English Summary

The Introduction of this book examined the state of the art in the study of statue inscriptions. It showed how the material element of statue inscriptions has come to be overlooked in the course of their collection, preparation and presentation in print form within existing scholarship on sculpture in the field of Classical Archaeology. As a special type of textual source, statue inscriptions are of essential importance to understanding the history of Greek sculpture. Yet as a topic within the scholarship on sculpture in Classical Archaeology, statue inscriptions have received hardly any attention. In light of this, this volume set itself the task of casting an archaeologically minded eye upon the statue inscriptions, and in doing so sought to re-endow to them the materiality which has been lost in the course of their academic study, which conventionally views them as purely textual sources.

Chapter I pursued an approach which focussed on questions of materiality and visual representation more than on the textual content of the inscription themselves. This approach was applied to the large group of Attic grave-monuments which date to the Archaic period. Through a systematic analysis, it was argued that statue inscriptions are not only obviously connected with the material medium—the stone base—which transmits their writing through engravement, but also that this material connection between the writing and the medium is culturally significant, and thus is worthy of investigation. A close look at how inscriptions were actually inscribed onto grave-monuments found that inscriptions bear meaning for the understanding of grave-monuments not just in their written content but also in their aesthetic appearance. The writings themselves constitute an important component of the grave-monument's general appearance. It was, for example, demonstrated that inscriptions adhered to a number of principles of decorative design in their layout. The general orientation of the writings towards the block edges, rather than towards the centre of the base blocks (as would probably correspond to modern layout conventions), results in a decorative profile of the monuments in which the inscriptions occupy the equivalent position on the block as a carved ornamental moulding (or *kymation*) would have had. The material base of the monument does not frame the inscription. Instead, the inscriptions themselves are involved in the contouring of the stones, and they exhibit their own formal attributes as engraved decoration. Also noteworthy was the fact that the writing is not set in close proximity with the statue or relief-stele that embodies the deceased, to whom the inscriptions' content refers. Rather, inscriptions are connected with the base of the grave-monuments. The base is the section that presents the entire grave as a permanently established material monument.[559] The statue base

559 In academic photographs the lower part of grave-monuments is also often overlooked, just as much as the inscriptions that are engraved on them. Even in those few cases in which the archaeological record allows us to firmly establish the connection between the statue/stele and its base, both

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110645422-007

thereby comes to occupy a central position, although, in modern archaeological research, the statue base is often blended out of the overall aesthetic reception in Greek sculpture.

In Chapter II the focus remained on the writing-bearing base of the statue monuments, but this time proceeding to the other important context for Archaic and Classical sculpture: the sanctuary. Instead of examining all relevant monuments from this context, we concentrated on a small, but still significant, group of Attic statue bases of the late-Archaic and early-Classical period, namely votive bases which exhibit a stylised incompletion in the manufacturing process in their appearance. Discussion showed that the votive inscriptions, which are characteristically placed in those 'unfinished' areas of the monuments, do not differ significantly in their layout from otherwise typical appearances of the statue bases. These monuments' unusual design has recently been analysed with reference to the Persian Wars. In opposition to this, it was argued that the votive bases exhibit a particularly refined decorative strategy, by which they would compete for attention in the late-Archaic Acropolis alongside an overflowing array of other splendid votive offerings. Instead of trying to outmatch the polished rectangular surfaces and the precisely carved column flutes, which are typical of other Archaic marble votive monuments by their even more meticulous carving and smoothening, these monuments are set in aesthetic contrast with those typical elements of Greek *kosmos* by presenting 'unfinished' rough surfaces. In this refined and playful decorative strategy, that puts on stage the process of the monument's material production, the inscriptions—here, as emphatically addressed from the perspective of their materiality!—play a crucial role, by marking this as the final stage of their process of production.

Chapter III departed from the earlier approach of focussing on a specific material group. Instead, it highlighted a number of general components of the layout of statue inscriptions, taking as its cue the early Archaic example of the Nikandre votive inscription. Rather than dismiss the many striking features of this inscription as signs of being 'early', a number of structural parallels were pointed out between it and other Archaic and early Classical inscriptions, which seek to uncover the underlying concepts and ideas which inform material writing and the inscribing of image-bearing artefacts. It was shown that the writing of inscriptions generally does not adhere to the linear principle of the line of verse, but is rather concerned with the occupation of empty surface. This principle of even surface-filling is particularly apparent in the *stoichedon* means of ordering letters—a highly unusual layout that is at the same time most characteristic of Greek material writing.

Lastly, in Chapter IV, three examples from a later period provided a foil by which various facets of the Archaic and Classical-era statue inscriptions were brought into

---

parts would typically be presented separately in the photographs taken: archaeological photography would therefore split up those rare cases of such perfect matches.

clearer focus. The Athenian grave-relief of Ampharete from the late fifth century BCE, the early Hellenistic votive offering of Daochus from Delphi, and the similarly dated Monument to Diomedes from the Amphiareion of Oropos all show that inscriptions on later statue monuments transmitted occasional similarities, but more emphatically significant differences, from the earlier case-studies. Differences in the appearance and design of the writing and its material base—especially concerning new layout solutions for offsetting different passages of text and for creating visual references to the image—not only helped to carve out the characteristic features of statue inscriptions from the Archaic and early Classical periods, but also made possible an initial inquiry into a full synthetic analysis of the relationship between images and inscriptions, with respect to both the inscriptions' content and their aesthetic dimensions. This synthetic analysis is made up of both the examples examined in this chapter and, retrospectively, the statue monuments that were examined in Chapters I–III.

By focussing on *how* texts were inscribed on statue monuments, instead of on *what* was actually written, this volume might be accused of having turned a previously 'blind' scholarship on statue inscriptions in Classical Archaeology—with the detailed, 'hands-on' analysis of inscriptions being mostly left for epigraphists—into an 'illiterate' one, as if statue inscriptions were essentially meant to be seen and not to be read (this is a thesis which one indeed sometimes encounters in the literature). The authors of this volume, however, favour a more nuanced understanding. We do not take certain layout conventions of inscriptions, such as their being written in *scriptio continua* (a feature which seems in fact to obstruct swift and easy reading), as sweeping proof that the inscriptions were not even read. Conversely, we do not wish simply to sidestep the question whether reading the inscriptions denoted standard, rather than non-standard, practice. Our view is that such conventions merit close attention with regard to issues of reading. The fact that statue inscriptions *were* read (even if not in every situation or by every viewer), speaks not only to common sense (dangerous though this apparatus may be in academic writing), but was also shown to be implicit through a number of concrete observations. Through a survey of the layout of Attic grave-inscriptions from the Archaic period, evidence was given not only of their decorative appearances but also of the scrupulous care given to highlight the structure of the content of the inscriptions. Sometimes this was achieved by the emphasising of certain key words through interpunctuation within the text, sometimes through differentiating the grave epigrams (narrowly understood) from the inscription of the sculptor. The essential question of reading statue inscriptions should therefore be reframed not as a binary alternative of reading vs. not-reading, but as a qualitative question concerning the modalities of reading, to be set in contrast with (especially) the modalities of viewing in the case of images. What this volume has added can, of course, be no more than an initial step. The textual meaning of the inscriptions, which have not played a central role in the analysis of individual examples, is nevertheless important for adopting a more comprehensive perspective. At the same time, the content of the inscriptions should not be separated from their aesthetic dimension

as visualised texts within the statue, its base, and the overall aesthetic appearance of the inscription.

The aim of this volume was to introduce into the field of scholarship on sculpture within Classical Archaeology an aspect of the visual culture of Greek sculpture, namely the study of statue inscriptions, which has been otherwise shut out of discussions about materiality. Previously the statue inscriptions were studied only from a content-based perspective, but with no regard paid to their material and aesthetic dimension. The goal was, consequently, not to treat this aspect exhaustively. Alongside the already-mentioned future challenge of connecting the material aspects examined with the content-related aspects of statue inscriptions, a further challenge is to develop the synchronic perspective which has been adopted in this volume, within the confines of the Archaic and early Classical periods, into a more inclusive diachronic perspective, that embraces the statue inscriptions from the earlier Archaic period down to the Imperial era. This diachronic extension of this field of research was outlined in the final chapter, with the purpose of capturing something of the culture of writing on statue monuments within the Greek visual tradition as it dynamically changed over space and time.