the arrangement is still provocative when one considers the political situation of late Republican Italy.

Beyond the threshold and in the peristyle proper, the viewer is faced with an array of sculptural personalities and themes. The most numerous individual type is the portrait, represented both in marble as pillar herms and as busts in bronze. These herms and busts include noted political and literary figures, divine personages and copies of famous sculptural pieces. Though there is little that links the totality of these sculptures, very often groups of two or four sculptures are placed together that play off of one another in some significant way. The herms of Bion and Menippos stand together as poets of satire, while the herms of Panyassis and Antimachos represent poets of the epic genre. Pyrrhos, Demetrios Poliorcetes, Archidamos III and Philetairos all stand together as great political leaders of the past, while Hestia and Athena stand opposite Herakles and Hermes as female and male gods. The relationship among the bronze busts is more complex. A bust of Sappho stands opposite a bust of Aristophanes, perhaps suggesting a relationship between lyric and comedy, while busts of Apollo and Artemis stand together as brother and sister. Two Herakles busts, one a Polykleitan type, the other of the Landsdowne type by Skopas, are placed together presumably to compare and contrast the same hero as conceived of by two great artists. All of the busts and portraits are arranged around the

87 Pandermalis (1971), 179-181, 202-203, nos. 22-25, 28-30; Wojcik (1986), 87-106, nos. C1-C7, Tav. XLVIB-C; Neudecker (1988), 153-155, nos. 14.57-58, 14.60-61, 14.67-69. For the Polykleitan head, see Kreikenbom (1990), 99-108, no. IV.5. For the Landsdowne head by Skopas, see Stewart (1977), 98-99, 142, n. 7. See Neudecker (1998), 88. The comparison of the two heads is an example of the Roman penchant for displaying sculptural doublets or pendants. The type of relationship expressed here is clearly formal, rather than thematic, as the viewer attempted to discern the stylistic differences between the two
outside of the *natatio* so that one could wander around the pool and examine the pieces up close.

In addition to these busts, complete statues are also represented both in marble and in bronze. At either end of the *natatio* are bronze statues of satyrs, one drunk and the other sleeping, though both are executed in similar open and languid poses and both are lying on rocks. Completing the satyric/sylvan theme are a marble group of Pan copulating with a goat and several small bronze statues, two of fauns, one of a pig and fragments of another animal.\(^{88}\) Another possible theme associated with this area is that of the gymnasium, as two bronze statues of runners stand at the far west end and fragments of a possible athlete may indicate that another stood at the eastern end.\(^{89}\) Other figures such as the woman praying are more difficult to place within a larger thematic context, but it may be that the “Lysippan” seated Hermes at the western end of the room is a pendant to the Athena Promachos in the *tablinum*, the former a generic representation of *negotium*, the latter a representation of *otium*.\(^{90}\) Finally, it is also possible that the famed sculptures and assess the qualities of each. For such pendants, see Bartman (1988). Plutarch, *Mor.* 243C, tells us that the difference between the virtues of men and women can best be judged when their lives are examined side by side “like great works of art”.


\(^{89}\) Pandermalis (1971), 181, 203, nos. 31a-b; Wojcik (1986), 108-110, nos. D2, D4; Neudecker (1988), 154, no. 14.65. Warden (1991), 259, would also see a reference to the stadium in these figures, though the general athletic/agonistic imagery holds. The identification of the figures at the beginning of a race is that of Warden and Romano (1994) and fits well with the elongated form of the peristyle. Traditionally they have been seen as wrestlers. See Rausa (1994), 158-161.

\(^{90}\) Wojcik (1986), 150. This dichotomy is seen as the central theme of the villa’s decoration by Pandermalis (1971), who even suggests that one of the villa’s owners was L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex based on Valleius Paterculus’ description: *vix quemquam reperiri posse, qui aut otium validius diligat aut facilius sufficiat negotio* (Vell. Pat. 2.98.3). Though both Wojcik (1986), 259-275 and Neudecker (1988), 113-114, stress more dynamic and fluid relationships among the pieces and general references to the gymnasium and the palaestra, they both see the tension between *otium* and *negotium* as central to these views. Sauron (1980) sees the image of the “gardens of paradise” in the material, which holds for individual cases, but cannot be upheld as a more general theme. The Athena Promachos is likely a Roman creation of the first century BCE and was specially ordered for its distinctive location, rather than simply being a generic copy. See Fullerton (1989); Fullerton (1990), 47-49; Ridgway (2002), 144-145. While it may act as a pendant to the
Herculaneum Dancers were also in this peristyle, lined up along the southern wall. Certainly this is where they were found, but more recent theories suggest that the figures were lined alongside the inner wall of the pool in the smaller square peristyle. Such an aquatic residence has led to a new interpretation of the figures as Danaids, though this remains conjectural.\textsuperscript{91} In addition, while the subject matter of dancers or Danaids does not have to relate to any of the other subjects associated with nearby sculpture, the general material of the square peristyle is cohesive without these additions, while the light-hearted or nature oriented themes of the dancers would fit with some of the sylvan themes in the larger peristyle.

The Villa dei Papiri presents one of the best opportunities from antiquity for assessing not only the decorative practices of the late Hellenistic period, but also for attempting to analyze the collecting habits of a learned and wealthy Roman citizen. The material shows a definite favoring of Greek material, especially from the fourth century BCE, and a particular love for portraiture.\textsuperscript{92} Though the satyr scenes from both the impluvium and the large peristyle are familiar themes from all domestic decoration, this seated Hermes, it is possible that the archaism of the piece meant to convey “antiquity”, given that it was found in a room with possible ancestral portraits. Such was the case with Brutus, who referred to the room with his family trees (sacrarium) as his Parthenon (Cic. \textit{Att}. 13.40). The owner of the Villa dei Papiri may have then wished to designate a type of sacred space, if only to “recreate” on a small scale the acropolis and its dedicatory statues, especially given that a version of this Athena Promachos was found on the Athenian acropolis. See Neudecker (1998), 90-91.

\textsuperscript{91} Pandermalis (1971), 181-182, 203-204, nos. 32-36; Wojcik (1984), 203-217, nos. H1-H5; Neudecker (1988), 151-152, nos. 14.35-39. Pandermalis (1971) views the pieces as nymphs, while Neudecker (1988), has them as “Tänzerinnen”. Sgobbo (1971) reconstructs the figures around the small pool, a reconstruction that has generally been accepted, though Neudecker (1998), 88, rejects it on the grounds that the small bays of the pool were not for the statues but for breeding fish. Ridgway (2002), 160-164, based on a theory of P. Zanker, notes that these may be copies of the Augustan Danaids from the Palatine in Rome, but this seems unlikely in light of the altered appearance of these figures from the Palatine Danaids and that the owner of the villa likely set up the sculpture prior to Augustus’ reign. See Ridgway (2002), 178-179, n. 19 with references.

\textsuperscript{92} Conticello (1989), 16, though the traditional affinity cited for the works of Lysippos specifically may be doubted.
emphasis on large scale Greek material with political or literary meanings is new and is represented on a scale previously unknown. That the material is likely Roman in creation and execution is suppressed, as the stylistic and thematic references for the statues are all from the Hellenic world. As such, the general nature of the material as illustrating a Greek air is paramount, though relationships between and among various pieces can lead to various interpretive strategies. This is not to say that one denies the “Romanness” of the material, simply that the Villa dei Papiri represents adapted Hellenic forms that are, nevertheless, rooted in a Hellenic past, whether real or imagined. Beyond sculptor or production center, the adaptation of these forms for specific location and context is what makes them Roman.

As for overarching decorative themes for the sculpture, certainly the gymnasium and the conceptual dichotomy between otium and negotium are invoked. Perhaps most interestingly, what strikes one so clearly is the didactic nature of the material. No longer are subjects such as the satyric, Dionysian or Erotic worlds dominant, but they take second place to literary and political figures, gods and goddesses and copies of famous works of art. The aesthetic being presented is that of an individual steeped in the history of his shared classical heritage with the Greeks, in terms of literature, politics and the

---

93 Zanker (1988), 25-31, stresses the primacy of Hellenic forms, but goes too far when he says “What is most interesting about this material for our purposes is the complete absence of Roman subject matter ... In this world of otium there was no place for the Romans’ own national traditions” (27-28). While the preponderance of material is indeed Greek in subject matter, there are some notable Roman portraits and Roman creations. There are also few things more Roman than the adaptation and re-contextualization of Greek material from a shared classical heritage. As Wallace-Hadrill (1998) notes: “These same men [the first villa owners] are the guardians of ancestral tradition, and the innovators who redefine it” (53). This is what he terms an “ambivalence” of Roman Hellenization. See also in general Gruen (1992); Galinsky (1996).
arts, though he uses these pieces to express Roman cultural ideologies. As seen elsewhere, (over) life-size pieces and the sheer number of sculptures in one home distinguish Roman decorative habits from those of the Greeks, though an increased emphasis on placing sculpture in a matching architectural context (busts of intellectuals near a library) is also more Roman than Greek. It is the attention to a grand cultural discourse with the material, however, that separates the Villa dei Papiri from all other Greek, and virtually all other Roman, domestic sculpture.

Other Hellenistic/Republican villas decorated with sculpture are known, but the dating of the remains, let alone the preservation of findspots, is nowhere near as thorough as in the case of the Villa dei Papiri. This severely limits the possible analyses of the material, but some general remarks concerning the makeup of these sculptures may be made. At the site of Frattocchie is a villa whose architectural remains are scant and which has been dated to the first century BCE based on the style of a mosaic found therein. In this villa two portrait herms were found, one of Sokrates and one of Cato. In addition an Athena statue in peplos and aegis was excavated as were two statues of satyrs. These subjects all match the types found in the Villa dei Papiri, whether portrait of a notable philosopher/statesman, goddess or satyr. Their ancient location in the villa is

94 Neudecker (1988) is too narrow when he says “Wie sich zeigen wird, bleiben Rezeption griechischer Kultur und ästhetischer Genuß auch weiterhin bestimmende Elemente des Villenlebens” (2). More than the slavish devotion to Greek aesthetics, the adaptation of the material provides a Roman aesthetic. Dillon (2000), 30, would suggest that the portraits reflect, among other things, the Roman conquest of Greek cultural past, thus making it Roman. One of the other ideologies, of course, is to reflect the taste and prestige of the villa’s owner, something that should not be forgotten amid the more erudite readings of the sculptural material. See Neudecker (1998), 91.
95 The reception of the figures and their meaning is partly defined by the space they inhabit, rather than sculptures that inhabit a specific space. Quintilian uses such architectural perceptions with regard to sculpture as a mnemonic device (Inst, 11.2.20). See Neudecker (1988), 121-126; Neudecker (1998), 82.
96 See Kaschnitz-Weinberg (1927), 159; Neudecker (1988), 159, 17.1-17.6. Although this seems to be the best date for the construction of the home, an unknown portrait statue dating to the second century CE was uncovered attesting to the possible length of habitation at the site.
unknown, but a possible location could have been a peristyle, *atrium* or garden given the subject matter.97 From the site of Albanum in Latium there is the Villa of Pompeius. While the structure of the villa can be dated to the first century BCE when it was constructed for Pompey the Great, it was later re-designed when ownership passed to the emperor Domitian.98 Much of the architecture and its decoration can then be dated between the late first century BCE and the late first century CE. Found here were statues of centaurs, a Dionysos and two heads, one of a satyr and one of Athena. Again, satyric or Dionysian themes remain paramount and the Dionysos, while found in a later context, was an archaistic piece that may date to the first century BCE.99 Other villa sites have been identified with architecture that may date to the late Hellenistic period, but their chronology suggests that the larger part of their occupation resides in the Imperial period, or, when archaeological contexts cannot help, that the majority of their statues have been dated to a period post first century CE. These include sites at Castel Gandolfo, Fiano Romano, Marino and Torre del Greco.100 It should be noted that among the statuary listed, satyric and Dionysian pieces dominate the *corpora*, while portraits and creations after famous statues from antiquity, whether as statues or herms, are also frequent.

97 Neudecker (1988), 159.
99 Neudecker (1988), 131, no. 1.5. The type corresponds to the Albani Type 144 and is listed as *LIMC III* (1984), s.v. “Dionysos”, 433, no. 94b (C. Gaspari). Fullerton (1990), 136-137, 150, no. 64, discusses the type, though with reference to *LIMC III* (1984), s.v. “Dionysos”, 433, no. 94a (C. Gaspari). He sees it as an eclectic Roman piece likely dating to the first centuries BCE – CE, rather than a copy of any older Greek statue. Based on the size of his no. 64 he suggests that it could have been a cult piece (136). The archaistic Athena from the Villa dei Papiri, however, was also over 2 m tall and, while perhaps presenting a “religious air”, was not a cult statue, which Fullerton (1990), 40, notes. The Villa of Pompeius figure is 2.01 m tall and presents a “religious” figure with phiale open to the viewer, but likely display context played a determining role in any meaning for the statue.
100 See Neudecker (1988), esp. 144, no. 10, 157-158, no. 15, 168-170, no.25, 243-244, no. 73 with bibliographies.
The evidence from Roman villas from the Hellenistic period is both slight and illuminating. One can perhaps be disappointed in the meager archaeological evidence that has survived, especially in light of the number of villas owned during this time.\textsuperscript{101} Though these villas stand near the beginning of the villa culture among the Romans, many of these grand dwellings were later refurbished and reused, such that they had long occupancies well into the Imperial period and differentiating between these periods can often be difficult. This makes the task of evaluating any sculpture in its architectural context especially daunting. Luckily the Villa dei Papiri stands out as an example of what could be done with domestic sculpture by a particularly wealthy and learned individual.

Complex thematic arrangements with an eye toward referencing “notable antiquity,” whether a person or a work of art, dominate, though traditional domestic themes like the Dionysian are also present. It may be that the material presented in the Villa dei Papiri is a paradigm for the decoration of the luxury villas that were to come, but this is difficult to tell.\textsuperscript{102} Certainly the sculptures are within the bounds of what was to follow in subject, scale and material and in this manner they fall well within the decorative tradition. The arrangements and complex associations of the sculptures, however, are unparalleled and may point rather to an exception within the record. As will be seen, similar types of arrangements and associations can be found in the garden statuary of the Villa of Poppaea at Oplontis, where setting plays an important role in

\textsuperscript{101} From the period of 75-31 BCE, D’Arms (1970) lists the owners of 44 villas, as gleaned from the literary evidence of Cicero and others. See D’Arms (1970), 171-201.

\textsuperscript{102} “Im wesentlichen bietet di Villa dei Papiri somit bereits an der Nahtstelle zur Kaiserzeit alle entscheidenden Faktoren und kanonisierten Sujets der statuarischen Villenausstattung späterer Zeit”. Neudecker (1988), 114.
viewing effect. Though material that references past sculptural pieces along with family portraiture are present, there are still no sculptures that allude to the literary, philosophical and political past in the manner of the Herculaneum pieces. The locations of these sculptures, peristyles and atria, are similar to those of the houses studied and it is likely that they both belong to a similar display tradition, with villas simply being on a larger scale. Though the material presented is far more complex, rich and on a larger scale than the sculpture found in houses, this seems to be a matter of degree. The subject matter, the display locations and likely the reasons for display all suggest a common cultural tradition.

4.3 Gardens

One other major Roman contribution to the field of domestic sculpture is that of the decorated home garden. The extensive private garden seems to have been a uniquely Roman phenomenon, though it is probable that such gardens were based on the large pleasure gardens of the Classical and Hellenistic rulers. These pleasure gardens, perhaps begun with the famous χαλκίδεια of the Persian palaces, were a common enough feature of the Hellenistic period. Though there is little in the way of archaeological evidence for these gardens, several Hellenistic rulers, especially those at Syracuse like Gelon, Dionysios I and Hieron II, created large parks that more than likely contained some decorative sculpture. The island of Rhodes was noted in antiquity for its public gardens,

---

103 See Warden (1991), 261. He notes “The Villa of the Papiri shows that Roman patrons not only borrowed but also had sculpture adapted and specifically created for themselves, and that architectural context could fundamentally change the nature of borrowed works of art”.

104 Theoc. Id. 15.
yet again there has appeared no archaeological evidence to substantiate this claim. Many of the sculptures so far unearthed on the island suggest an outdoor setting, but again if this is the case, then one is dealing with public garden sculpture and not private material.

As for private gardens, there is little evidence that such existed in the Greek world. One tantalizing reference comes from a Corinthian skylphos found in the Athenian Agora which has scratched onto the surface the inscription [Θαμια]ς κάθες : ἣντο τοί ιωδοὶ πᾶς θύρας τῷ κάτο : πρόνα(a). Based on the alphabet and letter forms, the writer is suggested to be Megarian and the note has been dated to the sixth century BCE. This could imply the presence of gardens, but there is no corroborating archaeological evidence for such an early date. Likewise, the famed gardens of Theophrastos in Athens suggest the presence of private gardens in the fourth century. Here Theoprastos had several buildings, a shrine, an altar and several statues erected in his gardens, but aside from a boundary stone nothing of this garden has been uncovered and there is little to suggest that any of these gardens were inside his home. Its nature as a school/retreat also places it in a liminal category somewhere between the public and the private. It would seem that the introduction of the garden into the home, along with any accompanying decoration, was a Roman invention that may have been inspired by these public gardens but owed little to any pre-existing Greek private practice.

---

105 See supra, 126, n. 211.
106 Lang (1976), 8 no. B1. For other literary references to early private gardens, see Pl., NH 19.51; Ath. 15.668a.
107 For the garden of Theophrastos, see Vanderpool (1954).
108 On Greek gardens and garden sculpture in general, see Burr-Thompson (1951); Ridgway (1981).
The majority of evidence for establishing a garden typology for the Roman period comes from Pompeii. As such one is again fettered with the town’s destruction sequence, but much work has suggested that gardens were present in a relatively unchanged form in the late Hellenistic phase of the city. For the most part these were simple peristyle gardens, owing some indebtedness then, at least in its architectural framing, to a Greek spatial form.\textsuperscript{109} At the heart of the house, these earlier gardens were simple units that featured at least one colonnade of the peristyle and a core that could include some shrubs or green with a paved or stone walkway, and a few large trees, often fruit bearing. It may be that some of these gardens had a commercial use and that the fruit or nuts from the trees were sold at the market. It is likely that these earlier gardens provided shade in the courtyard and perhaps some fresh fruit for the household but were not the lavish gardens of the later period. With the introduction of the Augustan aqueduct to the city in the early first century CE, more water was available and so more elaborate gardens, with low formal plantings, could be arranged. Literary evidence along with an analysis of the painted depictions of gardens show that flowers and ivy were also common, as were fountains, hanging masks and oscilla.\textsuperscript{110} First century CE gardens were large affairs that dominated their respective houses and acted as ornamental displays of ordered nature. It

\textsuperscript{109} For Roman gardens in general, see Grimal (1969). For the gardens at Pompeii, see Jashemski (1979); Jashemski (1981); Jashemski (1993). Literary references suggest that the earliest Roman pleasure gardens date to the early to mid-second century BCE and were for the Younger Scipio (Cic. \textit{Amic}. 7.25; \textit{Repub}. 1.9.14). The Elder Scipio may have included such gardens in his country villa (Liv. 38.52.1; Sen. \textit{Ep}. 86). For the literary testimonia of Roman pleasure gardens in the Hellenistic period, see Littlewood (1987), 9-16.

is to these more formal gardens that much of the statuary likely belongs, but Cicero’s correspondence point to garden sculpture in the later Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{111}

In general, garden sculpture conforms to the typologies found in other areas of the home. The statues are small and of subjects appropriate to outdoor or sylvan settings, such as animals, satyrs, Dionysos and his retinue or Aphrodite. In addition, the garden setting allows for sculptures to occasionally be life-size for interesting interplays between the individual statues and their display context.\textsuperscript{112}

At Pompeii, several houses had extensive sculptural collections placed in their gardens. All date primarily to the period between the earthquake of 62 CE and the eruption of Vesuvius, but they seem to reflect architectural and decorative patterns that date to the end of the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{113} The House of L. Tiburtinus (II ii 2; the “Miniature Villa”) attempted in much of its architecture to mimic the stateliness of a Roman villa in town, and so also tried to match its decoration.\textsuperscript{114} Facing onto the garden was a long terrace that contained a small canal covered by a pergola. This canal was lined with statues that imitated a watercourse or nilus scene that is comparable on a small

\textsuperscript{111} Cato (Gell. 13.24.1) lauds his own unadorned villa, suggesting that garden decoration may have been common in his day, but what type of decoration is not mentioned. Cicero’s sculptural collecting habits for his villas are well known. Quantity seems to have been a defining characteristic of his garden displays as he says to Atticus: \textit{qua re velim, ut scribes, ceteris quoque rebus quam plurimis eum locum ornes} (\textit{Att}. 9.3), which can lead to interesting display possibilities in a garden: \textit{ita omnia convestivit [topiarius] hederam, qua basim villae, qua intercolumnia ambulationes, ut denique illi palliati topiariam facere videantur et hederam vendere} (\textit{QFrat.} 3.1.5).

\textsuperscript{112} See Jashemski (1979), 34-41. To date no comprehensive study of Roman garden sculpture has been undertaken, so often the pieces are analyzed within the general context of domestic sculpture. See as an example Dwyer (1982). One conclusion that has been drawn is that the majority of these pieces were of local manufacture, either produced entirely at the workshops at Puteoli, or perhaps shipped partially finished and completed near to their final destination. Jashemski (1979), 35. On Pompeian sculptural workshops, see \textit{Pompeii AD 79}, 76.

\textsuperscript{113} Fundamental to this analysis in general is Zanker (1979). He deals with several homes not under consideration here; much of this work is re-published in Zanker (1998).

\textsuperscript{114} Here the atrium complex seems to date to the end of the second century BCE. See Maiuri and Pane (1947); Richardson (1988), 337-343; Zanker (1979), 470-480; Zanker (1998), 145-156.
scale to the Canopus at Hadrian’s Villa. The sculptures were all miniatures and included a reclining river god, a sphinx, several animals attacking prey, herms, two Muses and a satyr. This eclectic mix that can be associated with various decorative schemata and display contexts illustrates a desire to display material that generically invokes the art of Greece, though no specific associations are suggested. In addition to the sculpture, several paintings were done for this area, including one of Pyramis and Thisbe, one of Narcissus, one of Orpheus taming animals and one Venus on a shell. These again point to no coherent sense of decorative theme or reference, but play off of the sculptures to create an overall bucolic air within the terrace. From the terrace one descended a few steps into the long rectangular garden, which was also bisected with a watercourse. A small nymphaeum held a cupid holding a mask, through which the water poured, and further down the garden a large pool held bases for twelve statues or vases. The material here suggests that while sculptural decoration of these gardens was of prime importance and could include large numbers of statues, the main criteria tended to be the inclusion of pieces that would highlight the pleasurable and bucolic nature of the hortus.

Another house from Pompeii with extensive garden statuary is the House of the Golden Cupids (VI xvi 7). The house itself is rather small, but contains a peristyle

---

115 More likely a nilus than a generic euripus given the small sanctuary to Isis at one end. On the Egyptian themes, see Bartman (1991), 79.
116 As Zanker (1988) has suggested, 25-31. The river god and sphinx are traditional for a nilus/euripus, the herms for garden paths, the animals and satyr for a park or θαλάσσιος and the Muses for a Museion. See Zanker (1998), 150-152. This mix of all types of open-air material illustrates how many of the older Greek outdoor display contexts were fused into a Roman idea of a garden.
117 For the sculptures of this house in general, see Spinazzola (1953), 396-411.
garden at the center of the home. In spite of its size, or perhaps because of it, great care was taken to emphasize the garden, as small steps are needed to descend into it and a grand façade was opened for an unobstructed view from the dining room to the west. In the center of the garden was a large fountain, which was ringed by a pathway that was lined with statues. These statues were mostly herms representing Dionysos and his companions, though others subjects such as an Eros and a Jupiter-Ammon were also found. These herms were arranged along the garden path, but other sculptures including various animals and several hounds attacking a boar were positioned in the grass, providing a sense of the wild in this orderly garden. Like the House of L. Tiburtinus, this house had two collecting and display criteria: to acquire and display as large a number of sculptures as possible and to present primarily bucolic and natural subjects. The owner also had no compunction about altering the works, as a Dionysos herm was converted into a water-spout and several decorated pilasters were sawed in half to create supports for reliefs. Thus any artistic value for objects was often subservient to more practical decorative desires.

Similar to the House of the Golden Cupids is the House of M. Lucretius (IX iii 5), as it had a garden at the center of the home that was visible from all of the rooms nearby. Placed around the garden, as if one comes across a secret sylvan scene, are a series of statues that all relate to the natural or Dionysian world. Several animals lie

\[118\] For this house and its sculptures, see Seiler (1992); Zanker (1979), 492-496; Richardson (1988), 314-318.
\[119\] Also uncovered was a statue of Omphale and a portrait bust of Menander, one a general allusion to the Greek past, though she was known for her “domestication” of Herakles (Ov. *Her.* 9.53-118), the other a possible imitation of an art collection of “great Greeks”. See Zanker (1998), 168-170.
\[120\] Zanker (1998), 170-172; Sogliano (1907), 568-593.
\[121\] See Zanker (1998), 172; Mau (1908), 372-373.
\[122\] On these sculptures, see Dwyer (1982), 38-48; Zanker (1979), 496-498; Zanker (1998), 172-174.
about the small pool while in the basin are two dolphins with cupids. Satyrs abound as one shields his eyes from the sun, another removes a thorn from the foot of Pan, while another is in the form of a herm and a goat sniffs the air. At the back of the garden, elevated and encased in a niche, is a Papasilenus holding the baby Dionysos, as if the whole scene below were that of a nativity. In this house the general Dionysian themes found in other garden sculptures are apparent, but the arrangement and effect is more specific. Here the prime consideration was not the simple presentation of large numbers of statues, nor were they placed along a path so that each could be seen on its own and admired. The pieces were set in a definite order and meant to be seen collectively, with herms acting as frames for the primary viewing angle of the scene. This view, from the main entrance, through the atrium and tablinum, lines up directly with the garden and back niche, emphasizing this area as the prime focus. The garden was even elevated, producing a stage-like presentation of the material or that of a living tableau, personifying the expression et in Arcadia ego.

One of the best examples of such garden statuary comes not from Pompeii, but from nearby Oplontis and the Villa of Poppaea. The villa is a very large structure, second only to the Villa dei Papiri in area and rich in decoration and finds. It seems to have been constructed in two primary phases, the first limited to the western section of the home and dated to the first century BCE and the second to major renovations and additions in the first century CE, which provided the final architectural plan. The older section has as its core an axial arrangement reminiscent of the House of the Faun, with an

---

124 For this villa in general, see de Franciscis (1979); de Franciscis (1982), 907-925; Jashemski (1979), 289-314; de Caro (1987), 79-87; Dickmann (1999), 184-185, 330-331. This villa is ca. 5000 m², as compared to the 5600 m² of the Villa dei Papiri.
unobstructed view through the *atrium*, small garden and *tablinum* to the large northern garden. This north garden then becomes the central focus of the home’s spatial planning. It is unclear as to whether the garden was part of the villa’s first or second phase, but a section of an outer wall dating to the first phase was uncovered under room 45 in alignment with the edge of one of the eastern diagonal garden paths suggesting the possibility of the garden being within the limits of the home’s first phase.\(^{125}\) For the most part the sculptures associated with the garden date to the end of the first century BCE/early first century CE and so may be formally outside the scope of this study. Given that they may well reflect patterns developed in the late Hellenistic period, however, they are worthy of mention.\(^ {126}\)

The most noteworthy feature of the garden statuary from this house is the care taken to present an orderly setting and arrangement for the pieces. The garden is divided by one central pathway following the old axis of the house and by a diagonal path running SE-NW. A similar diagonal running SW-NE likely exists in sections yet unexcavated. Along and to either side of the central path were uncovered the bases for four statues, which had previously been found under a portico, likely “in storage”. These statues represent four centaurs, two male and two female. The centaurs are under life-size (h. 0.90 m), are of white marble (perhaps Aphrodisian) and were originally fountain

\(^{125}\) de Caro (1987), 85.

\(^{126}\) Some forty-five pieces of sculpture have been uncovered throughout the villa, but only those associated with the large garden to the north and the *natatio* to the east will be examined as illustrative. In fact the only secure areas of sculpture in the villa (discovery of the bases *in situ*) are in the gardens and outdoor areas. A large number of the sculptures show elements that reflect general Classical or Hellenistic sculptural styles, and several are known to be based on actual Classical or Hellenistic pieces. The overall presentation of the material seems to reflect Roman concepts of Hellenistic life. See de Caro (1987), 127-130.
statues, as attested by the vertical shaft that pierces each statue from bottom to top. Thus their position along the walkway was not original as no pipes have been found in the area, and they are perhaps to be thought as adorning a fountain or basin at the center of the garden. Their repositioning along the garden path allows the viewer, while taking a pleasant stroll, to come upon these forest creatures in their “natural habitat”. They allow the owner to bring the wild into the home and, as garden and centaur play off of one and other, reinforce the natural and not the artificial nature of the garden. The constructed quality of the garden is not forgotten, however, as the statues are placed in an orderly fashion along the path and not hidden among the wilds of the grass or plants. The iconography of the pieces also reflects this interplay between the natural and the constructed, as each centaur carries an identifying attribute. One male carries a boar, while another carries a crater. One female carries a faun, while another a lyre. Each group, then, has one male and one female with a wild animal attribute, while the others carry attributes associated with cultured activities. All of the attributes, however, could be associated with symposia and are within the iconographic tradition of these party loving creatures. These garden sculptures reflect the general bucolic nature of most Roman garden sculpture, but their iconography and position along the path create an interesting interplay for the viewer reflecting the paradoxical and pleasing character of nature captured within a home.

Similar in orderly arrangement are several pieces of sculpture that were excavated along the diagonal path of the garden. Interestingly, all of them were heads set on herm

---

127 de Caro (1987), 88, cat. nos. 1-4. These centaurs likely have Hellenistic prototypes, possibly originally from Pergamon. See Schäfer (1972), 184-190.
128 de Caro (1987), 127.
shafts. One of the heads is likely an Aphrodite (h. 0.36 m), one a boy (h. 0.28 m; found with its herm h. shaft 0.97 m), one a lady (h. 0.32 m; found with its herm shaft h. 1.08 m) and one a head of a child Dionysos (0.28 m; found with its herm shaft h. 0.93 m). The heads are all first century in date with the boy and lady showing clear Julio-Claudian features. Again it is the orderly arrangement of the pieces that is most striking. The portraits of the lady and the boy correspond nicely to those of the two deities. The statues were set up along the path as lady-Aphrodite-boy-Dionysos, an arrangement that clearly places each of the mortals in apposition to their divine counterparts. If the mortals were part of the homeowner’s family and especially if mother and child, then the links would have been that much stronger and possibly suggested, passively and nonchalantly, immortality for the humans. Again, like the centaurs, these pieces engage the viewer with ideas that are formed through their arrangement and which are independent of any iconography. These statues also show that each path was perhaps decorated with a separate theme in mind, all reflecting high degrees of planning and cohesive display in an otherwise casual setting.

Associated with the garden is the later natatio and associated area in the eastern section of the home. Though not a garden and certainly of Neronian date, several sculptures were uncovered in an outdoor setting that reflect certain illustrative tendencies among Roman domestic sculpture that was not found among the Greek. At the head of

---

130 de Caro (1987), 127-128.
131 On the nature of the visual planning of this villa and how art and nature interact, see Bergmann (2002), esp. 93-95. One other piece was found in this garden, a boy with a duck (de Caro (1987), 94-96, cat. no. 10). The sculpture is close to life-size and was originally a fountain statue with the water pouring from the duck’s mouth. The piece is likely based on a Hellenistic original that owes itself in turn to the famed boy with a goose by Boethos. The context of the sculpture makes it unclear as to where it was set up, though an original position in either an interior fountain or the one conjectured for the centaurs.
the pool were found two pieces, one a neo-Attic crater with Pyrrhic dancers in relief and the other a *symplegma* group of a hermaphrodite repelling the advances of a satyr. The hermaphrodite-satyr group is well known from its replica series and the multi-faceted setting here plays well against the complexity of the piece. One could have walked around the entire piece to examine the interplay between the figures, looked at it from the front with a garden as its backdrop, viewed it from below while swimming, or examined its reflection in the pool. Continuing on around the pool, lined up along one side are a Herakles herm, an ephebe, two Nikes, an Artemis, a boy and another Herakles herm. On the opposing side several pieces of sculpted architectural molding have been found. Of primary interest among these statues are the ephebe, the two Nikes and the two Herakles herms for they all reflect sculptures and sculptural types from the Greek Classical period.

The ephebe (h. 1.54 m; base h. 0.08 m), whose setting by a pool recalls his associations with the gymnasium, is nude save for a chlamys and raises his left arm which originally held some object. Several variations of this sculptural type have been identified and the piece is generally viewed as “in the manner of” Polykleitos or his followers. Indeed the hair is rendered in short, round and curling locks like many “Polykleitan” heads, while the general languid body type is similar to the Westmacott

---


133 It should be noted that those reclining in positions of honor in *triclinium* 78 would have seen the statue from the back, highlighting the ambiguous sex of the hermaphrodite. Such a viewing angle on this scene is depicted in a Pompeian fresco. See Bergmann (2002), 117.

134 de Caro (1987), 102-112, cat. nos. 13-18. Also found in this area was a portrait head of a young boy, done in a Julio-Claudian style (de Caro (1987), 112, cat. no. 19). The original context for the piece is uncertain, though it cannot be associated with any of the bases found around the pool.

135 For a study of the statue type, see Trillmich (1979). Other statues in the typology are in Benevento, Cartagena, Copenhagen, Dresden, Paris and Rome, with the Cartagena piece closest to that at Oplontis.
Ephebe. The Nikes are twin pieces (h. 1.60 m; base h. 0.16 m), though the first statue is fully preserved (minus the wings (apparently bronze)), while the second survives only as a trunk, missing its head, wings, right arm and feet. Each piece shows Nike in flight with feet pointed downward and drapery, held in the left hand, pressed tight against the body. Twelve replicas are known within the series and all show general affinities with mid to late-Classical sculptural types.\textsuperscript{136} Associations to the Nike in the hand of the Zeus Olympios statue, the sculptures from the balustrade of the Athena Nike temple and the Bronze Athena erected by the Athenians after the battle of Sphakteria have all been drawn.\textsuperscript{137} The type here, however, is more than likely a classicizing Roman creation of the first century BCE based on an amalgamation of several of these and other fourth century BCE sculptural types.\textsuperscript{138} Lastly, the Herakles herms (h. 0.42 m; h. 0.44 m) are not twins, differing in some details such as the tilt of the head, the type of crown worn and the execution of the brow/nose ridge, but they certainly belong to a similar sculptural typology. They have been identified as reflections of the Genzano type Herakles head created by Skopas, with the first of the heads suggesting clear Skopasian stylistic features in the oblique line of the eyebrows presenting eyes sunk deep in their sockets. The second herm shows many similar details in the hair, nose and mouth, but expresses less \textit{pathos} than the first.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{136} de Caro (1987), 108 with references.
\textsuperscript{137} See Schrader (1941), 21; Blümel (1931), 42-45.
\textsuperscript{138} On this sculptural type in general, see Gulaki (1981), 218-236.
\textsuperscript{139} de Caro (1987), 102-104. Stewart (1977), 90-91, would associate the Genzano-type head to an original statue by Skopas representing the hero with the apples of the Hesperides in his left hand, club in his right and chlamys over the right arm. Representations of this statue, originally set up in Sikyon and celebrated in antiquity, survive in an Antonine copy in the Los Angeles County Museum and on a Sikyonian coin dated to the reign of Geta. The original was likely executed in ca. 370 BCE. The arrangement of these two Herakles herms is similar to that in the Villa dei Papiri, where bronze herms representing a Polykleitan and a Skopasian Herakles were contrasted with one another. It should be noted that with this labor completed,
Each of these statues reflects two Roman collecting practices that, if Cicero is any judge, may be associated with the late Hellenistic period. The first is the affection for quantity. The sheer number of sculptures in a single space (the pool) is remarkable and reflects the wealth of the owners in as much as more equals better. In addition, these pieces are all life size and not the ca. 0.50 - 0.90 m generally associated with domestic sculpture. Their setting may have had something to do with this, as they would have been viewed from a certain distance if in or on the other side of the pool, but their size may more than likely have been associated with the second practice, that of collecting “known” pieces. Whether one obtained Greek originals or copies, the Romans were interested in obtaining sculpture that hearkened back to the great Greek masters. While none of these pieces are exact copies, they do represent Roman variants that clearly reflect the styles or types created by Greek sculptors. While some of the domestic statues uncovered in the Greek world were within an established typology, this was not a common feature of such sculpture. Here the statues are within known typologies and two invoke the work of Greek masters (Polykleitos and Skopas), while the Nikes suggest possible associations with Pheidias or Periklean Athens. These imitationes or aemulationes are new and represent a type of sculptural “gallery” seen in the large villas among the Romans, but not among the houses as at Pompeii. None of these sculptures need be an exact replica in order to evoke the sculptor, sculpture, period or style desired and while they exist as Roman statues reflecting Roman tastes and display practices, their Herkles gained the right to dine with the gods and enjoy his earned immortality - a peace and reward perhaps alluded to by the natural surroundings of the garden.

140 As Varro says of his friend Axius’ villa: Tua enim oblitabalis pictis nec minus signis, vestigium ubi sit nullum Lysippi aut Antiphili, et crebra cartoris et pastoris (RR 3.2.5).

141 Reminiscent, if on a smaller scale, of the sculptural galleries at the Villa dei Papiri. Interestingly, no bases associated with any sculpture have been found within the villa, suggesting a conscious preference for outdoor displays. See de Caro (1987), 127.
references to established Greek types suggest that the presentation of identifiable pieces was a new and important consideration for Roman domestic sculpture.\textsuperscript{142}

4.4 Conclusions

This cursory survey of domestic sculpture from Pompeii and Campania illustrates that several aspects of home architecture and decoration seem to be derived from the Greek world, especially in the earliest phases. This borrowing, however, was added to an already native vocabulary of household space and usage which created at the end of the Hellenistic period a truly Roman hybrid domestic culture. The House of the Faun shows that the introduction of peristyle courts, along with axial spacing, placed Campanian domestic architecture into the mainstream of the Mediterranean world in the second century BCE. Peristyles had long been a feature of Greek homes on the mainland and elsewhere, while incipient axial spacing was first seen at Pergamon. Both of these architectural features allowed for more and more dramatic decorative and viewing possibilities in the home. The Tuscan atrium, however, stayed as a main architectural unit and maintained its role as a traffic hub for the cubicula, triclinia and tablina that opened off of it. It is not surprising, then, that such spaces received decoration within the

\textsuperscript{142} The arrangement of the statues around the natatio essentially creates the feel of a Greek gymnasium. The associations among the gymnasium, the Ephebe and Herakles are clear, while the Nikes bring the crowns for the contests in the gymnasium. The Artemis could represent the female athletic ideal in the way that the Ephebe represents the male. This would all suggest a general understanding of the material on the part of the viewer, though any more knowledgeable viewer could have added to this, referencing the Greek past or individual artists or styles. It has been suggested that this house was in the family of the Poppaei and specifically owned by Poppaea Sabina, later Augusta and wife of Nero. Poppaea Sabina’s mother was married to a member of the Scipio family, all suggesting that the various owners of the villa were of a social class likely to have the education and acumen to recognize the various possible interpretations and meanings of the sculptures. For the owner(s) of the villa, see de Caro (1987), 131-133 with references.
Campanian home, as was the case in the Greek world. The more public spaces would also be decorated to proclaim the wealth and taste of the owner.

This also seems to be the case for Roman villas, only villas were decorated on a scale not seen before. The Villa dei Papiri contained a host of sculptures, most notably copies of famous Greek statues in complete and bust form and numerous portraits. These portraits were often of noted individuals from antiquity and the whole presents a picture of a learned collection that matches the supposed philosophical bent of the villa’s owners. The collection is spread throughout the villa and though on a scale previously unknown, the placements, subjects and interrelated themes all look back to a Hellenistic tradition. 

*Atria*, peristyles, *natationes* all provide large areas for display in these villas and can help create more dramatic backdrops for domestic sculpture.

The same may be said of the gardens associated with these villas. Such gardens were apparently unknown among Greek domestic architecture and so became a uniquely Roman display space for domestic sculpture. Roman gardens were decorated with all manner of sculpture, which could be used to create interesting walkways, storyboard tableaux, sylvan vignettes or even *nilus* scenes with the addition of waterways. Gardens provided the opportunity to bring the outdoors in for the Romans and so the sculpture that helped populate these *horti* matched their architectural and horticultural frame. More so than perhaps any other area of the home or villa, the garden was a place where domestic sculpture could be molded to create panoramic areas of thematic interest.

While these garden displays seem to be unique to the Romans, much of what they did with domestic sculpture and where their displays were set within the home were not. While there are some noted differences, in general they parallel a pattern of display and
sculptural typology established earlier in the Hellenistic period. Yet the problem of chronology for many of these buildings has been explored and so a gap between many of the early Imperial buildings and the late Hellenistic period remains. It is likely that any understanding of this gap is to be found among the remains of the mixed Italian and Greek populations on the island of Delos.
CHAPTER 5

THE EVIDENCE FROM HELLENISTIC DELOS

The island of Delos has produced the single largest corpus of domestic sculpture from the Hellenistic period. The most recent catalogues of Delian domestic sculpture list over 260 examples of statues, portraits and reliefs that have been uncovered over the course of the excavations on this island city.\(^1\) To this end, the Delian material has formed the only group of domestic sculptures that has received full-length comprehensive treatments. In 1988, Martin Kreeb investigated the surviving material, along with the excavation notebooks, to examine several issues concerning display contexts and meaning. His emphasis on archaeological and architectural contexts remains fundamental as a methodology for any exploration of domestic sculptural material. Using Kreeb as a springboard, Martina Saunders investigated issues of patronage and subject matter in order to see what sculptural subjects were chosen and why, and if ethnicity played any factor in the choices of subject. While she found that the different ethnic groups on this multi-cultural island played no determining role in subject choice, she was one of the first scholars to take this approach. These two studies paved the way for future research, but many of their conclusions can be looked at anew in light of the

\(^1\) Kreeb (1988) lists 268 examples and Saunders (2001) lists 260. This difference is due to individual interpretations of archaeological context and the level of domestic activity for a given building.
material presented in the previous chapters. These two works have done much of the necessary groundwork in collecting the surviving sculptures and in examining their architectural surroundings. What can now be added to their conclusions is the position of Delian decorative and architectural habits relative to previous and contemporary material. This relationship then adds to our understanding of the material on Delos and sheds new light on some outstanding issues.

As a crossroads of cultures, Delos was in a unique position to absorb and present the domestic customs of its inhabitants. Greeks, Italians, Jews and members of various Eastern ethnic groups all called the island home. These disparate people all lived together and created a society in which each found a place for their own individual cultural institutions. The two oldest representative cultures, the Greek and the Italian, however, shared in the general Hellenistic koinai that ruled the Mediterranean and so as the established élite of the island they also bound these various peoples into a type of cultural homogeneity.

The Greeks had been present from the beginning and Delos’ position as a pan-Ionian sanctuary opened the world of visitors and trade to the island. Whether during the time of Naxos’ control of the island, the era of Athens’ domination, the period of “free Delos” or the final phase of Athenian control, Greeks from around the Mediterranean came to the island to vow secular and religious tributes and establish a strong trade network. Italians seemed to have first arrived on Delos by the mid-third century, but it

---

2 Witness for example the Agora of the Italians, the Koinon of the Poseidoniasts of Beirut, the Synagogue, the Sanctuary of the Syrian Gods, as well as the numerous Hellenic temples and private dedications from individuals from throughout the Mediterranean. See Laidlaw (1933), 201-231.

3 The island was controlled by various Cycladic peoples, though primarily the Naxians, from the 8th to 6th centuries. Peisistratos purified the island during his third tyranny, likely between 540-528 BCE, bringing
was with the victories over the Macedonians in the early second century that strong political ties were established between the Romans and the Delians. By 192 BCE, Roman praetors and consuls began annual pilgrimages to the island to emphasize the growing relationship between the two peoples.\textsuperscript{4} With the declaration of Delos as a free port by the Senate in 166 BCE, intended to frustrate the economy of Rhodes, larger numbers of settlers from Italy began to arrive in order to make their fortune.\textsuperscript{5} A great number of these Italians came from Campania, and inscriptional evidence has shown that a number of the Italian trading families had business interests both at Delos and the port of Puteoli.\textsuperscript{6}

This summary illustrates two key points. First and foremost, the population of the island in the Hellenistic period was extremely multicultural. This multiculturalism was an outgrowth of the island’s position as a free trade port in the late Hellenistic period and it is after 166 BCE that the majority of these “foreigners” settled on Delos. Secondly the economic and social élite within the population belonged to the Greek and Italian peoples. As a great pan-Ionian sanctuary, Delos attracted Greek tourists and traders from all over the Mediterranean and would have been influenced by the major Hellenic powers of the day. The Italians were primarily from Campania and brought the wealth and

---

\textsuperscript{4} On Delos and Rome, see Laidlaw (1933), 201-210.
\textsuperscript{5} The Italian population of Delos expanded after 150 BCE, with the destruction of Corinth in 146 BCE and the formation of the province of Asia in 133 BCE both attracting Italian traders to the island. See Hatzfeld (1912); Laidlaw (1933), 202-203.
\textsuperscript{6} For the trading relationship between Delos and Campania in general, see Musti (1980). Several Italian families had business concerns both at Delos and at Puteoli. For examples, see Frederikson (1984), 299-307.
urbane culture of that area to the island. It is thus very likely that the major architectural and decorative trends analyzed in the previous chapters would have affected the domestic decoration of Delos. This then suggests that, while a heterogeneous population might point to a mixed cultural expression in art and architecture, the people of Delos actually articulated their cultures through a set of Hellenistic koinai.

5.1 General Architecture and Decoration of Delian Houses

The houses on Delos are remarkable for a number of reasons, the most notable of which is the excellent state of preservation for many homes, owing to rapid abandonment and sparse settlement on the island after the end of the first century BCE. These homes range from the smaller dwellings of the majority of the population to the expansive mansions of the island’s well-to-do, providing an excellent case study for examining the architecture of a whole society. More than mere ground plans, large sections and even almost complete homes survive, some of the larger to multiple stories. Even those houses that do not have surviving upper stories have interior walls or sections of walls that rise to a significant height, allowing for a particularly clear understanding of architectural form and space. This survival is also reflected in the interior decoration of the houses. Many of the homes have large sections of painted wall plaster still extant, while the numerous figural and non-figural mosaics are duly famous. Aside from these fixed items, the archaeological assemblages from the homes indicate an abundance of decoration, from terracottas, appliqués and the like to sculpture, both free-standing and relief. Thus, like the other sites examined in this study, the volume of architectural and decorative material
excavated at Delos allows for several observations to be made concerning the general forms that this material took.

The architectural plans for the houses suggest that the population of Delos conformed to the main types of homes present in the Mediterranean of the day. The home centered on a peristyle court with its several rooms opening off of this main feature, often with stairs leading to upper levels. These rooms included various exedrae, dining rooms, utility rooms (latrines and kitchens) and rooms of indeterminate or multifunctional purposes. Delian homes do lack anything that can be interpreted as a pastas or prostas, but the general architectural arrangement of the interior rooms conforms to similar patterns to those found elsewhere. It has been suggested that Delian houses bear a certain similarity to the homes excavated at Priene, based on the axial placement of the so-called oikos at the back of the house opposite the entrance to the peristyle, but any such comparison is misleading. Such a link is overly focused on the notion of Typenhäuser and fails to take into account the varied architectural plans of the homes that existed on the island. In addition, it fails to notice a chronological division that seems evident in the remains.

During the time of Delian independence, it appears that there was a relatively small population that built its houses within limited areas on the island. The areas of habitation were close to the port and near the theater, which was built in 305 BCE, and generally indicate a haphazard arrangement of homes and streets. From the little material that remains, it seems that a more normative house type existed at this time that

---

7 These normative types can also be referred to as Normalhäuser and Idealhäuser. For such Typenhäuser, see in particular, Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 244. Against such interpretations at Delos, see Kreeb (1988), 10-11; Trümper (1998), 115-119, 156.

8 See Bruneau (1968), 634-640; Trümper (1998), 126-128; Sanders (2001), 52-53.
took the form of an elongated rectangle with a central courtyard and rooms that ran alongside in two opposing rows. As the island became more prosperous during the period of renewed Athenian hegemony, and individuals wished to add to these plans, they realized that they could do so only by significant alterations to the houses or by reduced architectural forms. Thus any renovations ended with truncated versions of desired rooms, often placed in unfavorable locations. Therefore houses of the later Hellenistic period on the island tended to be larger in order to incorporate newly desired rooms, and more square in form in order to provide a better balance between overall length and width. This change in form can also be witnessed in the vertical expansion of the homes at this time, with several two and three story dwellings in existence. These homes were probably created after the influx of wealth that came to the island once it was declared a free port in 166 BCE and after Rhodes was shut down as a competitor in 130 BCE. No set architectural form or house type can thus be posited for the island, save perhaps in the overall size of the homes in the later Hellenistic phase. These houses were often three times the size of other Late Classical and Hellenistic homes and represented a level of wealth and luxury hitherto unseen.

As there can be no *Normalhaus* associated with the remains on Delos, attempts to link house form to any previous site or house type in a purely linear fashion are faulty. This is not to say, however, that there are no links to previous architectural forms. It was

---

9 Trümper (1998), 156.
11 See Hoepfner and Schwandner (1986), 243. While these houses were larger than their Classical counterparts, Trümper has noted that the homes on Delos were smaller than many contemporary houses in the Mediterranean. The largest house on Delos, the House of the Diadoumenos, covered an area of 900 m², while the majority of the wealthier homes were in the 300-650 m² range. The largest houses at Morgantina, for example, were 1250 m². See Trümper (1998), 166-168. The dense habitation in the island’s residential neighborhoods may have necessitated such smaller ground plans for the homes, and therefore account for architectural opulence in size through building up rather than out. See Westgate (2000), 425.
once thought that the earliest example of a peristyle house found on the island is the House of Kerdon. The dating of this particular building has been revised and it seems likely that it dates to the late second or early first century BCE. This would then push the advent of peristyle homes on the island into the mid-second century, a time frame that roughly corresponds to similar developments at Pergamon and in Campania.\(^\text{12}\) The construction of the peristyle house on Delos also shows affinities with these two sites in the inclusion of an oikos complex of rooms. As at Pergamon and Pompeii, this form includes one large room, possibly for dining and entertaining purposes, flanked by two side rooms. Often this series of rooms is placed at the back of the home, opposite the house’s main entrance.\(^\text{13}\) It may be that with the advent of increased trade brought about by Roman hegemony in the Mediterranean, the peristyle and the oikos complex became preferred architectural forms that could best display the wealth and status of an individual.\(^\text{14}\)

To illustrate these ideas two houses with few sculptural remains may be used to show this emphasis on previous architectural ideas. The House of the Trident is located just north of the theater in an area of extensive domestic habitation. While this house is particularly well-decorated, several of the surrounding homes are of equal size and proportion. Thus, while the House of the Trident is one of the most lavishly decorated on the island, its architecture and plan should not be viewed as atypical. The house itself is

\(^{12}\) See Bruneau (1968), 641-658 for the dating of the House of Kerdon. With the revised dating, he still sees no conflict with Chamonard (1922), 71 in ascribing this date to the advent of the peristyle, as no earlier examples are known. On peristyles in Delian homes, see Trümper (1998), 40-52.

\(^{13}\) On such oeci maiores room complexes at Delos and links to Pergamon, see Chamonard (1922), 170-174, 404-410; Wulf-Rheidt (1998), 313. Trümper ultimately sees these room complexes as a status symbol, along with the associated oeci minores and exedrae. See Trümper (1998), 17, 52-63.

\(^{14}\) See Trümper (1998), 128-138, 150-151. Rauh (1993), 193-249, looks at some questions of domestic wealth and status when he examines several of the Delian homes whose owners are known to be Italian merchants.
of rectangular form with one main entrance off the street leading directly into one central peristyle courtyard.\textsuperscript{15} From this courtyard one can travel straight to the central and spacious \textit{oikos} or move to one of several side rooms, which range in function from storage to dining rooms. To the right of the entranceway lie stairs that lead to a second story that does not survive, and the northwestern-most room opens onto the street at two places, suggesting a shop. What one notices immediately from the plan of this house is the axial alignment from the entrance to the back of the large \textit{oikos}, in a line that is completely unobstructed from the front door to the back wall. This emphasis on axial views is similar to what was seen at Pergamon in the House of Attalos and at Pompeii in the House of the Faun, but here the view is far more direct and runs the length of the home. The axial view as seen in a plan of the house, however, is misleading, for while the line of sight from the door to the back of the \textit{oikos} is unobstructed, two sets of stairs, one at the entrance to the peristyle and the other at the entrance to the \textit{oikos}, break the floor into three ground levels that alter the impact of the axial plan. Decoration in the house took many forms, including mosaic, painting and several sculptures. These include sets of carved lions and bulls on the top of two of the columns of the peristyle and the head of a small-scale sculpture.\textsuperscript{16}

This emphasis on axial arrangements and sight lines is also clear in the House of the Dolphins.\textsuperscript{17} The house is rectangular in form, with a corridor leading to a courtyard and an \textit{oikos} group of rooms beyond. There is a second entrance from a side street that leads directly into the courtyard. Opposite this secondary entrance lies a series of three

\textsuperscript{15} See Chamonard (1922), 27-29, 139-152.
\textsuperscript{16} See Kreeb (1988), 142-145; Sanders (2001), 63-64.
\textsuperscript{17} Paris (1884), 475-486.
rooms accessible from the courtyard. Here the line of sight from the open door of the front entrance, through the peristyle court and back to the main room of the house is even more pronounced.\textsuperscript{18} The axis from door to room mirrors that of the House of the Faun and while no sculptures were found in this house, the figural wall painting and mosaics, one signed by the artist, attest to the importance decoration played here. The axial arrangement, as in the House of the Trident, emphasizes a visual quality for the home and likely placed the decorative goods in the house on display for those immediately entering.

This wealth is also displayed in the many surviving examples of wall paintings and mosaics from the island. It has been noted that over the course of the Hellenistic period, these two decorative media increase considerably, such that four times as many mosaics appear in Delian homes compared to Olynthos, and nearly every room in a Delian home has painted wall plaster, compared to just a limited number of rooms from Olynthos.\textsuperscript{19} In general, the decorated rooms at Delos had both media and the two played off of one another. Rooms that contained tesselated mosaics often had walls with more elaborate wall paintings, while rooms with more plain tile mosaics (broken tile pieces set on edge) had undecorated white plaster.\textsuperscript{20} All types of mosaics are present on the island; most often they are non-figural with a decorative band of guilloche, wave or geometric patterns, though several figural mosaics attest to the wealth of some of the homes.\textsuperscript{21} The wall painting consists primarily of Masonry Style decoration that imitates the appearance of public buildings, emulating either ashlar masonry or colored paneling. This accounts

\textsuperscript{18} Kreeb (1988), 42, 227-230.
\textsuperscript{19} Westgate (1997), 111-115.
\textsuperscript{20} Westgate (2000), 393.
\textsuperscript{21} On the mosaics on the island, see Bruneau (1972). Other possibilities for flooring existed depending on the relative costs and functions of the rooms, with specialized flooring for water related rooms, cut stone decoration and pebble mosaic all present.
for the decoration on the lower bands of the wall; the upper frieze is often decorated with painted molding, stucco and the occasional figural frieze of repetitive images. 22 The analysis of the paintings and mosaics from the houses at Delos also makes it clear that a number of examples come from upper stories. This marks a significant difference between the previous homes examined and those from Delos. 23 Upper stories rarely survive elsewhere and those instances where decoration seems to have fallen from an upper level are few, suggesting that upper stories were not as decorated as ground floors. This may be an accident of preservation, but the attention to second and third story decoration is new at Delos and may imply a different social structuring of domestic space, though the sloping nature of the island’s topography and the dense habitation areas may also have necessitated building up rather than out. 24

These architectural and decorative patterns hold true for much of the domestic remains across the island and so make Delos ideal for the study of domestic decoration, especially sculpture. Given the studies that have recently been carried out on Delian domestic sculpture, let alone the numerous volumes produced by the French excavators, to reiterate these in depth would be superfluous. Kreeb and Sanders have created detailed catalogues of Delian domestic sculpture and analyzed several aspects of display and

22 Westgate (2000), 397-400. For Delian domestic painting in general, see Bruno (1985), esp. 31-54 for Masonry Style painting.
23 On which see Hellmann (1992), 423-426, sv. ὑπερώδιον.
24 Trümper notes that the second stories on Delos were often separately accessible and habitable. The physical need to build up on the island, coupled with the variation in room use and design among the homes, likely negates the simplistic view that upper stories were more private than lower. See Trümper (1998), 147-151, 156. Westgate remarks that unlike many other homes at this time, the upper stories on the houses at Delos were made of stone and not mud-brick, and so could have supported greater weights, such as statues or mosaics. See Westgate (2000), 425, esp. n. 102.
meaning. Thus what follows is a select look at a few examples from the island that best illustrate and illuminate some of the issues raised in these various works: how was domestic sculpture displayed in the home, what types were used and how did this material fit into the cultural and artistic background of the island?

5.2 The House of the Herm

As one begins to ascend the lower slopes of Mount Kynthos, one passes through an area named after the principal stream of the island, the Inopos. This area contained many of the temples and shrines to the foreign gods on the island, but at the base of this terrace stood one of the finest houses on the island, the House of the Herm. Discovered in 1948, this house is remarkable in several respects, most notably for its plan, which is preserved to three and a half stories in height. It seems that the house was constructed and occupied during the second and first centuries BCE, based on the architecture, plan and small finds, excluding pottery. In plan the house has a large courtyard on the ground floor with an artificial grotto at the southern end. To the north are a large oikos d and two attached rooms e and f. To the east was a small room with painted wall plaster and several niches in the wall. The second floor also had a peristyle courtyard, though only the southeastern rooms are preserved. The third floor had one large room, room l, and a separate entrance from the outside. The half floor above had only a few rooms to the south. Latrines on the ground floor seem to be a later addition, and the house was

---

25 In general, this study follows Sanders and her catalogue of finds when discussing what is or is not a domestic building. As in her study, the Establishment of the Poseidoniasts is excluded.

26 For the excavation and architectural study of this house, see Delorme (1953). On the finds from the house, especially the sculpture, see Marcafé (1953); Kreeb (1988), 200-215. Kreeb uncovered an Attic New Style coin within the wall between rooms g and h, confirming at least a late Hellenistic date for that wall’s construction. See Kreeb (1985b), 93-95. The coin is an earlier issue dated to 200-180 BCE, though it was likely in circulation until the last quarter of the second century.
within the circuit of the wall of Traiarius, suggesting continuous occupation of the home at least until 69 BCE. A later Roman building lay atop the northeastern corner of the house.  

Aside from extravagance, the plan of the House of the Herm illustrates a clear emphasis on axial arrangements and sightlines within the home. From the top floor of the house one has a clear view down the main stairwell of the home, through the courtyard and into the front rooms of the home. This emphasis on sightlines and axial planning has been observed previously at Pergamon and Pompeii and so may reflect an architectural trend “in the air” in the second century BCE, though the execution of these ideas via a peristyle or *atrium* arrangement varied. This emphasis also demonstrates a desire to incorporate “viewing” into the overall plan of the home and this seems to be reinforced with the large number of statues and other decorative elements that were uncovered in the home.

Adding together all the fragments, over thirty sculptures and statue bases were uncovered in the House of the Herm, of which the original setting of four may be reasonably reconstructed. The first is a statue base that stood at the back of room d and may have formed the focal point of the main axial view down the central stairwell. This base likely held a marble statue that was slightly under life-size, of which no remnants have been found. What is most remarkable about this base is that its surviving inscription is generally held to refer to the great fourth century sculptor

---

27 See Delorme (1953), 446, 448, 452, 475.
28 Delos inv. E 831. See Kreeb (1988), 205-206, cat. no. S 24.9; Sanders (2001), 222, cat. no St. 16. Marcadé (1953), 567, suggests that the base stood on the gneiss foundation against the near wall of room d, between rooms e and f.
29 Kreeb (1988), 205, estimates the height based on the size of the base, its cuttings and the position of the left foot.
Praxiteles. The inscription is reconstructed as [Πραξιτελ]ς ἐποίησεν and is generally compared to a similarly signed base from the Athenian agora (Agora Inv. I 4165) that has similar dimensions and that also uses the same form ἐποίησεν.\(^{30}\) Clearly the date of the base does not match that of the house and so Bruneau quickly realized that the base was likely moved to the home from its original location.\(^{31}\) There is, however, no independent evidence that the artist ever worked on the island, or had any commissions from the island and so either the base came from off the island or, more likely, the signature on the base is an identifying label or a forgery.\(^{32}\) The letter forms are identified as fourth century types and so the signature may be retrospective in style, designed to lend an air of authenticity to, or at least provide name recognition for, the statue.\(^{33}\) No matter what the origin or intent of the base, however, it is clear that the owners of the home intended one to believe that they owned a statue by the fourth century master and so it was given pride of place for all to see.

Within the courtyard, two more settings for sculptures may be determined. The first is for a nymph that was likely placed in a niche in the grotto. The body was discovered in the niche, while the head for the piece was found in room c. The statue stands 0.92 m tall and is missing its right arm from the shoulder.\(^{34}\) Notable is the face, which is highly classical in form, the torsion in the pose and the deeply cut and

---

\(^{30}\) As opposed to ἐποίησεν, as on Agora Inv. I 4568, the other signed base of Praxiteles from the Athenian Agora. See Marcadé (1953), 567-568. See also Ajootian (1996), 95-97 on these bases with references. She does not include the base from Delos in her analysis of bases signed by the artist.

\(^{31}\) Bruneau (1968), 640-641.

\(^{32}\) Sanders (2001), 73, n. 65. As a fragmentary inscription, it is also possible that a different name altogether belongs in the reconstruction. For those sculptors known to have worked on Delos and whose names are recorded on inscribed bases, see Marcadé (1969), 55-82, Delos, 297.

\(^{33}\) This type of retrospective inscription implying an idea of veneration, and thus providing a type of authenticity, has been observed on Archaistic Roman inscriptions. See Aleshire (1999).

voluminous drapery below the waist. The figural type is generally reminiscent of fourth century “Praxitelean” types and Marcadé uses early fourth century comparanda for the piece, most notably a votive relief from Athens and statues of Aphrodite of the so-called Arles type. The figure itself could be an Aphrodite, but it is more likely, given the setting, that the piece represents a nymph, which was influenced by Aphrodite types. The statue was placed inside a niche in a grotto with an elaborate water system, suggesting a type of indoor nymphaeum. Precisely what purpose such a structure would have served is unclear, though it seems likely that this would have been a focal point in the courtyard and provided a dramatic setting in which to place the statue.

Also in the courtyard was a herm, likely set up on the southwest side. All that remains is the herm shaft, along with its base. The head, the genitals and the lateral tenons are all missing, though one can tell that the head was that of a youth, given the lack of hair at the base of the neck and chin. The back is more cursorily carved than the front, suggesting a placement against a wall, and this is where the shaft has been placed within the house. A particular difficulty has arisen with the interpretation given the piece by the excavators. The herm was thought to have stood against the wall in the

35 Marcadé (1953), 533-538. Relief = Nat. Mus. Athens 1338. The Aphrodite from Arles type is known from four later versions. See Ajootian (1996), 127, with references. Ridgway (1976) believes the Arles type to be later than the fourth century.

36 It does seem that the grotto and its water supply were planned with the construction of the house and were not later additions, suggesting that the whole complex, including the statue, was a conscious design plan. See Kreeb (1988), 38. Marcadé (1953), 530, believes that the missing right arm should be reconstructed as pouring a libation. Though this may imply a religious act, there is nothing to suggest that the statue or the grotto served any religious function. The action would work well with the aqueous setting of the statue. Jockey in Marcadé et al. (1996), 126, notes that the statue has no plinth and so it would have sat directly on the floor of the niche. This leads to a curious viewing angle where one is almost looking down at the figure, providing a very different experience from, say, the Nike of Samothrace whose water based setting may have been comparable.


38 Marcadé (1953), 528.
southwestern section of the courtyard in a location immediately behind what has been interpreted as an offering table. This marble table is extremely ornate with carved volutes, lions’ feet and other decorative elements, yet its interpretation as an offering table is open to question. The table is identified based on some “traces of combustion” found at the base of the west wall and on the proximity of the herm shaft. These traces of combustion are not fully explained and while the herm has been restored in the southwestern section of the peristyle, it was originally found in the northwestern corner.

There does not seem to have been any traces of burning on the table itself and the restored location of the herm is open to interpretation. Any suggestion of evidence for household cult activity associated with this herm is therefore suspect and even if the table was for religious purposes, it begs the question how close do two items have to be (the table and the herm) to be associated with one another?

The fourth piece whose location has been identified is another herm, this time with a head and easily identified as Hermes from an accompanying inscription. The sculpture was not from the courtyard, but from a niche behind a bench in room L on the second floor of the home. Several elements about the location of the statue are noteworthy. The first is that the piece was discovered on the second floor of a home. The vast majority of the material examined so far has come from rooms located on the ground floors of homes. In those instances where material may have fallen from an upper story, there is no definitive proof as to where the pieces stood originally. If the steep

39 For the table, see Marcadé (1953), 576-579.
40 For the interpretation of the table as an “offering” table, see Marcadé (1953), 579. The “traces of combustion” could be the remnants of a host of activities that could even post-date the house’s occupation. On the location of the herm shaft, see Marcadé (1953), 527.
The geography of this area forced homeowners to build up rather than out, creating homes with more stories than usual, it is still curious that such decorative material would have been placed in an area away from the more public locations within the home. Westgate has witnessed a similar phenomenon when it comes to the locations of certain wall paintings and mosaics on the island. In his study, he sees a broad pattern on Delos where there is an increase in the amount of space dedicated to “public” activities and where the best rooms for such activities are on the second floor. In the House of the Herm there is a separate entrance to the second floor from the east, indicating that these rooms could have been accessed either from the stairway from the ground floor peristyle or on their own. From the inventories in the Temple of Apollo, it is known that rooms or indeed entire apartments could be let out separately from the ground floor. It is therefore quite likely that the room in which the herm was found was either a “private” room for the wealthy owners located on the second floor, or that it was part of a suite of rooms that was rented out and formed a separate oikos unit. That a herm is present in this location, then, may be reasonable, as it demarcates either public from private space, space of one floor from another, or the spaces used by different oikos members. It also shows that second stories were now being decorated in a manner that had previously only been associated with the first floors of homes.

42 Westgate (2000), 424-425. The precise social phenomenon that began such a practice is difficult to judge. Westgate’s tentative suggestion (424) that a relaxing of restrictions on women’s movement in the home was the cause of such a change seems untenable, given that the spatially determined segregation of women in the Classical home was unlikely. See Nevett (1994). Certainly Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994) seem incorrect when they suggest that the upper floors in Delian homes were reserved for female occupants (298).

43 On the inscriptions associated with this phenomenon on Delos, see Hellmann (1992), 423.

44 For a complete examination of the function of upper story rooms on Delos, see Trümper (1998), 90-106. The work of Trümper (1998) and Westgate (2000) illustrates that whatever the function of the rooms the decoration found on the upper stories at Delos is equal to that on the ground floors, suggesting an equal status.
In addition, the type of herm represented is interesting. The herm is of a type generally thought to have originated with the fifth century Athenian sculptor Alkamenes. Representing a fully mature and bearded Hermes, the herm is known in several later versions, most notably from Pergamon and Ephesos, and is thought to show Hermes Propylaios based on the inscriptions accompanying the herms and an associated passage in Pausanias.\(^{45}\) This particular interpretation has recently been cast into doubt, as has the relative relationship of each type to the fifth century original. It is likely that Alkamenes did create a herm of Hermes with certain archaistic features, but that later versions in the copy series became diverse in their interpretation. The herm could also have become part of a generic archaistic vocabulary for such pieces.\(^{46}\) Within such a tradition, the herm from this house is one of the earliest known of this type and supports the idea of a generic vocabulary given its differences from either the Pergamon or Ephesos type. Marcadé would place the herm type represented into the fourth century, based mostly on the archaizing features of the beard and parallels found among herm-pillar supports like that associated with the statue of Sisyphos II from the Daokhos monument at Delphi.\(^{47}\) The Pergamon and Ephesos types have more natural beards and illustrate other differences in the treatment of the hair and eyes. Placing the origin of the House of the Herm type in the fourth century would place it beyond the chronology for the copy series of the other two types and reinforce the notion that a generic archaistic herm was created in the fourth century.

\(^{45}\) Paus. 1.22.8. The Pergamon version was also a domestic piece, thought to be Hadrianic in date and originally standing in the House of Attalos. See supra, 105, n. 147.

\(^{46}\) For this interpretation, with relevant references, see Francis (1998). She also discusses the accompanying inscriptions on the Pergamon and Ephesos herms.

\(^{47}\) Marcadé (1953), 500-510. The archaizing features of the beard suggest a style that begins in the fourth century and carries on into the Hellenistic period. See Marcadé (1953), 504-507.
century, which then spawned a series of later variations. Though the type seemingly had its origins in the fourth century, the herm here has been dated to ca. 88 BCE based on an accompanying inscription that reads as follows:

Διονυσίως Πακονίως
Γναίοι κεφτέρος
'Εμεῖ
καὶ συνήθει
ἐπὶ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀστήμωδος τοῦ Σωτῆρας
'Αυτόνομο Πακονίου Ἀρτεμισίως. 49

The inscription notes that Dionysios dedicated this not only to Hermes, but also to his συνήθεις, a term that usually refers to some kind of religious or professional collective. The precise nature of this collective is impossible to tell, though Hermaists or Competalists would seem likely candidates. 50 This is also one of the earliest attestations to an organized cult of Artemis Soteira on the island. Given the importance of the island to the worship of Artemis, that one of her priesthoods, especially if recently established, is used as a marker is not surprising. This cult may even have held special significance for the home, given that fragments of a small statue of Artemis Soteira was found in the courtyard, likely from an upper floor. 51

48 Marcadé (1953), 509-510, suggests Kallimakhos as a possible alternative to Alkimenes for this particular archaistic herm type, though no specific artist, nor three separate herm “originals”, need be sought. Willers (1967), 90-91, sees this herm as a version of the Propylaios type and it should be seen as a generic type replicated frequently and possibly inspired by an original created by Alkimenes. See Francis (1998), 67.

49 Marcadé (1953), 510-512; Kreeb (1988), 209. The Paconii were well known Italian residents at Delos, who seem to have taken an active part in the religious life of the island. See Hatzfeld (1912), 62-64.

50 A Dionysios Paconius, slave of an Aulus Paconius, is mentioned in a list of Competalists (ID 1764), and the priest here named was also a Competalist (ID 1761). Both of these inscriptions may suggest a familial link to this cult. Hermaists would make sense given the inscription, but this group was generally comprised of only free men and freedmen. Both herms and Comptales were associated with boundaries. There is no definitive proof as to what group the συνήθεις specifies. See Marcadé (1953), 510-511.

51 Delos inv. no. A 5633 σ-β. See Marcadé (1953), 542-548; Kreeb (1988), 202, cat. no. S 24.2; Sanders (2001), 234-235, cat. no. Ste 50. Given the absence of a baldric or quiver among the fragments, Marcadé
In all, the herm is interesting for several elements. In the first place, it identifies the upper floors as a place of sculptural decoration, something generally not seen before this time and something that may be particular to Delos, given the number of mosaics and paintings also associated with upper floors. While this location may be new, it does seem that upper floors on Delos were locations for more public rooms or even rented out as apartments, suggesting that the type of room where these statues were found is similar to previous examples. In addition, the type of herm places it within the general tradition of a famous herm typology, that of the archaistic Hermes herm by Alkamanes. The dating of this version seems to support the notion of a generic, rather than a specific, copy series for the Alkamanes herm, something further buttressed by another Hermes Propylaios herm that stood by the propylon to the Apollo sanctuary. That herm has been dated to 341/340 BCE based on its accompanying inscription and identified as a Hermes Propylaios, even though it is heavily mutilated. With comparisons to a third herm from Delos, the propylon herm has been noted as the earliest “version” of the Alkamenes herm and in the tradition of the Pergamene type. All three of these “Hermes Propylaios” herms attest to both the popularity of this type and the variety of versions that were available for public or private commissions.

The herm in the house seems to be performing the usual duties of marking space, though whether the demarcation is between public and private, or between main and

---

(1953) suggests that the figure held a torch and was thus a representation of Artemis Soteira, citing the base as complementary evidence. The figure seems a variation of the Artemis Rospigliosi type, though the arms here are lowered and there is a bracelet on the right wrist. This may suggest a syncretization between Artemis and Aphrodite types, as Aphrodite is usually the goddess that wears such jewelry. See Sanders (2001), 235.

52 See Hermary (1979), 137-149. The comparison herm is Delos inv. no. A 6558. Francis (1998), 65, also notes that a later inscription (274 BCE) from Delos suggests that a relief of the Graces also stood by the entrance to the sanctuary, a group also associated with the herm at Athens (Paus. 1.22.8).
leased property, is difficult to say. A clue may come from the dedicatory inscription with the mention of the συνιστήσις. Though speculative, it may be that the upper story, with its separate entrance, was rented out or used as a meeting hall for the association to which the homeowner belonged. This may account for the inclusion of a bench in the room as well as the two entrances to the second floor, the main stairwell that ran up the home’s main axis and the separate entrance. There was no indication of any cult activity associated with this herm, but the religious nature of the inscription suggests that the piece was dedicated with religion, or at least cult activity, in mind. Dionysios may have been marking private versus collective space when he erected this well known type of herm within the home.

In addition to these four pieces, many other sculptures were uncovered in various areas of the home. On the ground floor, an Artemis and its base and an Aphrodite were uncovered in the courtyard. In addition, the head of a satyr, a base and several fragments were found in room d. Going to the second floor, the statue of an unidentified female, a Tyche and a statue base were found on the floor landing h. On

53 The Artemis is the Artemis Soteira mentioned above. Though found in the courtyard it seems to have fallen from the second floor. See supra, 208, n. 51. The Aphrodite is Delos inv. no. A 5631. See Marcadé (1953), 563-565; Kreeb (1988), 201, cat. no. S 24.1; Sanders (2001), 229, cat. no. Ste 36. Marcadé (1953) refers to the piece as an Aphrodite-Pudica (though in Marcadé (1969), 231, n. 6, he links it with the Knidia), while Kreeb sees it as a version of the Aphrodite-Medici type. As the four fragments to the piece join to provide only the torso and legs to the knees, any identifiable gesture, position or iconography is missing. It is likely a generic semi-draped Aphrodite with possible references to many specific Aphrodite types.


55 The unidentified female is Delos inv. no. A 4200. See Marcadé (1953), 548-553; Kreeb (1988), 207-208, cat. no. S 24.14; Delos 262-263, cat no. 103; Sanders (2001), 230, cat. no. Ste 37. The figure is identified as an Aphrodite by Marcadé, and followed by Kreeb, with links to the fifth century type known as the Aphrodite-Dora Pamphili. The Tyche is Delos inv. no. A 5632. See Marcadé (1953), 558-563; Kreeb (1988), 207, cat. no. S 24.13; Sanders (2001), 237, cat. no. Ste 56. The statue is unfinished. The base is
the third floor came a herm and a Herakles Farnese from room r. Of these pieces, two in particular are worth noting. The first is the satyr head from room d. The piece is sculpted from a dark shist, perhaps to imitate bronze, and may be associated with a shist base from the house. If this were the case, then the satyr would have been part of a larger, multi-figural group, something rare in domestic sculpture. In addition, Marcadé believes that this satyr, along with another from elsewhere, betray an Egyptian origin and suggests that there was an Egyptian workshop on the island. This idea will be dealt with below, but it is more likely that the satyr simply had certain stylistic elements that were popular throughout the Mediterranean, including Egypt.

The second is the herm from room r, which illustrates some personal traits in the rugged jaw-line, the deep-set eyes and the rather small and narrow nose and mouth. This has led some to see the piece as a portrait, or what Marcadé sees more correctly as a “pseudo-portrait”. While more individualistic than many herms, the piece simply references the gymnasium as the head has a fillet and a painted caduceus on the shaft implies Hermes. He, along with Herakles, was the god of the gymnasium and the Herakles Farnese was found in the same room.


57 Based on the size of the base. See Marcadé (1953), 558.

58 Marcadé (1953), 557. For his general ideas concerning an Egyptian workshop on Delos, see Marcadé (1952), 407-467 and esp. 129 and 133 for the two satyr heads. The other satyr head was found in Shop Γ of Insula V and is Delos inv. no. A 5329. See Kreeb (1988), 314, S 55.7; Sanders (2001), 244, cat. no. Ste 78.

59 Marcadé (1953), 516-524 with references. The notion that there are some elements reminiscent of royal portrait types, especially the portraiture of Ptolemy III, has been refuted by Marcadé, whose own analysis shows elements ascribed to Skopas, Praxiteles and Lysippos, all suggesting a generic typology.
All of these findspots confirm the importance of the courtyard as an area of display, in addition to room d on the ground floor that also contained the Praxiteles base. The landing h is an unusual location, though it may have been appropriate given that one would have passed these pieces going up the eastern stairwell to the second floor rooms. Depending on their precise location, they may even have been visible from the courtyard looking up the stairs.\textsuperscript{60} Room r also seems to have received some attention, again confirming the notion that, at Delos, upper rooms could be as decorated as ground floor rooms. Interestingly, no sculptural remains were uncovered in room g. This room has a prominent location off of the courtyard, has a decorated floor mosaic and fine Masonry Style polychromy on the walls. Given the raised border in the room it probably served as a dining room and two niches are located in the east and south walls. These niches would have been prime locations for the display of domestic statuary, though it should be noted that among the numerous wall niches uncovered in the houses on the island, only two were found with statue bases \textit{in situ}.\textsuperscript{61}

The House of the Herm thus shows what possibilities could exist in the realm of domestic sculpture. Elaborate treatments like nymphaea could be used, as could more simple display of individual statues. References to famous sculptors or sculptures of the past could show off the wealth and taste of the homeowner. The Praxiteles base was a reference to a great master of the past and the archaistic inscription was likely not to fool anyone, but rather to illustrate connoisseurship. The “Alkamenes” herm also was in the tradition of a famed original, but illustrates how a particular piece from the past could evolve over time into numerous variants. Rather than being a slavish copy, the type

\textsuperscript{60} Kreeb (1988), 37-40.  
\textsuperscript{61} Kreeb (1988), 250-251; Sanders (2001), 251-252.
likely evoked the original as perhaps any archaistic herm of this type would. The overall wealth of the home is evidenced by the more than 30 fragments of sculpture that were uncovered there, suggesting a sculptural display unparalleled in the Greek world. This display covered all floors and areas of the home, though again the courtyard and andrones were the prime display areas. It is noteworthy, however, that much of the surviving mosaic and painted materials are rather simple in comparison. What has survived shows Masonry Style walls and plain mosaic, though more elaborate types may not have survived. While the total number of sculptures suggests a vast display of material, little can be said about any thematic unity among the decorative pieces. A similar house, in terms of decorative finds, however, may allow for a better interpretation of the decoration on the whole.

5.3 House of the Masks

Located in a quarter of the island named after this large insula, the Insula of the Masks contains four separate houses, the most famous and lavishly decorated of which is the House of the Masks.\(^{62}\) Like the House of the Herm, this large residence is centered on a peristyle courtyard and decoration consists of wall paintings, mosaics and sculpture. The house seems to have been built in the second half of the second century, after much of the construction had been completed elsewhere in the area, and occupied until the end of the Hellenistic period.\(^{63}\) One entered the house from a rather long corridor that led

---

\(^{62}\) The insula is often referred to as the Insula of the Masks and the four houses are labeled A-D, with the House of the Masks being House B. See Chamonard (1933a); Chamonard (1933b); Kreeb (1988), 36, 230-236; Sanders (2001), 74-76.

\(^{63}\) For the construction of the home, see Chamonard (1933a), 110-158. A lamp was uncovered in the excavations that came from the workshop of Aristion, suggesting occupation into the late Hellenistic period.
into the courtyard d, with several rooms leading off of it. The central reception room of the house is room g, which contained the *opus tessellatum* mosaic after which the house is named. The central part of the mosaic contains a series of *tromp-l’œil* cubes, while the outer band consists of a floral garland into which are placed a series of theatrical masks.\(^4^4\)

It is also with this room that the sculpture uncovered is to be associated.

The only piece of sculpture that was found *in situ* was a herm base found just outside the door. This base seems to have been for a bronze herm, though no remains of the head, nor any inscription, was found with it.\(^6^5\) The placement of the herm is in line with what has been observed elsewhere; the location allows for immediate and maximum viewing potential upon entering the home and was located beside the entrance to the *oecus maior*, the most public of the home’s rooms. The other four pieces of sculpture located in the house were uncovered in the debris of room g. These include a portrait statue, a standing semi-nude male, a draped female and a seated semi-nude male.\(^6^6\)

The portrait statue is fairly well preserved and just under life-size at 1.28 m. It represents a standing male with a mantle draped over his left shoulder. His head, missing the nose, tilts slightly up and to the left, while his right arm comes across the body to hold

---

\(^{4^4}\) Kreeb (1988), 235, associates nine of the ten masks present as images to be associated with Tragedy. Bruneau and Ducat (1966), 156, would associate nine of the ten masks with New Comedy, following Pollux *Onomasticon* 4.143-154, as was seemingly the case at Pompeii in the House of the Faun. See supra, 144, n. 21. The one non-dramatic mask is number 3, which is either generic or satyric.

\(^{6^5}\) See Chamonard (1933a), 130; Kreeb (1988), 233, cat. no. S 29.6; Sanders (2001), 202, cat. no. H 36.

the mantle. The left arm, missing its hand, hangs down free. The exposed right shoulder is powerfully modeled and the mantle is deeply drilled and thickly rendered, with decoration that includes a tassel and a border pattern. The head on the figure shows some individual traits in the high cheekbones, deep-set eyes and fixed countenance, yet most noticeable is the generic classicism of its form in relation to the other more individualized portraits from the island. The hairstyle even seems “Polykleitan,” with its compacted curls and round “bowl cut” form. This mixture of individual and idealized elements has suggested to some that the statue may represent a Romanized Greek or a Hellenized Roman, but it should rather be seen as an example of the multiplicity of styles available to the artists and patrons of this multicultural island. Found in the general debris of room g, it may be that this statue fell from the second story, again suggesting upper floors as an area of prime display.

The standing semi-nude male, draped female and seated semi-nude male have all proved elusive to scholars in determining precise subject matter. The semi-nude male is broken at the neck and missing its head, right arm and left forearm. It has a cloak draped over its left shoulder that falls onto the extended left arm. Traces of long hair remain on the back of the sculpture and an unfinished support remains in the form of a tree trunk. The overall body has a pronounced S-curve and smooth and youthful musculature. The proportions of this figure are close to those of the portrait statue found with it and so Chamonard has suggested that the two go together as pendants. Sculptural pendants, however, tend to be a phenomenon found in Roman Imperial times and between

---

67 Michalowski (1932), 61-62. Sanders (2001), 180, suggests the combination of styles and influences. Her comparison to Delos inv. A 4142 is misleading, as this figure is also an under life-sized male with a mantle, but the two are stylistically quite different. See Sanders (2001), 181-182, cat. no. P 7, with references.
sculptures that have a thematic or typological link greater than mere proportions. The long hair has suggested to several scholars the possibility of either Apollo or Dionysos, the two gods often represented as youthful with long locks. Both are a possibility, with an Apollo appropriate to the island in general and a Dionysos appropriate to the numerous Dionysian themes found among the mosaics of the home.

Perhaps supporting an identification of Apollo is the draped female statue. The statue is much smaller than the semi-nude male, and is missing its head, right arm and left forearm. The figure stands frontally, wearing both a chiton and a mantle. There is a small drill hole in the upper left arm of the piece that was an attachment hole for something. Kreeb has suggested a torch as a possibility. If this were the case, then an Artemis figure would be appropriate and perhaps be displayed with the “Apollo” as a pair, though this is still speculative. The seated semi-nude male shows clear links in pose and throne to seated Cybele figures. Marcadé identifies the piece as a seated Apollo holding a now missing kithara. This attribution is based solely on the restored attributes, however, and so a seated Dionysos or some other deity is also possible. If it is

68 Chamonard (1933a), 155. Kreeb (1988), 40-43, has noted a small number of paired sculptures found in houses, suggesting that symmetry played a part in display. This type of display may point the way to later Roman developments. See Sanders (2001), 120-123. Possible pendant-sculptures have been noted at Rhodes and at the Villa dei Papiri, suggesting that this decorative phenomenon began to take shape at the end of the Hellenistic period. On pendants as a decorative phenomenon, see Bartman (1988) and Bartman (1991).

69 Marcadé (1969), 178, suggests Apollo or Dionysos, though he notes the possibility of a victor in a musical contest. Along similar lines, Chamonard (1933a), 155, had suggested an athlete. Kreeb (1988), 233, stresses the long hair as indicative of either Apollo or Dionysos.

70 One wonders if the pronounced S-curve, rather languid and youthful musculature and the presence of a tree trunk support would point to a Praxitelean inspiration. The sources note three free-standing (alone or as part of a group) Dionysos statues done by the master and four Apollo statues. See Stewart (1990), vol. II, 277-281.


72 The legs from this throne closely match those of a seated Cybele figure from the House of Dionysos (Delos inv. no. A 4144). See Chamonard (1933a), 156-157; Delos 282, cat. no. 190; Sanders (2001), 247, 231, cat. no. Ste 40, with references.

73 Marcadé (1969), 178.
an Apollo, and assuming for the moment that the other unidentified figures are also an Apollo and an Artemis, this could perhaps suggest a special connection to the god. Marcadé, following Chamonard, has suggested the house is in fact a meeting place or a “clubhouse” for actors. 74 This analysis is based primarily on the large size, the proximity to the theater, the subject matter of the home’s decoration and the understanding that the insula was one large dwelling. It seems clear now, however, that the insula was made up of four separate houses and the iconography of the mosaics and sculpture are certainly not out of the norm for domestic decoration. 75

Again, as with the House of the Herm, this particular home shows an emphasis on sight lines and decoration. The most decoration is reserved for a central and public room (room g), where both the mosaic and the sculptures were found. Unlike the House of the Herm, it is possible to speculate an overall Dionysian decoration for the home, given the subject of the mosaic and the likely subjects of the sculptures. The proximity of the home to the theater adds some credence to this theory, but it is too strong to suggest that this was not a home, but a koinon for actors. Were it, this might lend some credence to the theory that the House of the Herm was also some kind of koinon, given the inscription on the “Alkamanes” herm. It may be difficult to tell exactly what some of these large structures were, but it is likely that even if some communal activity took place in these buildings, they could have taken place within the confines of an individual’s home.

74 Marcadé (1969), 178; Chamonard (1933a), 152-153; Chamonard (1933b), 8.
75 The initial interpretations of the insula relied too heavily on Vitruvius’ description of a Greek house (De arch. 6.7.149-151). More recent excavations and a new view of Vitruvius have altered the interpretation. For an examination of the initial work on the insula with the proper identification of the four houses, see Kreeb (1985), 95-106.
5.4 Small Houses in the Theater Quarter

The so-called “Theater Quarter” of the island is one of the more important residential areas on Delos. Excavated and published in the early twentieth century, six blocks comprising 49 total houses were unearthed, including those with and without peristyles, those with and without shops and a host of house types, plans and decoration levels ranging from the humble to the very wealthy. Given this range of material, this quarter is particularly valuable for providing insights into social stratification within a relatively confined area. Kreeb thus focused on several of these houses to explore their relative decorative and sculptural remains. He focused most notably on House VI O, a small, oddly shaped house with an oblong colonnaded courtyard. Though small, there seems to have been some decoration in the home, as figural wall paintings survive with scenes involving Theseus, Dionysos and possibly Ariadne and there was a small torso of an Aphrodite Anadyomene. Both items were found off the courtyard in room d, likely the reception/dining room of the house given its off-set door, and, if the statue belongs here, there may be a thematic link between the two. As goddess of love, Aphrodite would certainly play well against the “love lost and gained” tale possibly represented and the Anadyomene type may refer to the water/island/beach that plays an important locative element in the story. It could be that a mystery frieze revolving around Dionysos and Ariadne, like that in the Villa of the Mysteries, was also involved.

78 Though there is a processional element to the painting, its narrative format in metopes somewhat detracts from this quality. See Kreeb (1988), 265.
This house is atypical of what one tends to find in this quarter, however, as a large quantity of the material found inside these houses are either stray finds without sufficient contextual information or deposits of material from later activities. Two examples are the excitingly named House of Five Statues, whose pieces likely belong to the theater, and House VI L, whose sculptures were probably gathered for reduction in a nearby limekiln.\textsuperscript{79} Noting this difficulty, Kreeb catalogued eleven houses with definite sculptural deposits associated with them.\textsuperscript{80} Among these are the House of Dionysos, the House of Kleopatra and Dioskourides and House Th III S. Given the light these three houses and their contents can shed on aspects of Delian domestic statuary and decoration, they will be dealt with individually.

5.5 The House of Dionysos

As with the House of the Masks, this particular house is named after the fine floor mosaics uncovered in the excavations that seem to have Dionysian themes. The most noted is the \textit{opus vermiculatum} mosaic from the center of the courtyard depicting a youthful and winged Dionysos riding a panther “side-saddle”.\textsuperscript{81} The house is a large home with two entrances leading to different ends of a central peristyle courtyard.\textsuperscript{82} There are stairs that lead up to a now lost second floor, while the most notable of the ground floor rooms is room f. Given its size and three openings onto the court and one into room g, it likely served a particular role in the home, perhaps for receptions or as an anteroom for room g. Associated with this room is the one piece of sculptural material

\textsuperscript{79} Sanders (2001), 78.
\textsuperscript{80} See Chamonard (1922), 218-221; Kreeb (1988), 237-319.
\textsuperscript{81} See Bruneau (1972), 248-253.
\textsuperscript{82} See Chamonard (1922), 58-59, 127-134.
found *in situ* in the home, a statue base uncovered in front of the central column at the northern end of the peristyle.

This base is of a size and type that seems to have held a small-scale statue. The placement of the statue, however, illustrates a concern for viewing and viewing angles onto the courtyard from room f. Though no statue was found with the base, nearby, against the wall of room f in the north portico facing the base, a small and well preserved statue was uncovered. Based on material, size and proximity, Kreeb has suggested that this statue belonged on the base. The statue is usually identified as a representation of the god Poseidon. It stands 0.855 m and is missing both arms just after the shoulders and both feet below the ankles. Though worn on the surface, the musculature is large and full and the face shows elements of age in the slightly saggy cheeks and the deep-set eyes. The hair and beard fall in thick bundles. The statue and many of its distinguishing elements – strong chiasmus and torsion, up-turned gaze, thick and curling hair with an *anastole* - have led scholars to see Lysippic traits in the execution. It is known that Lysippos created a statue of Poseidon at Corinth, but this is generally thought to be of the Lateran type, the type that was found in a domestic context at Pella. This particular statue, however, has little in common with the Lateran type and is different from similar

---

83 See Chamonard (1906), 558; Kreeb (1988), 254, cat. no. S 38.2; Sanders (2001), 223, cat. no. St 18.
85 Chamonard (1906), 556-558; Chamonard (1922); Marcadé (1969), 47, 281, 380; Kreeb (1988), 253, cat. no. S 38.1; Delos 264, cat. no. 109; Sanders (2001), 218-219, cat. no. St 11.
86 Sanders (2001), 218-219. Chamonard (1906), 558, even went so far as to suggest that the statue was a fourth century original.
87 For a Lysippan Poseidon at Corinth, see Lucian, *J.Tr.* 9. Often associated with this is the mention of a bronze Poseidon with a dolphin at his feet at Corinth (Paus. 2.2.8), with a possible similar statue at Antikyra (Paus. 10.36.8). Neither of these descriptions fit well the statue at Delos, and the Lateran type is usually resting his foot on a rock, rather than a dolphin. It has also been suggested that the Lateran type has fifth century origins and should not be associated with Lysippos. On the type and its relationship to Lysippos, see Walde (1978); Ridgway (1990), 125-126, 145, n. 39 with references.
standing Poseidon statues in that it looks out and away and not down at its outstretched arm. Remnants of what may be the statue’s hand remain on the right hip of the sculpture and if the left hand held a trident, then this could reflect the Lysippan Poseidon from Corinth, but links to the Lateran Poseidon should be abandoned. Given the lack of identifying iconographic elements and the general similarities between the depictions of the two gods, this statue could as easily be a representation of Zeus. Similarly, the statue should properly be viewed as a second century piece, whose strong Lysippan influence is evident, yet the subject and typology could have come from numerous sources.

Also from this house was found a statue of a seated Kybele in the west portico of the courtyard. This figure sits on an elaborate and decorated throne following an established typology for enthroned Kybele figures. Overall the figure looks more Greek and classicizing than many other examples of the goddess and it has been suggested that there is the possibility of syncretism with other figures. The figure still bears some of its original paint and illustrates another subject possible for domestic sculpture on Delos.

88 *LIMC VII* (1994), s.v. “Poseidon” 451, no. 24a (E. Simon) is close in form and body posture, but the head looks down the arm and the hair locks are not as individually rendered. The same holds for *LIMC VII* (1994), s.v. “Poseidon” 452, no. 25 (E. Simon). The head looking out is closer to the Melian Poseidon (Nat. Mus. Athens 235 = *LIMC VII* (1994), s.v. “Poseidon” 452, no. 32 (E. Simon)), but in general should recall more the portraiture of Alexander, especially with the pronounced *anastole*. On these standing Poseidon statues, whose general arm positioning is different from the Delian statue, see Walter-Karydi (1991). The overall body position and modulation of the torso recall the so-called Alexander with a Lance, another sculptural type thought to originate with Lysippos that had a strong influence on later Hellenistic body types.

89 As was suggested by Lippold (1950), 288-289. Lysippos is known to have created several Zeus statues, as for example the Zeus Nemeios at Argos (Paus. 2.20.3), whose reproduction on a Severan coin suggests a similar pose to the Delos piece. See *Lisippo*, 50, cat. no. 4.3. If the *anastole* were any indicator, it should be noted that Alexander more closely associated himself with Zeus than with Poseidon. In general, see Volk (1984).


91 Delos inv. no. A 4144. See Chamonard (1906), 558; Chamonard (1922), 220; Marcadé (1969), 113; Kreeb (1988), 254, cat. no. S 38.3; Marcadé *et al.* (1996), 94-95; *Delos* 282, cat. no. 190; Sanders (2001), 231-232, cat. no. Ste 40.

92 Marcadé (1969), 245.
There seem to be no other examples of the goddess in a domestic context from elsewhere in the Hellenistic period. Also associated with this home are a male portrait statue and four female heads. The portrait is comprised of a head that was found in room m of this house, while the body was uncovered in the House of Five Statues, ca. 35 m away. The head has strong individual features, including a creased forehead, heavy brow and broad nose. The body is wrapped in a long tunic and a mantle. This seeming mix of a more veristic face and more idealized drapery may be contrasted with the portrait statue from the House of the Masks. The four female heads were all uncovered in room m of the home and are relatively nondescript. All of these heads are noteworthy for they likely do not belong to this house. The excavation reports suggest that it is possible that these pieces originated elsewhere in the quarter. Kreeb maintains that the pieces fell from an upper story in the home, yet Queyrel’s analysis of the excavation reports suggest that other locations are just as possible. The only consensus is that the “Poseidon” and the Kybele figures are from this house. Even so, these two statues offer rare, though not unknown, examples of statues of deities not usually found in domestic contexts.

93 For other examples of Kybele statues at Delos, see Sanders (2001), 231-232, cat. nos. Ste 40-44.
95 Sanders (2001), 181. See Marcadé et al. (1996), 206. Based on the facial elements, Michalowski (1932), 13, 35, considered this among the earlier of the portraits on the island, dating it to ca. 100 BCE.
96 One head has a Delos inventory number and is Delos A 248. Chamonard (1906), 560-561; Marcadé (1969), 439; Kreeb (1988), S 38.4; Sanders (2001), 223, cat no. St 19. The other three heads have no Delos inventory numbers. Chamonard (1906), nos. 5-7; Kreeb (1988), 256-257, cat. nos. S 38.6-8; Sanders (2001), 249, cat. nos. Hd 17-19.
5.6 The House of Kleopatra and Dioskourides

The image of the two statues of Kleopatra and Dioskourides has become so emblematic of the island that this symbol now adorns all manner of gifts sold in the Delian gift-shop. More than a mere stop for tourists exploring the island, however, these sculptures represent two of the best-preserved and most interesting examples of domestic statuary. What is particularly remarkable about these statues is that they were found in situ with a base that provides much information about the portrait statues and the owners of the house. This information, coupled with the precise findspot, has allowed scholars to examine these two sculptures in a highly detailed fashion.98

The building itself is a peristyle courtyard house that, at the time of the statues’ erection, was enlarged through the incorporation of a neighboring home. These renovations seem consistent with those one would expect from a wealthy and notable family from the island.99 One entered the home from the south, traveling along a corridor that led into peristyle d. From this peristyle one could access a series of rooms, whose purposes remain uncertain. Likely room e was a dining room, given the circumstantial evidence of an off center doorway, a non-figural tesselated mosaic with a differentiated border and its large size. Other rooms may be described simply as halls (room i) or side rooms. The statues themselves were placed inside a niche against the wall of room f, facing the courtyard d.

The inscription from the statue base mentions the Athenian archon Timarkhos and so the sculptures, coeval with the renovations that created the house’s ground plan as we

98 For these sculptures in general, see Marcadé (1969), 325-328; Kreeb (1988), 17-21, 282-284, cat. S 48; Moreno (1994), 673-674; Delos 276, cat. no. 160; Sanders (2001), 182-183, cat. no. P 8.
have it, seem to date to 138-137 BCE. This inscription is the sole example of an inscribed base for a domestic sculpture found with its associated statues. The inscription marks the two homeowners as clearly being Greek and, even more specifically, from Attica. The wording is reminiscent of a dedicatory inscription and highlights the piety of Dioskourides, though Kleopatra is listed as the dedicator. The inscription (ID 1987) on the base reads in full:

Κλεοπάτρα, Ἀδριάτου ἔγενες Μυρρηνίτης, θυγάτηρ τοῦ ἑαυτῶς ἅγιας Διοσκούριδος Θεοδίσου ἔγενες Μυρρηνίτης ἀναπτεχώστα τοὺς δεξιῶτας πίπτοντας τοὺς ἄγρυφος δίο ἐν τῷ ποὺ Ἀττικὸς ναῖν παρ’ ἐκατέρας παραστάδα ἐπὶ Τιμάρχου ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίων.

The inscription marks both husband and wife as from the Attic deme of Myrrhinous, while the reference to Timarkhos cements the Athenian connection. This connection may have marked the couple as belonging to an especially important family, or the connection may have been of particular importance only 28 years after Rome established Athenian control of the island. It may also be that this demotic was added to emphasize a connection not immediately apparent in the statues themselves. It has been noted that Kleopatra is dressed in a Greek style, though one typical of statues found in the Hellenistic East. Similarly, Dioskourides’ chiton is unusual in that it shows some affinities to the Roman toga in the folds about the neck and the excess material draped over the left shoulder. These elements need not reflect any direct non-Greek cultural influence, however, and more likely reflect the multicultural nature of the styles and sculptors present on the island. It is unlikely that these dress elements would have confused the viewers into thinking that the sculptures represented non-Greeks, but still

100 The is no definitive proof that Kleopatra and Dioskourides lived in this house, but given the importance of the statues, this seems likely. That any other members of their family lived with them is unknown.
101 See Kreeb (1985a).
any hesitation on the part of the viewer would have been clarified upon reading the dedicatory inscription.

The statues and their base clearly mark the home’s occupants as Athenians, but what is perhaps more remarkable still is the manner in which both present a very public and devotional face to those who enter into the home. The inscription highlights the piety of the owners as Dioskourides dedicated two Delphic tripods in the Temple of Apollo. In addition, the entire presentation of the monument has a dedicatory air, as the placement of the statues in a niche within the wall is comparable to a small *naiskos* or other public sculptural dedication. Like public dedications, these statues were also meant to be seen by the public. Sightlines play an important role in the understanding of this sculptural group as great care was obviously taken in deciding where to place the statues. Most noted is the primary view one had of the sculptures upon entering the home. The base is in line with the entrance corridor and one had an unobstructed view of the group from the front doorway of the home. This had the effect of “advertising” the homeowners to those who would simply be passing by the house, let alone those who entered it. In addition, this created an interesting visual focal point that drew the viewer from the outside of the home inside, essentially eliminating the distinction between inside and outside space.

What is noticeable upon entering the courtyard of the house, however, is that this concern for viewing was continued though several sightlines within the home. The two

---

103 See Zanker (1993), 215, where he stresses how similar figures in *naiskos*-like grave stelai in Asia Minor reflect the self-image of free citizens. Zanker (1995), 254, comments on the uniformity of similar mantled figures and how they thus speak of continuity and tradition. If this is the case, then the styles chosen for Kleopatra and Dioskourides may further emphasize the connection to Athens and her democratic traditions. 104 See Kreeb (1988), 21. Stewart (1990), 227, “The pair were cunningly sited so as to be visible from the front door, as if ever-present to greet the entering visitor.”
statues can be seen from the doorway of most rooms off of the courtyard. Much like what was observed in the House of the Mosaics at Eretria, this careful and calculated placement of the statues was likely done to allow for maximized viewing potential for those guests being entertained in the home. Indeed one of the more interesting sightlines offered by the statues’ placement is that from what was likely the main andron of the house, room e. Looking from the doorway of the room, one can see the group, but the statue of Diokourides is blocked by a column from the peristyle. This has the effect of highlighting the presence of the mistress of the home to what would have been a male grouping of guests during a symposium. The fact that Kleopatra is named first in the dedicatory inscription and that she erected the statue group, though in honor of her husband, places her in a place of visual and “textual” primacy within the home. The whole visual presentation gives the statues a very public appearance and setting, though within the private realm.  

As for the styles of the sculptures, both seem to conform to standard types. The statue of Dioskourides hearkens back to a fourth century prototype, that of the Lateran Sophokles. His himation has several press folds, which Ridgway takes to be a status symbol, while the presence of a tunic underneath denotes East Greek or Roman influence. Kleopatra wears a mantle, chiton and sandals of a type that seem to date to the Hellenistic period. In addition, the proportions of her shoulders to her hips seem to be in keeping with trends that were popular in the second century. Both have mirrored

---

105 Note the reconstruction drawing in Kreeb (1988), abb. 2.3.
106 Ridgway (2000), 145. For the Lateran Sophokles, see Pollitt (1986), 60-62; Ridgway (1984) 102, 106, n. 31, who notes the survival of the Lateran Sophokles as a prototype into Imperial times.
107 Ridgway (2000), 145. Smith (1991), 85-86, refers to the Kleopatra as a fine example of the mainstream developments in draped female figures over the course of the Hellenistic period.
chiastic poses that present the two as complementary figures to be viewed as a unit. Both also have standardized poses that hint at class and respectability, she the *pudicitia* pose, he that of orators and poets.\(^{108}\)

In all the statues are meant to display the character, class and status of the homeowners, and this is achieved in several ways. First, the sightlines established for the statues place the group at the heart of the home. The statues are placed in a niche in the courtyard to offer maximized viewing potential not only for those entering the home, but to the various rooms off the peristyle. Most notable is room e, the dining room, suggesting that a primary audience for the group would have been visiting non-household males. Second, the niche-like setting provides a display context that is similar to that found in certain public dedications and honorary statues. This commemorative aspect is reinforced by the inscription on the statue base that highlights the piety of Dioskourides through his dedications. Third, the inscription also highlights the Athenian ancestry of the couple; a fact that may have had increased social importance so soon after Delos again came under Athenian control. Fourth, the size of the statues, unusually large for a domestic setting, underscores the worth of the couple and adds to the visual meaning. Lastly, the styles of the sculptures themselves emphasize certain elements of class that may have indicated the importance of the individuals presented. It is clear that with these portrait statues the complex visual planning and social subtexts normally associated with public monuments have now come into the home.

\(^{108}\) Ridgway (2000), 145. Kleopatra is a Macedonian name and not Attic and so Ridgway notes that her name may have been inspired by Kleopatra II. Whether a specific queen was being referenced or not, the name certainly invokes the Egyptian royal house, who had strong associations with Delos, and likely added to the regal air of the statues.
5.7 House Th III S

Another example of domestic sculpture that shows similar concerns for public viewing comes from a house in the southern section of the Theater Quarter. A significant difference between this example and that of Kleopatra and Dioskourides is that the statue under consideration here is not a portrait of the homeowners, but a statue of the goddess Artemis.

The statue depicts the goddess as a huntress, as she slays a deer to her right. The majority of the statue survives, with only the goddess’ right hand and the head and right hind leg of the deer missing. The drapery of the goddess wraps tightly about her belly and right leg indicating movement as she strides forward to kill the deer, but her face is largely calm and classicizing in contrast. The deer is not as well executed as the rest of the group and the back is roughly done, suggesting a placement of the figure against a wall, or at least a primary frontal view. The typology of the figure falls within the general pattern of a hunting Artemis with high boots and a short chiton, but the prey is usually not included in the group. Closely related to the Delian piece is a type referred to as the Artemis Elaphebolos, whose examples are mainly found in Italy, though another example comes from the Egyptian Sanctuary on Delos. At 1.44 m tall, this is the largest piece of domestic sculpture of a mythological subject found on the island, perhaps

110 Marcadé (1969), 281, 288, sees specifically Praxitelean elements.
111 Marcadé (1969), 219.
112 Marcadé (1969), 353, n.5. On related Artemis types in general, see Sanders (2001), 208-209 with references.
not surprising given her cult on the island and the important relationship between Artemis and the land of her brother’s birth.\footnote{In general, the depictions of Artemis tend to be larger than those of other deities. See Kreeb (1988), 59. This may be an indication of her continued importance on the island in the late Hellenistic period. See Sanders (2001), 107-109.}

Most important about this piece, however, is not the style but the fact that the base for the statue was discovered \textit{in situ}.\footnote{On the base, see Kreeb (1988), 294, cat. no. S 52.1a} The base was placed off center to the main entrance to accommodate a set of stairs, but the main sightline axis is still focused on the main entryway. Those immediately entering the home, as well as those who would be passing by, would have direct visual access to the sculptural group. In addition, those wishing to enter any of the rooms of the home would have had to pass in front of or beside the group as it dominated the decoration of the home.

In addition to this group, a smaller statue base was excavated in the home, in the northern room d, which also contained a diamond-patterned mosaic with an anchor in its border. These elements attest to the level of decoration in the home, though there is no discernable association among the elements.\footnote{For these other elements, see Kreeb (1988), 294-295, cat. nos. S 52.2, S 52.3, M 52.1.} Kreeb views the choice of an Artemis as subject matter in two ways. On the one hand the goddess had a long association with the island and so she could still be seen as an “altehrwürdige Göttin”, while the image of the hunt could be associated with Hellenistic royalty and so be indicative of “Luxus”.\footnote{Kreeb (1988), 69.} If this were indeed the case, then while a certain religious air may be implicit in the subject of the statue, the primary impression of the piece would be to illustrate the status of the homeowner. Like the statues of Kleopatra and Dioskourides, this statue both illustrates the piety of the homeowner, and reflects traditional upper class activities. No inscription
was found on the Artemis base that would allow us to more fully explore these ideas, but the size of the figure, the subject matter chosen and the prominence of the base’s location all support an important decorative function for this statue.

These houses, then, demonstrate that concerns for viewing and display were paramount for the homeowner on Delos. The conspicuous display of wealth was likely an important social act among the merchants of the island and so sightlines helped to set off a home’s sculptural material and maximize viewing potential. The Artemis and the statues of Kleopatra and Dioskourides both show how a singular piece could attract considerable attention and illustrate multiple social and decorative ideologies. Typical also are the houses with numerous sculptures creating an entire visual field within the home. These works could play off of each other as possible pendants, or interact with the other decorative material in the home. More than visual interplay or thematic unity, however, the sheer number of these statues within some of the homes is remarkable. One has to wonder where these statues were coming from and if there was a homegrown industry in domestic sculpture.

5.8 A School of Delian Domestic Sculpture?

Given the numerous sculptural finds that were uncovered across the island in both public and private contexts, along with Pliny’s statement that Delos was famous for its bronze work, it has long been a question as to whether or not a “school” of sculpture existed on the island in the Hellenistic period. A “school” is generally thought, to

---

117 Plin. NH 34.9: Antiquissima aeris gloria Deliaco fuit, mercatus in Delo celebrante toto orbe, et ideo cura officinis. tricliniorum pedibus fulcrisque ibi prima aeris nobilitas, pervenit deinde et ad deum simulacra effigienemque hominum et aliorum animalium.
paraphrase Marcadé, to be a coherent tradition of techniques and “artistic conceptions” that is passed from teacher to student, within a geographic area or surrounding a particular individual, that express a preference for certain themes, modes of expression or styles that are then transmitted and noticeable in spite of individual or evolutionary peculiarities.\textsuperscript{118} More often that not, this idea of a school is viewed as an expression of a given style, thus the traditional attributions of a school to the sites of Rhodes and Pergamon. This notion is problematic at best in the Hellenistic period, given the multiplicity of styles that exist diachronically and the mobility of sculptors, and so current research into Hellenistic sculptural centers has moved away from the notion of “schools” and more towards the idea of manufacturing centers.\textsuperscript{119} To this end, most scholars now do not associate a “school” of sculpture with Hellenistic Delos.\textsuperscript{120}

And yet there are enough peculiarities surrounding the sculptural production on the island that certain questions remain. The first concerns the seeming lack of a definite workshop building on the island. Four locations on the island have been posited as being workshops, or having been locations for workshop activity.\textsuperscript{121} These are the House of Kerdon, the House of the Diadoumenos, the Agora of the Italians and the Stoa of Philip. The Agora of the Italians had two workshops, rooms 103 and 106, in the southwestern section of the row of shops. That these two rooms were used as workshops seems clear,

\textsuperscript{118} Marcadé (1969), 249.
\textsuperscript{119} See as examples, Mattusch (1998); Jockey (1998). Based partly on the work of Jockey, Ridgway (2002), 262-263, sees small-scale statuette production in the first century BCE as “the products of workshops rather than ‘signature masters’”.
\textsuperscript{120} See Marcadé (1969), 249-259; Jockey (1998). Some scholars had previously seen the Delian production as primarily Attic in its outlook. See Linfert (1976) 112-116; Stewart (1979), 65-98, sees the two as almost diametrically opposed.
\textsuperscript{121} The concern here is for marble workshops, though there is some evidence for bronze workshops as well. See Marcadé (1969), 83-115, esp. 102-115. Originally seven were posited, but the two from the Agora of the Italians may be condensed into one. Others suggested have been refuted or may reflect sculptural activity in a home, rather than a workshop. The four listed here are those of Jockey (1998).
given the amount of marble chips and dust recorded by the excavators and by the 30 unfinished sculptures that were uncovered. The unfinished works include pieces of furniture, a stele of Isis Pelagia, a small-scale Herakles Farnese and part of a statue of Artemis. The workshop in the Stoa of Philip presents a problem, as no material generally associated with a workshop, such as marble chips or dust or tools, were found in the building and the identification of the area as a workshop rests on the assumption that a number of unfinished statuettes found “in the area” of the stoa should be associated with it. These statues could have been placed in or near the stoa at a later period; to speak of a workshop is speculative. The group of statues comprises Aphrodite types and represents sculptures in the tradition of the Knidia, the Pudica and Aphrodite tying her sandals. Primarily these statues are noteworthy for what they can say about carving techniques and how these techniques seem to have been specific to Delos.

The other two locations have been traditionally viewed as houses and so present an interesting case for this study. The House of Kerdon was excavated along the east side of the sanctuary of Apollo and likely dates to no earlier than 150 BCE. The house is divided into two sections, with the main section of the house (A) comprised of six rooms around a courtyard and the attached section (A1) comprised of four rooms grouped around a fifth that was paved. A third area to the east of A1 may be another house or another section associated with the whole structure. Within the complex, some 22
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122 In general, see Lapalus (1939).
126 See Jardé (1905), 40-54; Bizard and Leroux (1907), 471-503; Kreeb (1988), 181-198; Sanders (2001), 66-68. The date of the house is particularly important. Vallois had initially suggested that the house’s construction should date to the third century BCE and thus be the earliest evidence for a peristyle courtyard.
sculptures and fragments, both finished and unfinished, were found.\textsuperscript{127} The number of statues led Jardé to interpret the building as a workshop, though there is little other evidence to suggest workshop activity, such as marble chips or dust.\textsuperscript{128} Kreeb has suggested that the building may not be a workshop at all, but rather a house where commissions were sculpted on the spot in order to maximize the manufacturing process for a large-scale order.\textsuperscript{129} This is certainly possible given the lack of other manufacturing materials and is bolstered by an interpretation of the other house that has been suggested as a workshop.

The House of the Diadoumenos was one of the earliest houses excavated on the island, with work begun in 1894. The house is large (36.30 m x 26.40 m), with a central peristyle courtyard, a large room to the east and a particularly advanced hydraulic system with a cistern underneath the courtyard. Dating of the house is difficult, given the large number of refurbishments and final destruction and abandonment of the home, though an ephebic inscription dating to 133/132 BCE was found in the house.\textsuperscript{130} A total of nine sculptures came from this house, including three famous statues now in the National Museum: a version of the Polykleitan Diadoumenos, after which the house is named, the

\textsuperscript{128} Jardé (1905), 47-54, supported by Marcadé (1969), 103-104. Jardé (1905), 46-47, notes several industrial basins and channels, which could have been used in a workshop setting and bolster this theory. It is unclear, however, to which phase of the building these belong, one of which is post Hellenistic and it is not necessary that these basins are coeval with the unfinished sculptures.
\textsuperscript{129} Kreeb (1988), 184, though he notes that this is speculative.
\textsuperscript{130} See Couve (1895), 460-516; Chamonard (1922), 426-531; Kreeb (1988), 155-160; Sanders (2001), 57-60. The inscription is \textit{ID} 1946. See Chamonard (1922), 426.
so-called Pseudo-Athlete and an Artemis. There were also five portrait heads, three more individualized and two more idealized, and the torso of a Priapus/Pan herm. The herm was found mutilated and Marcadé saw this as evidence of later pagan activity. Indeed, he and others have seen many of the pieces as being later additions to this building, noting especially that the inscription, the Diadoumenos and the Pseudo-Athlete would all be suited to a gymnasium or palestra, and so may have been moved from such a location. Given these links, Couve initially suggested that this building was not a house at all, but possibly a gymnasium or bath, though he also noted a workshop as a possibility, based on some marble chips and dust that were found in the courtyard and cistern of the house. These were primarily fragments of columns, however, that were originally from the peristyle. Picking up on this idea, Chazidakis suggested that the building was specifically the Palestra of Staseas, an individual named in the inscription.


133 See Marcadé (1969), 105; Sanders (2001), 58-59.

134 See Couve (1895), 510-516, countered by Chamonard (1922), 427.
based on the building’s size and layout and the presence of both the Diadoumenos and Pseudo-Athlete statues.\textsuperscript{135}

Yet it has been noted that “athletic” statuary is not unknown in a domestic contexts and was likely even a central theme in the decorative scheme in the House of the Mosaics at Eretria. Neither the size of the house, nor the material uncovered in the house, is inconsistent with the types of material found in Hellenistic homes. As to whether the house was a workshop or not, there was little found in the house aside from three unfinished works, the Pseudo-Athlete, a portrait head and the so-called “round altar”, to suggest workshop activity. As stated, what marble detritus remained was from the columns in the courtyard and so in all probability no workshop activity took place here, though it is possible that sculpting did. Jockey has suggested that, at the time of the house’s destruction, sculptors were working on sculptural decoration for the home and so carving the material on site.\textsuperscript{136} Yet he would see this building not as a house, but as a “club-house”, much like the Establishment of the Poseidoniasts, just to the south. Again, it should be noted, however, that the size and layout of the house is not out of the norm for a private dwelling and that, despite the large size of the sculptures, their location in the largest room (\textit{oikos \ensuremath{e}}), axially placed opposite one of the entrances from the street, is in line with domestic decorative practices. It is likely that this was a wealthy home.\textsuperscript{137}

To date, excavations on the island have yet to reveal any large sculptural workshops. From a domestic standpoint, it may be that a tradition developed to sculpt


\textsuperscript{137} Some of the material may well have been transported to the building at a later date, possibly from a palestra. Though large, the number of portraits found in the home is comparable to what was found in the Villa dei Papiri. The lack of small-scale statuettes may also be the result of later activity at the building. See Sanders (2001), 60.
the material *in situ*, when the commission was either for a large number of sculptures (House of Kerdon) or included particularly large pieces (House of the Diadoumenos). This means that the material uncovered was specifically domestic in nature and the remains from the Agora of the Italians and the Stoa of Philip - furniture and small-scale statuettes of known works, especially of Aphrodite - also seem to support workshop activity associated with household decoration.\(^{138}\) It may then be asked if there is anything particular in the technique or style of the material produced that could lead to similar conclusions.

Jockey has suggested that there is something in the technique that is unique to Delos in the Hellenistic period. Through an examination of the statues from the “workshops”, he suggests that there was a three-stage process to sculpting these images: 1) roughing out the piece using a point, 2) faceting with a flat chisel with some details created with a drill and 3) final finishing and polishing. In his opinion this type of production was best suited for creating works based on its “standardization, its vagueness and its depressing uniformity.”\(^{139}\) Questions of taste aside, this type of production was suitable for large scale and rapid production work, suggesting that there was a large clientele for the purchase of such works. Other types of sculptural techniques were used on the island, but in general they seem to have been employed in order to produce repeated and repeatable sculptural types.\(^{140}\) Close parallels to these carving practices were found on Kos, and a Delian provenance has been posited for the sculptures from

---

\(^{138}\) Though speaking of the House of the Diadoumenos and the Agora of the Italians, Jockey (1998), 179, citing Stewart (1990), 226, states: “In sum, there is no difference in between the finds of Delian houses and those of the two workshops (or their area), whose activity was focused on the production of ‘garden sculpture’.”


Fianello Sabino based on “Motivwahl, Stil und Stückungsteknik”, suggesting that customers for this rapid production may have been found across the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{141}

That such clients existed elsewhere can perhaps be seen in the material uncovered from two nearly contemporary Hellenistic shipwrecks that included a large amount of sculptural and other materials among their cargo. The first wreck, known since 1900 and investigated again in 1976, is that found near Antikythera off the coast of the Peleponnesos. Based on coin evidence, it has been suggested to have sunk ca. 80-50 BCE and have had either Pergamon or Delos as the port of origin. Delos was seen as the favorite between the two, since the cargo is predominantly Parian marble and the sculptures have certain piercing techniques in common with sculpture from the island.\textsuperscript{142}

These piercing techniques, however, are relatively common throughout the Mediterranean, and the cargo of this wreck contained a large number of life and over life-size statues, something noted as being unusual among the sculptures from Delos. It is more than likely that the cargo from the Antikythera wreck originated somewhere other than Delos, perhaps in Anatolia or the Near East.\textsuperscript{143}

The other wreck was uncovered near the site of Mahdia off the Tunisian coast and contained all manner of goods, including architectural members, sculpture, ceramics and furniture, a large number of them seemingly intended for use in the home. While the precise origin of this ship is debated, the two most often cited sources, based on the

\textsuperscript{141} The carving for the Fianello Sabino statues is not particularly similar to the Delos sculptures, but there are some similarities in the joining techniques. For the Fianello Sabino sculptures, see Vorster (1998), 55-56. Jockey (1998), 183, cites parallels at Kos. See Kabus-Preisshofen (1989), nos. 36-37, 42, 46.
\textsuperscript{142} On the wreck in general, see Bol (1972). For a general summary of the finds and arguments, see Ridgway (1997), 340-342, 359 n. 33. Bol supports a Delian provenance for the material, along with Hellenkemper (1994), 158-159. Gelsdorf (1994b), proposed a Pergamenian origin for the material as reparations to Rome in the Mithridatic War, but this has been refuted by Hellenkemper (1994).
material found in the wreck, are Athens and Delos. Indeed it has been suggested that the destination of the ship was a port on the west coast of central Italy, an area that the Campanian merchants on Delos would have known well. Beryl Barr-Sharrar has proposed that a majority of the bronzes from the Mahdia wreck were likely produced on Delos and that the cargo may have been partially the result of pirate activity. This follows the belief that the bronze herm from the wreck, signed ΒΟΗΘΟΣ ΚΑΛΧΗΔΟΝΙΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ, was done by the same Boethos who signed the base of a portrait of Antiochos IV from Delos. This larger collection of bronze material from the Mahdia wreck illustrates an important difference in its cargo from that of the Antikythera wreck. The Mahdia ship was laden with material of a more diverse nature, including architectural members, bronze work, furniture and decorative ware like the candelabras, and small-scale statuary. The Antikythera wreck cargo was less diverse and contained more large-scale pieces among its statuary. In addition, a general stylistic difference has been observed between the two, with the Mahdia material seen as more eclectic and Hellenistic, and the Antikythera pieces as more classically inspired and Polykleitan. While not too much should be made of these stylistic differences, similar styles have been suggested between some of the Mahdia material and the statuettes from

144 Ridgway (2002), 11.
146 See Barr-Sharrar (1998). Usually the material from the wreck is seen as having to have been produced before 89 BCE, when Sulla’s sack of Athens, and Mithridates sack of Delos in 88 BCE, would have negatively impacted the sculptural production of the two centers. Recent work has shown, however, that both Athens and Delos recovered somewhat after each of these destructions, even after the second sack of Delos in 69 BCE. On a Delian revival post 69 BCE, see Kreeb (1999), 343-344.
147 See Linfert (1994); Mattusch (1994).
148 In general, see Himmelmann (1994). He particularly places an emphasis on the lack of epic subjects among the Mahdia wreck.
Given these links to Delos, even though circumstantial, it is likely that the Mahdia wreck may have either picked-up some Delian produced material from Athens, or from Delos herself, given the trade routes in the Hellenistic Mediterranean.

Perhaps, then, while a “school” of Delian sculpture cannot be supported in terms of a unique style of sculpture, there is enough circumstantial evidence to posit workshop production on the island that specialized in the creation of small-scale statuettes expressly for the use in domestic structures. Certainly Delos could qualify as a regional production center based on Jockey’s criteria: there was marble both on Delos and in the nearby islands, there were local sculptors and a sculpting tradition dating back to the Archaic period, many unfinished works have been found throughout the island and the trading significance of the island is well known. Some of this material could have been carved in situ for the wealthy merchants, while much could be exported for use in Roman villas in Campania and Latium. It seems likely that in the later Hellenistic period, both at Delos and at Rhodes, there was a tradition of producing small-scale statuettes and other material for domestic use. This would be in line with current ideas concerning sculptural

---

149 The “pigtail” on a youth from Fianello Sabino matches that of both a crouching youth and an Eros from Mahdia. See Ridgway (2002), 74, 98, n. 17. On the Youth from Fianello Sabino, see Vorster (1998), 30-33. Aside from any stylistic or thematic differences, Ridgway (2002), 69, suggests that the difference in cargo between the Antikythera and Mahdia was due to weight; the Mahdia wreck was loaded with heavy architectural members and thus could not support heavier large-scale statuary. In addition, the version of the Stephanos Athlete found among the Mahdia pieces shows that classically inspired pieces were also among that ship’s cargo.

150 While Stewart (1979), 67-68, may have seen a sharp division, even dislike, between Athenian and Delian artists and their production, such divisions would have meant little to the Roman traders and buyers. On these trading routes, see Gelsdorf (1994a).


152 See Stewart (1990), 226-228; Ridgway (2002), 262-263. Marcadé would see a distinction between the two, noting that Delos excelled in portraiture, but that Rhodes is a “school”. The problems with the terminology have been noted. See Marcadé (1969), 469-498. Pedley (1998) has looked at a group of statuettes from Paestum (mid to late first century BCE) and attempted to ascertain possible provenance. Primarily he suggests Delos and Rhodes as possibilities, preferring Rhodes given that he believes sculptural production of all sorts began to decline on Delos after the sacks of 88 and 69 BCE.
production centers, perhaps refining it a little. While no specialization in style, subject or material is suggested, there seems to have been a specialization in size and type (domestic) of sculpture that would have led to economies of scale and craft streamlining for one area of sculptural production on the island. Certainly in this, as in many areas, the islands of Delos and Rhodes would have competed for their appropriate market share.

5.9 Conclusions

The material presented in this chapter has constituted a brief consideration of a few houses and their domestic sculpture as examples of what can be found on the island and what the remains can tell us about decorative uses at this time. Using the works of Kreeb and of Sanders as a base, several general comments with regard to the Delian material may be made. As with all of the sites examined, it is especially in the reception rooms and courtyards of houses that sculptures appear. Kreeb lists 9 statues uncovered in the oikoi of houses, 32 in the courtyards, 11 from other rooms on the ground floor and 22 from upper floors. 153 Presenting a more skeptical view with regard to findspots and functions of buildings, Sanders states that 8 were from oikoi, 16 from courtyards, 11 from other ground floor rooms and 20 from rooms on upper levels. 154 The largest reduction in numbers are those from courtyards, but this is mainly due to the exclusion of the House of Kerdon, and the overall picture does not change much, especially when one examines the number of sculptures found in situ: 2 from oikoi, 6 from courtyards, 2 from other ground floor rooms and 1 from the upper floors. Most of these were examined here; from

154 Sanders (2001), 80.
the oikoi was the Praxiteles base from the House of the Herm, from the courtyard were the nymph and the herm from the House of the Herm, the herm base from the House of the Masks, the statue base from the House of Dionysos, the Artemis from House Th III S, and Kleopatra and Dioskourides and from the upper floor the “Alkamenes” herm from the House of the Herm. Not examined here were a statuette base from an oikos in House VI D, a Small Herculaneum Woman from an exedra in the House of the Lake and the Stertenios base from House E, though these conform in placement to those studied here.\textsuperscript{155} The area of the courtyard specifically is used to highlight prime sightlines, and sculptures therein are often placed to provide maximum viewing potential from the street. The continued importance of the courtyard as a viewing area is highlighted by the large number of sculptures that are visible to those within the courtyard, whether the statues are in oikoi or in other rooms. This indicates a careful attention to placement and Kreeb has suggested that in some instances, statues were planned from the outset of a house’s construction.\textsuperscript{156}

Much of the material in the houses of Delos is in line with what is found elsewhere in the Mediterranean. The sculptures are for the most part under 1 m in height and represent themes that have been seen in all previous locations in the Hellenistic world. By far the most represented figure is Aphrodite. She appears three times as often as any other mythological subject. Other popular figures include Herakles, Hermes in the


\textsuperscript{156} Kreeb (1988), 37-40.
form of herms and representations of Dionysos and his cortège, especially satyrs.\(^{157}\) Compared to elsewhere, however, there is a marked increase in the number of portraits found in domestic settings, with a total of 17. This is significantly higher than any other site and likely points to a peculiarity of the island. Though many of these heads display veristic characteristics, most mix more or less real and idealizing elements to create a pastiche. To attempt to ascribe any of these portraits to a specific cultural group would deny the multiplicity of styles available to all on the island.\(^{158}\) Still, the number of portraits does not match the number found in Roman contexts, such as in the Villa dei Papyri. Also, there do not seem to be any vast thematic programs among the decoration at Delos, as there were in late Hellenistic/early Imperial villas, though Kreeb has noted some attempts at sculptural pendants.\(^{159}\) All of these are generally thought to be Roman decorative practices, but may be witnessed here in embryonic form.

The architectural form and sizes of the Delian houses, their spatial focus, the types of sculptures and their display contexts all should be viewed in light of the other material studied. It is to this comparison that we turn in the following chapter. In the conclusion, not only will the material from the sites be gathered in order to see if there are commonalities or trends that may be observed over time in the Hellenistic period, but also the thorny issue of meaning(s) will be addressed. It is here that the links between these domestic images and domestic cult will be examined and an overall picture of Hellenistic domestic sculpture will be developed.

\(^{157}\) See Sanders (2001), 89, Table 2 for a chart of subjects. In general, see Sanders (2001), 87-109.
\(^{158}\) See Stewart (1979), 91-96; Sanders (2001), 129-130.
\(^{159}\) Kreeb (1988), 40-43; Sanders (2001), 120-123. I have a hard time with viewing the Artemis, Diadoumenos and Pseudo-Athlete from the House of the Diadoumenos as “thematic juxtapositions”. While there may have been some interplay in opposing styles, they likely are joined together under a general athletic or agonistic theme.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has examined free-standing domestic sculpture from the Hellenistic period, through an analysis of the material itself as well as its archaeological and display contexts. While the number of examples of domestic sculpture found in situ is relatively small, an examination of archaeological reports and research can help to resolve some issues with regard to depositional context and aid in the reconstruction of general, if not specific, patterns of placement. In addition, such an approach can help to understand possible meanings for such statues. Previous studies on Hellenistic domestic sculpture either have been overly literary, or focused on the material from one particular site. The first is limiting and does not take into account what the archaeological remains can add to an overall understanding of this group of sculptures. The second can prove fruitful in an analysis of a given site, but cannot help to place the material into a broader picture and address issues of development or regional variation. This study has examined the material from a broad perspective, looking at the literary and material evidence to understand domestic sculpture across the Hellenistic landscape.

The first chapter examined the history of research in this field. While scholarship on various aspects of Greek and Roman domestic studies has boomed in recent years, the
study of domestic sculpture has lagged behind. To an extent this is understandable, as issues of archaeology and architecture had to be explored in order to understand domestic space and how such space was utilized by the ancients.

A renewed interest in domestic material from Greece and Rome shifted scholarly attention back on the remains in order to answer new questions with regard to spatial usage, the existence of normative architecture, and varying social relationships between the home and the larger community. Works by Hoepfner and Schwandner, Nevett, Zanker, Wallace-Hadrill, Allison and Cahill all spurred on the study of domestic architecture, with special attention paid to the archaeological assemblages found in the homes. Among this material were the artistic remains that also received new attention. These studies, along with a new appreciation for the art and culture of the Hellenistic period led to a deeper understanding of the domestic culture of this complex era. Still, only three studies specifically involving Hellenistic domestic sculpture were undertaken: Harward’s dissertation that attempted to examine the whole of the period, yet whose heavy reliance on the literary record did not sufficiently engage the material record, Kreeb’s fundamental work on Delos which has done much to illustrate certain trends, yet remains site specific, and Sanders’ dissertation, which furthered the work of Kreeb on Delos. None of these studies fully incorporated recent work that was also being done in Campania, a key geographic area that was to have a strong cultural influence on the island of Delos.

The second chapter explored the literary evidence surrounding the use of sculpture as a decorative element in the home. While fifth century drama provides a few tantalizing references that mention sculpture in a domestic or quasi-domestic setting, it is
among sources that discuss the wealthy of the fourth century that domestic sculpture is
first mentioned. Fourth century kings and tyrants like Archelaos of Macedonia and
Dionysios II of Syracuse were famous for the rich adornments of their palaces, done to
impress onlookers with their wealth and taste. These rulers set the benchmark for
decorative displays, though wealthy individuals of the fourth century like Glaukon and
Iskhomakhos also adorned their homes. All of these figures placed their artistic displays
in the most conspicuous areas of the home, namely the courtyard and dining room, those
areas most open to individuals not of the household unit.

Such displays were to lead to the ostentation of the Hellenistic kings. Alexander
the Great provides the paradigm and, while there is little evidence to reconstruct the
decoration of his palaces, it is clear that he was a great patron of the arts and surrounded
himself with noted artists and works of finery, even while traveling. Kings like Ptolemy
II of Egypt and Hieron of Syracuse followed suit and lavishly decorate all manner of
living establishments, from palaces to pleasure boats. These decorations included
sculpture and again it is the courtyard and dining room, prime areas to entertain visitors
and show off one’s wealth, that receive the most decorative attention. Given that the
social practices that took place in these areas were common across status lines it seems
likely that the non-royal wealthy of the day also decorated their homes in a similar
manner.

The Roman literary evidence is more forthcoming with regard to domestic
decoration and sculpture specifically. Cicero especially provides much information, both
as litigant and collector. He prosecuted Verres for plundering Syracuse and bringing
back numerous spoils to decorate his home. In his letters to Atticus, he asked his friend
to acquire numerous pieces of statuary to decorate his villas. Another important source is Polybios, whose description of ancestral masks hanging in the Roman home and their use in family cult illustrates a key point: while there seems to be specific material set aside for religious rites, their display within the home suggests that display and religious functions need not be mutually exclusive. Like their Greek counterparts, these and other Roman sources stress the courtyard and *atrium* as the prime display areas within a home.

Given this stress on the courtyard and dining facilities as areas of decorative display, the terminology of these areas was reviewed and found to show that, while the terms used may differ, the social functions of the περίστυλος, the αὐλή, the *atrium*, the *porticus* and *ambulationes* all provided large open areas that were used to entertain guests. Similarly, ἄδεων and *triclinia* were locations of high display potential, where outsiders looked upon the decorative wealth of the home and the art could become conversation pieces that highlighted the taste and status of the homeowner. This general homogeneity suggests that private art served a very public function within the home.

In the third chapter the archaeological evidence for domestic sculpture from the Greek mainland and the Anatolian coast was investigated. This evidence stretches from the fourth century to the late first century and shows a remarkable coherence with the literary testimonia. Sculptural material was found in the home, primarily in courtyards and near dining rooms suggesting a primacy for display. The earliest evidence comes from the site of Olynthos, where a statue of Asklepios was found outside of an *andron* in a house that contained painted plaster and other decorative accoutrements. This site, as well as the cities of Pella and Vergina, attests to the decorative wealth in Macedonia in the fourth century and suggests that sculpture began to be erected in the home at this
time, a thesis supported by the literary evidence. Noted for their fondness for drinking and entertaining, it is perhaps not surprising that it is among the Macedonians that decorative sculpture is first encountered and, as their cultural and military influence spread, later cultures were to imitate their practices.

The sites of Eretria and Priene provided stronger examples of sculptures found in domestic contexts. Again the evidence showed that *andrones* and courtyards were the prime areas to receive sculptural decoration. Eretria provided several examples of domestic sculpture, the most telling of which was from the House of the Mosaics. The house contained many decorative elements from mosaics to appliqués, Panathenaic amphorae and a sculpture of a nude male. This sculpture was located in an area that maximized viewing potential, and sightlines within the home illustrated a concern for viewing. Similarly, all of the decorative material may well have been linked thematically, suggesting a level of decorative cohesion usually thought to exist only among Roman villas. Priene also provided numerous examples of domestic sculpture, although the depositional context varies. In House 13 an Aphrodite statue was uncovered just outside the home’s *andron*, while in House 33, a cache of several statues was uncovered in a room that was likely a storeroom. It has been suggested that the statues belonged together as one group, and if so this represents a total number of statues for one collection again thought usually to be indicative of Roman practices. Though the setting of the statues is uncertain, the sculptures themselves are illustrative of the types of statues typical in domestic contexts: under 1 m in height, with fronts that are better treated than their backs, suggesting a primary frontal view, and depicting gods such as Aphrodite and Dionysos, deities particularly suited to the context of a symposium.
Chapter four explored the archaeological evidence from Hellenistic Campania. The inclusion of this material is important, as scholars have increasingly seen Roman material from this era in terms of a larger Hellenistic world-view. Similarly, while one could argue that the material found at Pompeii and elsewhere is overly prescriptive, it is fortuitous that the people of Campania had known contacts with the Greek world and that these people were to form the largest group of Italian merchants on the island of Delos. The evidence suggests that in the Hellenistic period the Campanians fused some native Italic or Etruscan architectural traditions, like the Tuscan atrium, along with Greek elements like the peristyle courtyard. This was done so as to create homes with strong axial tendencies and vistas through the home that maximized viewing possibilities within the domus. A prime example is the House of the Faun at Pompeii that had a long axial view from the front door, through the atrium and past the far triclinium. The placement of the faun statue in the atrium welcomed viewers from the street and announced the decorative sculpture and mosaics that lay therein. Like their Greek counterparts, the atrium, peristyle and dining rooms were used for sculptural display, though a new and important area was added in the form of a home garden.

Perhaps the biggest difference in the display of Hellenistic domestic sculpture between the Greeks and the Italians was in scale. The Campanian material shows that villas like the Villa dei Papyri had vast sculptural collections that were placed on display in the home. Though not always the case, this material could be linked thematically, either among themselves to create sculptural pendants or tableaux or with other decorative elements within the home. Also a greater number of types is found, including portraits, genre statues, athletic statuary and sculptures of deities, all in styles that range
further afield among available types. While the volume of decorative sculpture used was much greater than what was found in the east, most of the types of sculptures are present earlier, while the notion of an intricate theme involving domestic statuary was found at Eretria, suggesting some Hellenistic commonalities. New was the more widespread use of portraiture, though this was usually historical portraiture of noted individuals rather than personal portraiture. Also new was the extent to which domestic sculpture permeated more areas in the home. That these areas were still dining rooms and courtyards, however, suggests that the display of the sculpture was there to highlight the wealth and refinement of the owner.

The fifth chapter focused solely on the site of Delos, the island that contains the largest corpus of domestic sculpture from Greece or the Hellenistic east. Much of the ground-work concerning Delian domestic sculpture has already been laid by Kreeb and Sanders, though some specific questions remain. Noted were Kreeb’s findings that courtyards and andrones remain the focus of decorative attention. Also receiving sculptural attention are oikoi, rooms flanked by two other rooms that seem to first develop as an architectural form at Pergamon.\(^1\) New, however, is the firm evidence concerning sculpture on the second floor of Delian homes. It may be that spatial usage was different on the island given the need to build up rather than out, but it may also be that upper floors performed different functions as meeting rooms or rental units. The House of the Herm provides a prime example, as sculpture was found in the courtyard, in oikoi and on the second floor. Sightlines remained a concern and often material was placed in areas that provides maximum viewing potential. So much so, in fact, that in

\(^1\) As an example, the group of rooms surrounding room 2 in House II at Pergamon. See supra, 112, n. 169.
certain instances, Kreeb has suggested that domestic sculpture may even have been planned from the outset of a house’s construction.²

In addition to placement, the subjects and styles of the sculptures found in Delian homes match those found elsewhere in the Mediterranean. The statues are largely under 1 m in height and, when the subject is known, often represent Aphrodite or Dionysos and his cortège. Herakles was also popular, as was Artemis, as is perhaps to be expected given her family’s unique associations with the island. Portraits appear more often and in the form of personal, rather than historical portraits. These portraits display obvious veristic traits, although the inclusion of more idealized elements in some suggests a conscious mixing of styles available to the artists of the island. It is preferable to conclude that the material represents a mixture of populations, so that there is no connecting the portraits to any one of the island’s cultural groups based on style. The total number of portraits found suggests a popularity matching that implied by Roman assemblages such as that at the Villa dei Papiri. Any further links to Roman decorative practices remains elusive, however, as no grand thematic unity was found among the Delian sculptures, and few sculptural pendants were found. Both of these decorative schemes, while not unique to Roman decorative practice, remain characteristic. Similar to later Roman practices, however, is the presence of larger sized statues, such as the three life-sized statues from the House of the Diadoumenos. Like the examples seen elsewhere in the Hellenistic period, the emphasis of the material is maximum visual impact and decorative effect. In only a few instances could other specific functions be detected.

The evidence from all these sites suggests that a prime function of sculpture in the home was to display the wealth and taste of the owner in areas of the home that were most conspicuous, especially to male visitors from outside the household unit. There is little evidence for other functions for the statuary and the material is rarely associated with any finds that could be interpreted as religious. Given this emphasis on decoration, sightlines and visual display, it is surprising to note how often this aspect of Hellenistic domestic sculpture is downplayed in exclusive religious interpretations. This is partially understandable in light of the many gods and goddesses represented among the domestic sculptures uncovered. Aside from Aphrodite types, however, the largest single group of domestic sculpture is portraits, and identifiable genre scenes and male or female figures are comparable in number to those statues of other deities. While unidentifiable torsos could be representations of deities, it seems probable that the bulk of these statues represent generic male and female figures. In addition, many of the traditional gods and goddesses associated with the home are not found in the sculptural record, leading one to wonder where they should be found? Lastly, it is only very rarely that domestic sculpture is found clearly associated with any religious assemblage from a home, such as an altar or louteria. It is this appreciation for archaeological assemblages that seems to offer the best chance at understanding the relationship between domestic sculpture and domestic religion. Clear links to domestic cult are difficult to recognize, let alone assert, for sculpture in the home given the pervasiveness of ancient religion and our own meager understanding of its domestic manifestations. It is of value to examine what is known about domestic cult in the Hellenistic world in order to determine what role, if any, sculpture played in it.
6.1 Domestic Sculpture and Religion

The most recent statement regarding Hellenistic domestic sculpture was made in a recent monograph on the bronze Horse and Jockey group found in the Artemision shipwreck off the coast of northern Euboia. In a section on small bronze statues from private contexts, the author writes: “as far as we can tell from the archaeological evidence, these private statues and, more commonly statuettes served a largely religious context”.

In the accompanying note, he goes on to say that: “Even though the subject matter of sculpture became increasingly decorative in the Late Hellenistic period, it is probable that almost all of it was displayed under the guise of domestic religious dedications.” For these statements, the author cites Harward’s dissertation. Harward’s central thesis is that Hellenistic domestic sculpture served a largely religious function within an individual’s home. While not denying that decoration may play a part in sculptural display, he suggested four “motivations” for domestic sculpture: 1) it could serve an apotropaic function, 2) it could be votive, 3) it could serve in domestic cult, and 4) it could play a role in commemorative family cult. Unfortunately, his analysis of examples for these categories tends to be overly positive with regard to religious elements and to rely excessively on the material from Delos for his findings. For example, for only two of the herms he examined did he suggest an apotropaic function; yet even this conclusion is misleading. One was found in the Establishment of the Poseidoniasts, a building whose “private” status is debatable, while the other was

---

3 Hemingway (2004), 16.
5 Harward (1982), 98-101, 128-149.
excavated in a street, making domestic attributions difficult. While a statue from the House of the Lake is also listed as apotropaic, this is based on other material discovered in the home and would still only provide three examples of statues with possible apotropaic functions.

Similarly, the dedicatory inscription for the “Alkamenes” herm from the House of the Herm on Delos does provide a votive context, but this again depends on how private the location was. One other dedicatory inscription, unmentioned by Harward, comes from the Spurios Stertenios base found in House E off of Peribolos Street. Located in situ in a niche 1.30 m from the floor, the base is inscribed:

\[
\text{Σπόριος Σπερτένιος}
\]

\[
\text{Αφτίμιδι Συστείραι}
\]

No associated statue was found with this inscribed base, but the dedicator is otherwise known. Four other dedicatory inscriptions, including from the portico of the Agora of the Italians, name this individual, while his family is also well known. This at least attests to a dedicatory context for a domestic statue, at least implying domestic religion or piety.

---

6 As with Sanders (2001), I exclude the Establishment of the Poseidonasts as being properly “domestic”. While the architecture of the structure bears some resemblance to domestic buildings, it can best be termed a semi-private club. See Kreeb (1988), 21-29; Sanders (2001), 44-49, 255-259. The second herm was uncovered in the Theater Street near the House of the Masks and is not associated with any particular structure. Even Harward admits that it could have stood at a crossroads and that, in general, the apotropaic function of herms decreased over the course of the Hellenistic period. See Harward (1982), 128-129, 162, cat. no. 21, 181-182, cat. no. 56.2

7 The statue from the House of the Lake depicts Herakles. The House of the Lake also contained reliefs of a phallus, a shield between two piloi (symbol of the Dioskouri) and a Herakles’ club, all apotropaic symbols. See Bruneau (1964), 159-162. While Herakles was worshiped as ἄλεικκικας, the statue here may not have any particular association with the reliefs. See Harward (1988), 129-131, 166, cat. no. 28; Kreeb (1988), 163-164, cat. no. S 9.2; Sanders (2001), 241-242, cat. no. Ste 71. One sculpture from a domestic context that may have had an apotropaic purpose is a relief from Delos depicting Agathodaimon. Some Egyptian elements may be present, but likely a protective deity is being invoked. See Kreeb (1988), 197, cat. no. S 22.1; Sanders (2001), 205-207, cat. no. R 3.

8 See Bizard and Leroux (1912), 495; Bulard (1926a), 197-198; Kreeb (1988), 196-197, cat. no. S 21.1; Sanders (2001), 251, cat. no. Bse 12.

9 On these inscriptions and the Stertinii in general, see Hatzfeld (1912), 81-82. The dedication from the house is his no. 5.
but when added to the two other possible inscribed bases, this still accounts for only a small number.\textsuperscript{10}

To speak of domestic cult statues also relies too heavily on the idea of transference; that a copy of a cult statue necessarily was produced with cultic intentions. Statues like the Small Herculaneum Woman or a Knidian Aphrodite from Delos may have cult statues as their inspiration, but any religious purpose is not automatically carried over to the copy.\textsuperscript{11} Lastly, the idea of sculptures used in ancestral cult relies too heavily on poor parallels from public contexts and is indebted to Roman ideas, as in the famed passage from Polybios that describes the use of portraits in such activities.\textsuperscript{12} The statues of Kleopatra and Dioskourides from Delos do present the images in a public and “dedicatory” context, yet there is little evidence that such self-promotion was in any way utilized in cultic activity.\textsuperscript{13}

Finally, as the examples utilized here show, Harward’s main thesis regarding the functions of domestic sculpture relies too heavily on the evidence from Delos. While this

\textsuperscript{10} Harward (1982), 132, list two “probable” dedicatory inscriptions, restored as \( \Gamma \Lambda \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \gamma \nu \nu \gamma \nu \n
is understandable given the amount of material excavated on the island, the multicultural population and numerous religious threads that converge on the island make any statement reflecting previous Hellenistic practices difficult. There is little in Harward’s argument that illustrates a broad trend for the religious nature of domestic sculpture over the course of the Hellenistic period. Even if one accepts the analyses of his case studies, he still only finds religious elements in 60 of the 129 pieces he lists in his catalogue. Even if he is correct, however, there is a problem of chronology that must be addressed.  

While domestic sculpture may have fulfilled any of these roles, the primary difficulty with Harward’s assertion is that it derives primarily from an *ex silentio* literary argument. While analyzing the literary sources, he viewed the silence of the philosophers with regard to domestic sculpture as puzzling. While many, Plato and Xenophon particularly, denounced the arts of τεχνη, they saw this idea expressed primarily through paintings and tapestries. Domestic sculpture is not mentioned by these philosophers and so, since they exist in the fourth century archaeological record, they must have been an acceptable art form. As such, they must have served a religious function. The literature on the topic has already been analyzed and the pattern has been established that there are mentions of domestic sculpture in the fourth century, though these largely involved the wealthy élite, especially tyrants and kings. The references are few but increase over time, and the lists of conspicuous decoration among the tyrants do not seem to include religious statuary. This pattern seems consistent with the archaeological evidence, where the sites

---

14 Harward (1982), 125. Given the amount of material excavated at Delos, the record is heavily weighted to the first century BCE. In the fourth through third centuries a greater proportion of the material, especially at Priene, is of deities. It should be noted, however, that with Delos taken into account the total number of non-religious pieces (portraiture, genre figures, and in all likelihood most of the indeterminate male and female statues) outnumber those of deities and herms combined.

15 See Harward (1982), 57-79.
of Pella, Olynthos and Eretria provide the only known deposits of such material. Among this material, Pella had the Lateran Poseidon and the Alexander/Pan statuette. Olynthos had the Asklepios statuette, one diademed head, another plain head and a female figure. Eretria had two torsos of youthful males and a herm. As was shown, none of these figures come from an overtly religious context, but even so the Poseidon, Alexander/Pan, Asklepios and diademed head are images of deities that, when added to the herm, account for 5 out of 9 pieces. Clearly the archaeological record shows that there were non-religious domestic sculptures in the fourth century.

While acknowledging that decorative concerns for domestic sculpture increased over time, Harward still saw religious intent in most domestic sculpture down into the late Hellenistic period. The more recent treatments of the Delian material have stressed other elements of domestic sculpture, yet they too recognize an inherent religious quality in many of the sculptures. Kreeb and Sanders have both stressed the importance of visual display, sightlines and overall decorative intent among the various household sculptures on the island, yet suggest that these motivations can go hand in hand with any religious elements inherent in the statues. One cannot dismiss the fact that any image of a deity will have a certain religious quality to it, yet many of the examples of religious domestic statuary are suspect with regard to a definitive link to domestic cult. While the “Alkamenes” herm is dedicatory, it may be from a quasi-domestic setting. The herm near the “offering table” in the House of the Herm was found at the other end of the courtyard.

16 Harward (1982) 142-149. In his admission, Harward sees the divorce between religious and decorative elements as a Roman phenomenon. He does not deny a decorative function for these statues, but feels that this is the easy interpretation and that a religious motivation for sculpture is what is counterintuitive. He sees the inception of sculpture in the home as religious, yet the early evidence has shown how total the decorative intent can be, as in the House of Mosaics at Eretria.

17 In general, see Kreeb (1988), 63-66; Sanders (2001), 83-84.
and the table could just be decorative. An altar was found in the same room as an *in situ* statue base, but begs the question how close must objects be in order to be associated with one another? The “nymphaeum” from the House of the Herm may or may not have served a cultic purpose and several bases, while dedicatory in nature, could illustrate general piety rather than overt religious activity. Kreeb is correct to stress that overly strict dichotomies, like decorative vs. religious, are faulty and do not account for all possible purposes for domestic sculpture, yet functions such as honorific (Kleopatra and Dioskourides), dedicatory (“Alkamenes” herm), apotropaic (a herm near the entrance of the *oikos* of House B, Insula of the Masks) or ritual (the herm from the courtyard of the House of the Masks) could all fall under the general rubric of “domestic religion or cult”. Also, a strong decorative element was uncovered in most of these instances with sightlines and “public” placement paramount, with the House of the Herm perhaps being the strongest example. Clearly sorting through the functions of domestic sculpture is still challenging.

The difficulty with any such analysis is that so little is known about Greek domestic religion and its rituals. Few historical documents survive that explain what such practices were like and those that do are often perfunctory and offer little in the way

---

18 On offering tables in general, see Dow and Gill (1965). That such tables were important, however, is noted by Polybios, who states that those who destroy cult tables are not only wicked, but crazy as well (32.27.7-9).

19 This base, along with the Stertenios base, are the only two bases found *in situ* in niches. The three-sided hole suggested to Kreeb that this originally held a Hekate figure and that the associated altar illustrated cult activity to Hekate. See Kreeb (1988), 250-251, cat. no. S 36.1; Sanders (2001), 252, cat. no. Bse 15. As with the herm from the courtyard of the House of the Herm, it is unclear how close these two elements were and whether they should be connected or not. Chamonard (1922), 53, does not state at which end of the room the altar was found.

of details. These sources do provide the names of the most important domestic deities and what their primary functions within household cult were. The best known domestic deity was Hestia. She was the sacred hearth around which much activity occurred and it was she that presided over the important act of declaring the legitimacy of children to the *oikos* and, for boys, to the *phratry*. Though lacking the developed mythologies of other Greek deities, she usually received sacrifices in the same manner as the other gods. In Classical and Hellenistic times, she was usually not represented as a large hearth on the floor, but rather as a brazier or temporary hearth within the home. This is important, as one on the prime domestic deities was aniconic, and so could not be present in the form of any domestic statuary.

The same holds true for an aspect of the most important of the domestic gods – Zeus. Zeus was present in the home in many aspects, one of the most typical being Zeus Ktesios, or Zeus of the Property. This aspect of the god was meant to ensure the prosperity and wealth of the household and so became a particularly important domestic deity. The god was represented by a two-handled jar, wrapped with a white fillet and filled with grain, olive oil and water. This jar would then be placed in a storeroom with a small altar and sacrifices would be preformed in this room. That the god was not represented in statuary form again suggests that the lack of depictions of Zeus among the sculptural record in the home is understandable. It may even be that this god was seen as partially “public”, in that Antiphon records a story where a man, his slave mistress and

---

21 In general, see Burkert (1985), 255-256; Parker (1996), 133-159; Zaidman (2004).
22 On Hestia, see Burkert (1985), 61, 170; Zaidman (2004), 433; Mikalson (2005), 135-136, 153, 155.
23 Paus. 5.14.4.
24 In general, see Sjövall (1931).
25 Ath. 11.46. Zeus Ktesios could also be zoomorphic, represented as a snake. On Zeus Ktesios, see Burkert (1985), 130, 278; Zaidman (2004), 434; Mikalson (2005), 133-135. Given the representation of the god it may be that the prosperity of the home, at least in cult, was thought of in agrarian terms.
his friend sacrifice to the god and then proceed to have a dinner party. It may be that
the god was worshipped with members outside the household unit, if they were business
partners.

Zeus Herkeios, or Zeus of the Fence, was the deity most often mentioned in the
sources, effectively being a divine manifestation of the home itself. He protected the
enclosure of the home and was usually present in the form of an altar in the center of the
courtyard. This is an older cult, as the god appears in the Odyssey and an altar to Zeus
Herkeios was said to be in front of the house of Oinomaos at Olympia. It seems likely
that this deity was worshipped by the entire household unit, with sacrifices taking place at
an altar in the courtyard of the home. There are no mentions of a particular domestic
statue or representation of the god being worshipped and so it may be that in the home,
Zeus Herkeios was also aniconic.

Two deities traditionally associated with the home that certainly were not
aniconic, were Apollo Agyieus, or Apollo of the Street, and Hermes. Both of these
deities were seen as protector gods, averting evil and marking the space between
boundaries. Numerous herms with representations of Hermes, either youthful or older
and bearded, have been discussed and attest to his presence in the home. No

26 Antiphon 1.15-18. Inside Philaneos’ home, they sprinkle grain, pour a libation and say prayers together.
29 See as example Eur. HF 925-928, where Herakles’ whole family sacrifices to Zeus at a household altar in
the courtyard. Zeus Herkaioi is not specifically named, but this seems probable.
30 ID 1814 records that a certain Dionysios, son of Nikon, erected a public statue of Zeus Herkeios. It was
also said that when the Greeks sacked Troy, Sthenelos took as booty a wooden statue of Zeus Herkeios
(Paus. 8. 46.2). There was usually a public counterpart to this cult, essentially noting the community as one
large household, and so it is possible that there was a distinction between public and private worship.
31 On Apollo Agyieus, see Bulard (1926a), 19-20; Mikalson (1998), 115, 269; Mikalson (2005), 133, 135.
Apollo could be represented as a statuette or a pillar of some sort and there is a reference to an aniconic
Apollo Agieus at Ar. Thesm. 489. He could thus be rendered as iconic or not. For Hermes, see Burkert
representations of Apollo Agyieus have been found, but the literary record attests to representations of the god as a herm or statuette.\textsuperscript{32} The question does arise, however, as to how “domestic” these cults were. While certainly protecting the home in their apotropaic function, many representations were on the street in front of the house and so part of the “public” domain. In as much as they acted as boundary markers, they served both the public and private spheres at the same time.\textsuperscript{33} Other domestic deities are known, such as Zeus Ephestios (of the hearth), Zeus Xenia (of guest friendship), Zeus Patroos (of the ancestor), Zeus Meilichios (of kindness) and Apollo Patroos (of the ancestor). While attested in the literary and epigraphic records, no images of these deities have been found and they may all be aniconic.\textsuperscript{34} Zeus is clearly the pre-eminent deity among all in the household, likely reflecting the father’s role as head of the house.

Another problem may be caused by separating the \textit{oikos} unit, and indeed its people, from wider societal concerns. In as much as the \textit{polis} may have been made up of individual \textit{oikoi}, it was actually defined by its individual citizens.\textsuperscript{35} A key term used to describe “public” religion is \textit{δημοσελείας} or “by the people”, suggesting that individuals, rather than the state, were the important elements in religious activity. It was, after all, the individual that made sacrifices and dedications at public temples and created a personal or private relationship with the gods through activities at public shrines. It was


\textsuperscript{33} The many herms in an indoor domestic context have already been noted. Hermes was addressed with prayers before a symposium (Ath. 11.460e), and was also a god of commerce (with herms in the agora), and so important to the prosperity of the home. See Sanders (2001), 90-93.

\textsuperscript{34} Apollo Patroos is primarily known in Athens and the epithet may represent the god as ancestor of the family’s lineage. On these deities, see Burkert (1985), 130, 158-159, 255; Mikalson (2005), 133-136; Zaidman (2004).

\textsuperscript{35} Thuc. 2.34-46; Arist. \textit{Pol}. 1253b.1-3.
thus in public that the individual was to express a large amount of his private piety.\(^{36}\)

Such an idea is expressed at Plato’s *Laws* 909e-910d, when he states:

\[\text{“Γεγονεί ἐσθιαὶ ἱεραὶ ἕκτησθι. Θεοὺς ὅσιον θέλον ἡ τρίτη, πρὸς τὰ ὄντα δεχόμενα ἐπὶ θυσίαν, καὶ τοῖς ἱερείσι τε καὶ ἱερείας ἐγχειρίζετω τὰ θυμάτα, αἷς ἀρετὴ τῶν ἐπιμελήσεων.”} \]

Plato continues to admonish as irrational those who fill “every house and village” with altars, yet many such shrines to those “domestic” gods mentioned were prescribed by tradition, or even by law.\(^{37}\) Aristotle asked for a merging of private (ἰδια) cults and common (κοινά) cults in the polis, suggesting that the two had much in common.\(^{38}\) Thus the public cults of the *polis* and the public conventions that sanction them essentially governed domestic cultic activities. While one can perhaps distinguish between activities that take place in the public sphere and those that take place in a home, a distinction between public and private religion is more difficult to establish.\(^{39}\)

The presence of such cult activity in the home is partially evident in the archaeological record, however, in the form of the cult paraphernalia that has been uncovered, primarily terracotta figurines and altars. Among the sites discussed in this study, altars were found in many houses, with the earliest evidence coming from Olynthos. For the most part these altars conform to the standard type of small, portable

---

\(^{36}\) As an example, see Men. *Dysc.* 260-263. Sourvinou-Inwood (1988), 264-267, sees the individual and not the οἰκός as the minimum unit in Greek cult activity. See Parker (1996), 6.

\(^{37}\) For example, one of the questions posed to an individual seeking a magistracy in Athens was: *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτα εἰ ἔστω αὐτῷ Ἁπάλλωμα Πατρίως καὶ Ζεὺς Ἐρείπις, καὶ ποιῶ ταῦτα* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 55.3). Plato elsewhere extols private cults of sanctioned deities (*Leg.* 717b, 885a), and Sourvinou-Inwood (1988), 270-273, suggests that the private versions of such cults were largely dependant upon their public counterparts. See Parker (1996), 6.

\(^{38}\) *Pol.* 1319b.24-25.

\(^{39}\) It should be noted that one could be charged with ἀνώγεια for one’s private cult activities. Such state control over private religious acts was also in evidence in Athens’ control of private burial practices and state versions of the cults of Hestia and Zeus Herkeios. See Sourvinou-Inwood (1988), 270-273; Parker (1996), 7; Mikalson (2005), 160-161. Jameson (1990), 192-205, argues about how frequent formal household cult activity even was. If it were as informal as he suggests, then one wonders what “functions” domestic sculpture served in between religious observances.
altars made of terracotta, though larger, more ornate altars made of stone are also in evidence. The House of Many Colors, for example, contained three altars. One was a larger stone altar uncovered in the courtyard of the home, while two smaller portable altars were uncovered in the pastas of the house.\textsuperscript{40} This at least suggests that while altars to Zeus Herkeios could be in the courtyard, worship could take place in several different areas of the home. Notably, however, the andrones from Olynthos were almost bare when excavated and no altars seem to have been uncovered in such rooms. In the House of Asklepios, the statue was noted as having been discovered outside the andron of that home. Immediately opposite the andron, room a contained a square terracotta stand with Ionic volutes that may have been an altar.\textsuperscript{41} The head of the terracotta figurine that was also uncovered in the room may suggest cult activity took place in this room, but it seems clear that the statue of Asklepios does not belong with this “religious” assemblage.

The House of the Mosaics at Eretria contained an altar in the middle of the western courtyard.\textsuperscript{42} The base of the altar is 1.22 m x 0.85 m and the height is unknown owing to the altar’s fragmentary nature. A stone foundation was set into the stone mosaic floor of the center of the peristyle. This conforms with the literary evidence that states that the courtyard was an appropriate place of cult, especially for altars to Zeus Herkeios.\textsuperscript{43} The orientation for the altar was WNW-ESE and was roughly facing the place where the statue of the youth was uncovered. This is significant, as the sculpture

\textsuperscript{40} See Graham (1953), Robinson (1946), 190; Cahill (2002), 87-89. In the pastas was also found a marble louterion that could have been used for cultic purposes in addition to everyday use. In five houses at Olynthos were such louteria found in association with portable altars. See Cahill (2002), 99-100, 110, 144, 158, 168, 248-249.

\textsuperscript{41} See Robinson (1946), 137-142.

\textsuperscript{42} See Ducrey et al. (1993), 65-66. Based on the molding for the altar, there do not seem to be any parallels elsewhere in the Greek world.

\textsuperscript{43} See Ducrey et al. (1993), 66.
appears to be nothing other than a nude male and no one has suggested that the two should be linked. Though the two are in proximity, the statue seems decorative and should not be associated with any cult practices. This should warn against the automatic association of a piece of sculpture with a cult object that may be nearby. A full contextual analysis, including proximity and subject, should be undertaken when ascribing any cult functions to a sculpture. No other altars were found in domestic contexts at Eretria.

Small altars were also found at Priene. In House 33, there was an altar with a dedicatory inscription that was found in the courtyard of the home. The altar was dedicated to Zeus Olympios, illustrating another aspect of the god that could have been worshipped in the home. Again, no sculpture was found that could clearly be associated with this altar and the numerous pieces of domestic statuary found were from another room. The same holds true for House 13 that contained the small statue of Aphrodite. The statue was found in a room just off the prostas, while an altar was located in the main room at the northern end of the house. The relative findspots of the two suggest that they should not be connected. Similarly the altars found in House 29 and the house to the west of House 29 were at the other end of the home from the statues. In no instance were any of the marble statues discussed found with any of the altars uncovered in the homes. It should be noted that there were other options available for household cult for the citizens. In front of House 32, two altars were uncovered

---

44 In general, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 319-328 with the contents uncovered in the various houses. See also Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 180.
45 Here it is likely that the homeowner had a special relationship to Zeus Olympios. See Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326; *IVP* no. 191; Akurgal (2001), 203-204.
46 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321.
47 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 321.
flanking the entrance, suggesting that some type of domestic cult took place in front of the home rather than in it. If cultic activities were done out in the open and on the street, then here is an instance of domestic cult that seems very “public.” There were also two shrines in the domestic area at Priene that were originally houses. The first is the so-called “House of Alexander,” the house that the Macedonian stayed in while at Priene which seems to have become a type of heroon or shrine to the general or his “genius” after he had died. The second is the shrine to Kybele. Both illustrate that the presence of cult activity within domestic areas of a city need not be exclusive to the homes themselves.

The best evidence for domestic cult activity comes, not surprisingly, from Delos. Here numerous altars, herms and cultic paraphernalia were excavated in several of the houses; Bruneau lists 16 small portable altars that had dedications and inscriptions. Several of the deities mentioned in these inscriptions are not found among the subjects of Delian domestic sculpture. The most popular, not surprisingly, are Apollo and Artemis. These altars are not clearly associated with any domestic sculptures and, as has been shown, several instances where religious implications have been cited are problematical.

48 Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 326. See esp. the excavation photo when they were first uncovered, 300, Abb. 318.
49 For the House of Alexander, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 172-182; Akurgal (2001), 205-206. Some sort of cult activity took place here, given the architecture and finds from the northern section of this house. Here were found an offering table and a small portrait head of Alexander, hence the assertion of cult involving the Macedonian. This is far from certain, however and the excavators label it simply an ἱερός θάλασσα. For the shrine to Kybele, see Wiegand and Schrader (1904), 171-172; Hoepfner and Schwandner (1994), 167-169; Akurgal (2001), 205.
Another aspect of domestic religion from the island is the religious painting found on the exterior of homes. Originally 23 paintings were uncovered by the excavators, with another number of partial drawings as well. Since 1926, another 8 have come to light. The paintings were usually placed to either side of a niche that surmounted an altar immediately beside the front door to the home. These paintings usually had an image of a deity, religious symbols such as an amphora or sows (whole or jointed), and twinned characters in heraldic display or possibly in combat. Such images have long been associated with similar paintings found at Pompeii, though the paintings on Delos are up to 100 years earlier. This similarity in imagery has prompted scholars to see links between these paintings and the Italian populations on the island. The similarity to Pompeii carries over to placement as well, as the paintings there are also found on the exterior of homes right beside the door. This placement seems to mark implicitly this exterior religious space as different from that of the interior and it seems likely that any rites associated with such paintings on the interior of homes were also different from those practiced outside the home.

Roman domestic religious practices are slightly better known than the Greek, but we rely rather heavily on the archaeological evidence from Pompeii and Herculaneum.

52 On which see Bulard (1926a); Bulard (1926b); Marcadé (1969), 336-354; Bruneau (1970), 589-620; Hasenohr (2003).
53 Bulard (1926b), 7-96, noted that the majority of figures represented are in *toga* and *calcei*, suggesting Romans. He essentially saw the paintings on Delos as reflecting Roman domestic religious practices, especially that celebrating sacrifice to the *Genius* by the *paterfamilias*. Bruneau (1970), 590-603, saw fault with this thesis, noting the similarities between the *Genius* and *Agathosdaimon* and that the 4 names painted in these images are Greek. He believed the images to represent the *Lares competales*, but that they were placed there by Greeks and not Romans. Hasenohr (2003), 173, ultimately merges the previous theses and suggests that these paintings are Italian, with some Greek influence. For comparisons with Pompeii, see Hasenohr (2003), 190-192.
54 On these paintings, see Fröhlich (1991); Tybout (1996).
55 5 paintings were found on the inside of Delian homes. See Bulard (1926a), nos. 5, 8, 13, 15, 16. Hasenohr (2003) suggests that the exterior paintings should be associated with the *Competalia* and so the interior paintings reflect domestic cult.
For the most part there were three focal points for domestic religion: the hearth as symbolized by Vesta, the titular gods of the home as represented by the Lares and certain watchful gods set in cupboards and storerooms, the Penates.\textsuperscript{56} Like Hestia, Vesta was worshipped in the home as the hearth, possibly the most important area for the propitiation of household \textit{numina}.\textsuperscript{57} She was associated with the \textit{di Penates} and was worshipped to ensure the health, wealth and well being of the \textit{domus}. Also like Hestia, she seems to have been largely aniconic.\textsuperscript{58} Associated with Vesta were the Penates, the guardian deities that lived in the home’s storeroom or \textit{penus}. In public cult the Penates were seen as two youthful male gods who protected the hegemony of Rome.\textsuperscript{59} In private, the \textit{di Penates} were more nebulous and were guardians who “lived” in the storeroom and protected the family grain supply.\textsuperscript{60} The worship of these figures came to express all the household gods, and so one can view the painted figures found in Campanian house shrines as Penates.\textsuperscript{61}

The Lares may have started out as agricultural deities, but in household worship they became guardians of the home, with the \textit{Lar familiaris} becoming a \textit{numen} that could watch over family members wherever they were.\textsuperscript{62} So associated with the home were

\textsuperscript{56} Orr (1978), 1559. In general on the shrines from Pompeii and Herculaneum, see Boyce (1937); Orr (1972).
\textsuperscript{58} Ov. \textit{Fast}. 6.295-299. There are paintings of Hestia/Vesta at Delos that show her associated with the omphalos. See Bulard (1926b), 310-313, 400-401. At Pompeii, she is sometimes depicted in the \textit{lararia} associated with an ass. See Jordan (1865), 1-20.
\textsuperscript{59} It seems that the Penates were, in fact, either the Dioskouri or syncretized with Castor and Pollux, at least in state cult. See Weinstock (1960). Galinski (1969), 154-157, would see the origin of the Penates elsewhere and there may have been a shrine to the Penates of Troy in Lavinium. See Orr (1978), 1562-1563.
\textsuperscript{60} Mart. 8.75.1. In this way, the Penates are similar to Zeus Ktesios.
\textsuperscript{62} Plaut. \textit{Aulularia}. 1-5; Tib. 1.10.13-25; Ov. \textit{Fast} 5.142. See Orr (1978), 1563-1569.
these deities that at times the word *lar* becomes a metonym for the home.\textsuperscript{63} The Lares could take the form of small wooden figures or bronze statuettes, sometimes brought with a traveler, but are often depicted in paintings as happy, dancing figures holding *rhyta* full of wine. Their overall conception is very Greek and many of the Lares from Pompeii are shown with Greek *rhyta*, though their dress could be either Greek or Roman.\textsuperscript{64} Closely associated with the figures of the Lares are, of course, the *lararia* found in the home. The term *lararium* is first used later than the actual placement of a shrine in the house, and early terms used are *sacraria* and *aediculae*.\textsuperscript{65} The material at Pompeii seems to form a mid-way point in the development of *lararia*, illustrating the shift from smaller to more permanent and monumentalized shrines.

At Pompeii, three different types of *lararia* have been identified: the niche type, the *aedicula* type and the wall painting type.\textsuperscript{66} In general, the common features found among these different types are the representations of the deities and the ability to sacrifice before them. The representations of the deities could be small statuettes placed inside niches or more grand, temple-like constructs. The paintings would likewise have a depiction of the deities, often paired with a representation of the genius and a serpent, and

---

\textsuperscript{63} Verg. *Georg.* 3.344; Martial 10.61.5.
\textsuperscript{64} Tib. 1.10.15-20, 2.1.59-60. Another form in which the Lares appear is standing, holding a *cornucopia* and *patera*. Wissova (1905), 172, saw the dancing pose as reflecting a Dionysian pose from the Greek East that was common in South Italy. For these types, with references, see Orr (1978), 1568-1569.
\textsuperscript{65} The word *lararium* is first used in the *Historiae Augustae*, when Marcus Aurelius is said to have kept golden statues of his teachers in his *lararium* (*SHA* M.Ant 3.5-6). On *sacraria*, see Cic. *Mil.* 86. On *aediculae*, see Petron. *Sat.* 29.8. Orr (1978), 1576, n. 129, notes that a simple cupboard could also serve as a shrine and Trimalchio’s large cupboard held shrines within it (Petron. *Sat.* 29).
\textsuperscript{66} Boyce (1932), 10. Some *lararia* do not fit neatly into one of these categories. See Orr (1972), corpus A, no. 42.
would have an altar placed at the bottom.\textsuperscript{67} This is precisely the basic make-up as was observed at Delos.

It should be noted that these \textit{lararia}, while the focal point of family cult, were not exclusive, and the many small portable altars uncovered at Pompeii without \textit{lararia} attest to different types of worship.\textsuperscript{68} As elsewhere in the Greek world, these were primarily small, portable altars, the earliest being made of tufa, with later examples made of marble, limestone and terracotta.\textsuperscript{69} These altars were used for sacrifice, but could also have been votives themselves, placed inside the niches. Their distribution shows no discernable patterns: other than gardens, kitchens, \textit{pistrina} and \textit{cellae penariae} were the prominent locations.\textsuperscript{70} This differs considerably from the Greek world, where such altars were located in the courts and peristyles of the home. In Pompeii, it seems that these altars were placed in areas of more restricted access, suggesting that cult activity may have been a more private affair, the opposite of what is generally seen as the public and decorative nature of the domestic sculpture.\textsuperscript{71}

As for the subjects, the gods usually depicted in the \textit{lararia} are Fortuna, Vesta and Bacchus, deities of importance in the town of Pompeii. Fortuna is the most common, often with accompanying rudder and cornucopia, in order to insure luck and prosperity.

\textsuperscript{67} Orr (1978), 1577.
\textsuperscript{68} There could even be a separate room for worship entitled the \textit{sacellum}. See Boyce (1932), 18; Orr (1978), 1576-1578.
\textsuperscript{69} See Boyce (1932), 15, 36; Orr (1978), 1578. For Pompeian altars in general, see Pernice (1932).
\textsuperscript{70} Examples include Helbig (1868), nos. 32, 336-38, 40, 47-49, 52, 57, 61, 63, 71, 73. See Bulard (1926a), 18; Orr (1972), 99. The more elaborate versions of \textit{lararia} could be found in \textit{atria}. See Dwyer (1982), 114-115.
\textsuperscript{71} It may also be that over time the cult of the Lares became a concern for slaves and freedmen and that this accounts for the location of many \textit{lararia} in areas of the home not frequented by members of the \textit{domus}. See Fröhlich (1991), 31; Bomer (1981), 57-59. This also holds that a larger proportion of altars from Delos were on the exterior of houses, in plain sight, whereas the majority of Pompeian altars were interior and those that were outside were likely for the \textit{Lares Augusti} and the \textit{Genius Caesaris} and not for domestic cult. 31 of the 89 altars listed by Helbig (1868) were exterior, of which 5 were for the \textit{magistri vici} and the \textit{Lares Compitales} and should be removed from consideration. See Bulard (1926a), 17, esp. n. 4.
Vesta is the all-important Roman goddess of the home, while Bacchus was especially important to the numerous *taberna* and *fullonica* workers. Mercury, Venus, Minerva and Isis are all also present, the last especially as Isis-Fortuna.\textsuperscript{72}

Among the several examples of Campanian domestic sculpture examined, there is more firm evidence to suggest that some of the examples of domestic sculpture had a relationship to cult activity.\textsuperscript{73} There is the archaistic Diana from the garden of House VIII vi 3 that was found with an altar. The presence of the altar implies some sort of cult activity with the figure, though whether the figure was found in a shrine or not is debatable.\textsuperscript{74} As with the material from Delos, however, proximity is again an issue. The Diana was found with the altar, while the Apollo from the House of Menander and the Diana from House III iv b were both uncovered with braziers.\textsuperscript{75} The room in the Casa del Citarista in which the Apollo was found, however, also contained an altar but the precise findspot is unclear.\textsuperscript{76} Should they be associated simply because they were both found in the same general area? What if found near *lararia*? Several of the domestic sculptures mentioned were uncovered in areas of the home that also contained *lararia*. While Dwyer is clear on a distinction between the two types of images, domestic and *lararia* figurines, these can often be of the same subject matter, though often differ in size or

\textsuperscript{72} Aside from the depictions of the gods themselves, several other motifs are often present, especially in the painted *lararia*. These include plants, flowers, animals, representations of the *Genius*, and scenes of sacrifice. For a brief summary of the motifs found in *lararia*, see Orr (1978), 1580-1586.

\textsuperscript{73} In general, see supra, 155-156.

\textsuperscript{74} See Dwyer (1982), 136; Richardson Jr. (1970), 202; Fullerton (1990), 22-29, 34-35, no. IIA1, with references.

\textsuperscript{75} A bronze brazier was found near the Apollo from the House of Menander (Allison (1992), 165), while a brazier and an incense burner were found with the Diana from House III iv b (Dwyer (1982), 125).

\textsuperscript{76} See Dwyer (1982), 88-89.
material. A *lararium* was excavated in the same courtyard as the Apollo from the Casa del Citarista, though at an opposite end. It is likely that the two should not be connected.

Similarly compounding the difficulty are those decorative contexts for sculptures that are made to appear religious, though such a context may have been ironic or allusive. The garden of the Casa di Marco Lucrezio contained a series of statues in a complex arrangement, with a drunken Silenus at the back in a shrine like setting. His elevated status has more to do with the decorative tableau created than with any cultic function, though the whole is presented in a way that mirrors cult presentations. The Miniature Villa contained an elaborately decorated garden with a canal lined with statues creating a *nilus* scene. At one end was a shrine to Isis, a goddess noted in domestic worship. While this may then be evidence of domestic cult, the elaborate decorative program suggests that the shrine itself may have been part of this decoration, changing a general *euripus* scene to a *nilus* scene and adding to the Egyptian feeling of the program. These types of decorative schemes suggest that while a strict interpretation of statues as either religious or not is challenging, even when one has a seemingly secure shrine-like context, the level of decorative to religious intent is still difficult to ascertain. It does seem, however, that Roman domestic statuary can be more easily interpreted than the Greek, with some statues discovered with altars, while a separate focus of domestic religion in

---

77 In general, *lararium* figures seem to be approximately 0.25 m or smaller, while most decorative sculpture is approximately 0.25 m or larger. Exceptions are known, such as the Venus from the Casa di Epidio Rufo that was 0.47 m, but was located inside a large cabinet associated with the *lararium*. See Dwyer (1982), 115, 121. Venus figurines are often larger than the other gods found in *lararia*. Marble *lararium* figures are known, but most are bronze or terracotta. Decorative or ‘garden’ sculptures were primarily of bronze or marble. In general, see Dwyer (1982), 121-128, 135-137, who notes distinctions between the two.

78 See supra, 149, n. 31.

79 See supra, 153, n. 40.

80 See supra, 179, n. 115.
the form of lararia would seem to separate the majority of these statues from a religious context.

What this brief examination of domestic religion shows is that there are very few examples of domestic sculpture that can clearly be placed within an explicitly religious context. Statues are rarely found with assemblages that can be considered religious and when they are, questions of proximity are always a concern. The major deities associated with domestic cult are either unrepresented, or the deities are aniconic. It is likely that many of the religious rituals that took place in the home left no traces in the archaeological record, as prayers or libations were the prominent means of expressing one’s piety in the home.\(^{81}\) Some religious value is inherent given that many of the statues represent the gods and goddesses of the Greeks, and so one should not maintain a strict adherence to a religious/decorative dichotomy, but view it rather as a question of degree within the religious-decorative classification. Still, it does seem like any formalized relationship between statue and cult is difficult to maintain. When one examines what we know about ancient domestic religion and the archaeological contexts for the sculptures, an exclusively “religious” interpretation for these statues cannot be maintained. Contextual analysis seems the best evaluative approach to approach this question, and with it there is usually nothing in the material record that helps support a primary religious interpretation for domestic sculpture.

Other alternatives for cult were available, as shown by the numerous paintings on the outside of the homes on Delos. These provided a form of domestic religion that had

\(^{81}\) “Belief in their [herms] efficacy did not require an actual image, and most families probably made do with occasional prayers or libations at the house door.” Jameson (1990), 194. Such expressions of piety are difficult to quantify, but point to an intermittent and informal relationship at best between a sculpture and religious practice.
little to do with any sculpted image. It is likely that these paintings were for the Italians of the island, indicating yet another manifestation of the mixed religious nature of Delos. As for the Romans, unlike the Greeks they had an area set aside for religious worship with *lararia*. Dwyer has shown that there was a clear difference between *lararium* figures and other sculptural material. *Lares* figures are more often bronze or terracotta and are considerably smaller than domestic sculpture. The subjects can often be the same, especially when examining images of Bacchus and his followers, but their stature and material set them apart and suggest that there was a separate group of statues for religious worship in the home. While there is some improved evidence for increased religious use of some of the sculpture among the Campanian examples studied, these remain in the minority. In addition, the display context of some of the sculptural groups seems to consciously evoke a religious setting without implying an actual cult. It seems that while religious functions for Hellenistic domestic statuary are possible, these are often subservient to decorative and display concerns and one should be cautious in ascribing any cult functions to any statues uncovered.

6.2 Sculpture in the Hellenistic Home

It seems clear from the evidence that a general pattern of sculptural use in the home develops over the course of the Hellenistic period. While this development should not be seen as directly linear, the placing of sculpture in the home seems to follow a broad progression. The sources indicate that, in the fourth century, the kings and tyrants of the age began to decorate their palaces with all manner of art. The reason for this decoration revolved around status, as the art could be used to impress visitors on state
occasions. This seems especially clear in the case of the royal palaces from Macedonia, whose several dining rooms reflect the social practice of the kings to entertain numerous guests and not be as sequestered as previous monarchs.\textsuperscript{82} This in turn precipitated a pattern of social emulation that lead people to imitate the social behavior of the élites, but also the manner in which this behavior took place – surrounded by luxury.\textsuperscript{83} Scholars have noted that these Macedonian palaces became templates upon which the larger houses of the Hellenistic period were based.\textsuperscript{84} The large peristyle courtyard and the importance placed on dining rooms can be seen in the House of the Mosaics at Eretria, Houses I and II and the House of Attalos at Pergamon, House 33 at Priene, the House of the Faun at Pompeii and the House of the Herm at Delos. It is therefore not surprising that in the diffusion of spatial types, that usage of space is also diffused.

What may seem more surprising is that many of these changes occurred at about the same time. If one excludes the House of the Mosaics for the moment, peristyle courtyards and emphases on rooms for entertainment began to be incorporated into the homes of the wealthy some time ca. 200 BCE. This also included the development of the three-room group, so prevalent at Pergamom, which appears elsewhere in the Hellenistic world at this time.\textsuperscript{85} What did not develop fully until the age of Pompeii and Delos, however, was a concern for axial arrangements that had the effect of maximizing vistas through the home. This seems to have been an Italic invention that became popular in the

\textsuperscript{82} Nielsen (1999), 97-99.
\textsuperscript{83} This is precisely the type of social emulation posited by Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 173.
\textsuperscript{85} The first use of columns in an “empty” courtyard can be traced back to the fourth century at Olynthos and Eretria, but become more prevalent from the early second century onward. See Dickman (1997), 121-124; Zanker (1998), 16-17. These three-room groups can be interpreted as exedrae and can be found at Pergamon, Samos, Rhodes and Pompeii. Nielsen (1999), 230, n. 215, notes that this commonality is illustrative of the cultural koine of the late Hellenistic period.
later Hellenistic period and illustrates a concern for spatial arrangement that maximizes viewing potential for those entering the home.\textsuperscript{86} The House of the Mosaics, however, illustrates that sightlines were a concern for decorative arrangement and so while axial views may not have taken root until the later Hellenistic period, certainly an interest in viewing and display potential had surfaced much earlier.

Spatial usage among the Greeks and Roman of the Hellenistic period, then, remains largely similar, though the degree to which this usage is articulated in the house changes. Courtyards and dining rooms, whether one refers to them as περίτυλοι, αἰλαί or atria, ἀμφώος or triclinia, were centers of activity in the home and the area most open to outsiders. This is the same whether one is dealing with the rather closed ὄικος of the Greek world, or the more open domus of the Roman. This is not to suggest an overly normative or exclusive use of space. The multifunctional use of space within the Greek and Roman home has been established, yet dining rooms especially are areas where we know that a specific activity took place at a specific time.

Scholars have been correct to point to the difference between the public world of the Greek, which largely took place in the agora, and the public world of the Roman, which took place in the domus with clientes coming to do business daily.\textsuperscript{87} This does

\textsuperscript{86} Wallace-Hadrill places an emphasis on what is termed “optical symmetry”. This has the effect of making a dramatic impact on the viewer. See Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 44-45 with references.

\textsuperscript{87} This is a central thesis of both Wallace-Hadrill (1994) and Zanker (1998). In delineating the Roman domus through axes of differentiation (38), Wallace-Hadrill (1994) sets four quadrants for reception, paying special attention to amici (58), in the home. The size and complexity of this interplay is greater in the Roman domus, but the axes themselves are also present in the Greek ὄικος. Zanker (1998), stresses that power in the Roman state flowed from the home to the state, while in the Greek home it flowed from the polis to the home (6-7). The Greek polis, however, was thought of as a collective of households and again it is a question of degree. Wallace-Hadrill (1994), perhaps makes too much of the influence of Greek public architecture on Roman homes, setting as allusive the Roman private sphere to the Greek public sphere (17-21). It has been noted by historians of Greek architecture that such public buildings as the gymnasium, palaestra and stoa had a similar influence on the forms adopted in Greek private architecture. This development begins in the fourth century and may involve increasing independence among the
stress the more public nature of the Roman *domus*, yet it is again a question of degree. While the circumstances for visitors to a Greek home were more limited, they still did enter the home and remain in the same areas, courtyards and dining rooms, as the *clientes* did in the Roman home. Thus the decorative attention paid to these two areas was the same in both cultures, it was just that the larger *domus* provided more space and more opportunities for decoration.  

This difference in scale carries over to the number of the statues as well. In the earlier part of the Hellenistic period, one finds a few examples at Olynthos, and a similarly small number at Eretria. The examples at Pergamon and Priene in the mid-Hellenistic period are still few, but the number of statues uncovered in House 33 at Priene suggests that it was perhaps possible for larger collections of domestic statuary to be found in the Greek home. This group of statues was almost certainly not meant to be a unified collection, however, and it is only among the collections in the Roman period at Pompeii, Fianello Sabino and Oplontis that one finds large collections of statues meant to be displayed in one home. This carried over to Delos, where the House of the Herm had 30 pieces of sculpture displayed in the home. This, coupled with the strong axial house plans one finds on Delos suggests that either the Campanian inhabitants of the island had a strong cultural, and thus material, influence or that there was a number of spatial and decorative arrangements available for the islanders to choose from that developed over

---

88 Average house sizes in the Greek world ranged from 2400 square feet at Priene, 3335 square feet at Olynthos and 4200 square feet among the houses of the Theater Quarter on Delos. The House of the Faun, for example, is 31000 square feet in area. The only comparable sizes in the Greek world are to be found among the palaces, such as the Palazzo delle Colonne at Ptolemais at 32000 square feet and the Palace at Pella at 56000 square feet.

89 House II at Eretria had four examples, illustrating that more than single examples of domestic statuary could be found as early as the fourth century.
the course of the Hellenistic period. The latter seems more likely. As stated, the axial nature of many Delian homes may be borrowed from an Italic vocabulary and yet the kind of thematic integration found among domestic sculptural assemblages in Campania is not found on Delos.  

Cohesion of subject matter is, however, to be found at the House of the Mosaics at Eretria. This should caution against attempting to create overly strict divisions between the Greek and Roman material in the Hellenistic period. What are traditionally seen as Roman features, large numbers of statues and thematic unity, can be seen at sites like Eretria and Delos, though not all in one house or at one site. Similarly, while the majority of home types discussed in the Roman sphere come from Campania, it should be noted that this area had a long tradition of cultural contact with the Greeks and is generally illustrative of the kind of effect that Hellenization had on the culture of the Romans. 

Thus it is that one can speak of variation in degree of use for domestic sculpture in the Hellenistic period, but one should view the material from the various sites in Greece, Anatolia and Campania as fitting within the general cultural koinai of the age.

As to meaning for domestic sculpture, it is clear that a largely decorative purpose served as the major function for these statues. From the earliest examples at Olynthos, through to the latest examples on Delos and at Pompeii, the emphasis placed on courtyards and dining rooms illustrates a desire to show off one’s statues to those who

---

90 Kreeb (1998), 101-102. The chronology of the houses on Delos, however, is uncertain as they pre-date much of the material found at Pompeii prompting one to question typological and cultural links. Still, earlier material like the House of the Faun shows this emphasis on axial arrangements and thematic unity.

91 Zanker (1998), 4, 32-43. This is also an idea pursued by Kunze, who would see the sculptural decoration of Hellenistic palaces as influential on the later sculptural decorations of Roman villas. See Kunze (1996).
enter into the home. The fairly consistent concern for sightlines also highlights the desire
to ensure that these statues were seen as clearly as possible by those entering the home.
This should not be surprising given the importance that viewing and entertaining had in
the Hellenistic period. Since the time of Lysippus, art had had a new emphasis on its
visual qualities and how people would react to seeing the art.\footnote{Pl. NH 34.65. This is also manifest in the science of catoptrics that became popular in the Hellenistic period. This is another expression of the time’s interest in the visual. See Onians (1975), 45.} This represents another
aspect of what Pollitt has termed “theatricality,” a major force in much of the art and
architecture of the age.\footnote{Pollitt (1986).} The home became a theater in which to put on a visual display
as grand as any drama and, like the choregos of a drama, the domestic display was meant
to shower praise on the homeowner and illustrate his wealth, taste and refinement.\footnote{“Public buildings and their setting are then viewed as a kind of performance space, a stage created by a society to meet its own needs.” Zanker (1998), 3. The same may be said of private homes.}

This is not to suggest that there were no other secondary or tertiary meanings for
domestic sculpture. Polyvalence is a hallmark of Greek art and art in the home is no
exception. Harward’s argument that all domestic sculpture is religious has already been
addressed, but the ideas of decoration and religion need not be mutually exclusive.\footnote{Kreeb (1988), 96, 101-102.} On
a base level many of the statues are images of deities and so imbued with a certain
religious quality, while certain acts of piety such as a prayer or libation would leave no
archaeological trace to suggest cultic activity. The material at Delos certainly illustrates
the range of possibilities for domestic sculpture, including, votive and apotropaic
functions, but these all seem subservient to greater sense of display for the figure. The
statues are rarely found with material that can be thought of as cultic and, with the
exception of Hermes, the gods most often associated with domestic cult are not to be
found among the subjects of domestic sculpture. Throughout the Hellenistic period, Aphrodite, Dionysos and their associated supporting characters were the most favored among sculptural themes. Neither of these deities was especially associated with domestic life or cult, though both had general associations with fertility that may have appealed to homeowners. Their associated creatures, nymphs, erotes, satyrs and silens, were also associated with fertility, but their frolicsome and liminal nature suggests a primary use other than cult. It is these representations of gods, goddesses and creatures associated with fecundity that also offered the most potential for interesting visual portrayals.

This mix of religious characters, decorative and display prominence and, in the later Hellenistic period, an emphasis on spectacle best sums up the place of sculpture in the home. From the earliest examples, these features are prominent and the material from the House of the Mosaics at Eretria illustrates a level of decorative and thematic cohesion usually associated with the Roman period. It seems that the types of displays found in domestic contexts in the Greek and Roman worlds were very similar in intent and execution, except that the Roman evidence provides more individual examples in the home. Like many other aspects of the Hellenistic period, this reflects a dynamic relationship between the cultures that share in the cultural koinai of the age and express them in similar manners. With regard to domestic sculpture, this expression manifested itself through a primary interest in displaying one’s wealth and taste to the community at large, whether that was through minor or major social interaction in the home, and

96 For an evaluation of these deities and their possible relation to a domestic setting on Delos, see Sanders (2001), 93-99 104-106. The representations of Aphrodite are mostly those involving bathing (Knidos, Anadyomene, crouching), whose opportunity to represent the goddess nude may reinforce any associations with fertility.
possibly reflecting some aspects of piety. This places domestic sculpture in line with public sculptural dedications going back to Phrasiklea and Kroisos. The dedications of kouroi and korai, the numerous sculptures at sanctuaries like Delphi or the Athenian acropolis all had this dual aspect in the promotion of the individual dedicating the piece. The status of the dedicant was reinforced through the expense of the monument, as is the piety of the individual for making the dedication. It is likely that domestic sculpture followed this practice and so the types of complex analyses and associations that have been brought to bear on public sculpture may also be used to evaluate private sculpture. Given the similarity to the Daokhos monument and the youth from the House of the Mosaics, then such associations between public and private sculpture should not be surprising. Hellenistic domestic sculpture was as much of a cultural expression of status, wealth and, to a lesser extent, piety as any public sculpture and its decorative and architectural contexts show as much a concern for visual display as has been traditionally seen in Hellenistic sculpture in general.

This study has shown how Hellenistic domestic sculpture should be seen as a decorative medium in the home from the fourth century onward and that the relationship between the sculptures and their display context is much more complex than previously envisioned. By utilizing the methodologies established by Kreeb at Delos and other scholars in the study of Roman domestic sculpture, this Hellenistic material may now receive the attention it deserves.
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