Greek Statue Terms Revisited:
What does ἀνδριάς mean?

Catherine M. Keesling

It has long been a truism in scholarship on Greek sculpture that the ancient Greeks had no word that meant "statue." Rather, the Greek terms used to describe or refer to statues depended upon their functions and the contexts in which they stood. Though recent scholarship has argued against any clear-cut ontological distinction between cult statues and other divine images, a series of specialized terms—ξόανον, βρέτας, and ἔδος—seem to have been used beginning in the sixth century BCE to denote a divine statue displayed on axis in a temple building. In the early fourth century, a distinction began to be made between a divine statue called an


āγαλμα and a portrait statue called an εἰκόν. From the third century onward, a statue representing a Hellenistic king or a prominent civic benefactor might be referred to as an agalma if its function was primarily religious, but an eikon or an andrias if it was likened to portraits of other persons. As Simon Price pointed out, agalma, andrias, and eikon could all be used to describe statues representing the Roman emperor, and so “the observer could use different terms depending on what aspect of the object [statue] he wished to stress.”

One of the most common Greek terms for a statue, andrias, is also the least discussed and the least understood. Recent studies of Greek portrait sculpture raise key questions about terminology that thus far remain unanswered. When did

---


5 S. R. F. Price, _Rituals and Power_ (Cambridge 1984) 176–179 (quotation at 176); see also P. Veyne, “Les honneurs posthumes de Flavia Domitilla et les dédicaces grecques et latines,” _Latomus_ 21 (1962) 49–98; A. Oliver, “Honors to Romans: Bronze Portraits,” in C. C. Mattusch (ed.), _The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections_ (Cambridge [Mass.] 1996) 144–145. K. Tuchelt’s assertion, _Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien I_ (IstMitt Beih. 23 [1979]) 68–71, that the material distinction between marble statues and bronze ones was paramount in determining which were called agalmata (marble) and which were called eikones (bronze) has been criticized by K. Höghammar, _Sculpture and Society. A Study of the Connection between the Free-Standing Sculpture and Society on Kos_ (Uppsala 1993) 68–70, and D. Damaskos, _Untersuchungen zu hellenistischen Kultbildern_ (Stuttgart 1999) 304–309.

6 For andrias see, in addition to the citations above, H. Philipp, _Tektonon Daidala: Der bildende Künstler und sein Werk im vorplatonischen Schrifttum_ (Berlin 1968) 106–107, and S. Bettinetti, _La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca_ (Bari 2001) 37–42, both with an emphasis upon Classical literary references.

7 R. Krumeich, _Bildnisse griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahr-

---
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andrias, a term whose etymology naturally connects it with male figures, begin to be used to refer to portraits of women? Why did andrias eventually become a more common term for portrait statues in Greek inscriptions than eikon? And when did andriantopoios come to denote a maker of bronze statues specifically? As I hope to show, though it is clear that andrias, beginning in the fifth century BCE, was sometimes used in both literature and inscriptions to refer to portrait statues, it can only be said to mean “portrait” from the second century BCE onward. Appealing to later Greek usage risks obscuring several important points about what the Greeks called their statues before the second century BCE. In the Archaic and Classical periods, both inscriptions and literary sources used andrias for any male statue. Eikon became a standard term for a portrait statue once honorific decrees awarding portraits began to be inscribed on stone; thereafter, andrias was used sporadically in such decrees to convey the technical specifications of male portrait statues called eikones. The earliest inscribed decrees in honor of women in the Greek world, dating to the fourth and third centuries BCE, avoided referring to female portraits as andriantes. The inscribed Hellenistic temple inventories from Delos consistently used a constellation of other terms (ζῷον, ζῷδιον, and ζῷδαριον especially) to avoid calling

---

8 For andrias as a term applicable to female portraits see Dillon, The Female Portrait Statue 36–37 and 189 n.133, citing R. R. R. Smith, Hellenistic Royal Portraits (Oxford 1988) 16 and 35, and LSCG Suppl. 107, a decree of the third century BCE from the Asklepieion on Rhodes regulating the placement of offerings. The decree makes a distinction between andriantes (statues) and anathemata (non-statue offerings); in this particular case, andrias means any statue, not only portraits.

---

female figures *andriantes*, down to ca. 200 BCE. Thereafter, both inventories and honorific decrees frequently made a distinction between painted portraits, called *eikones*, and portrait statues, called *andriantes*. This seems to be the origin of the use of *andrias* in the Roman imperial period as a standard Greek term for a portrait statue, either male or female. Finally, the terms *andriantopoios* and *agalmatopoios* seem to have been used interchangeably to mean “sculptor” until the time of Aristotle.

Of the terms for statues enumerated in my introductory paragraphs, *agalma* by far dominates the literary and epigraphical lexicon of the Archaic period and the fifth century. As Joseph Day has most recently shown, in inscribed dedicatory epigrams *agalma* connoted “an ornament that generates friendly responses with its beauty.” Down to the end of the fifth century, at the same time that *agalma* in literature often denoted the statue of a god or a hero, it continued to be used in epigrams inscribed on votive offerings that were not statues, such as ceramic tiles and vases. In contrast, *andrias* occurs in only three inscriptions on statues or statue bases before the end of the fifth century, each time in reference to a schematic, nude, standing, male figure of the *kouros* type. The first appears on the base of the so-called Naxian colossus on Delos, a massive marble *kouros* of ca. 590–580 representing Apollo (*CEG* 401):

> [τὸ ἄγνυτό λίθο ἐμὶ ἀνδριὰς καὶ τὸ σφέλας.]

I am (made) of a single stone, both statue and base.

The second inscription with *andrias* is a late Archaic (ca. 500) prose dedication to Apollo on the base for a *kouros* from

---


10 For the date see P. Bruneau and J. Ducat, *Guide de Délos* (Paris/Athens 1983) 125–128, no. 9, who interpret the verse as a riddle or *adynaton*; see also P. Bruneau, “*Deliaca (VII)*,” *BCH* 112 (1988) 577–579. According to Herodotus (2.176), the pharaoh Amasis dedicated at Memphis a colossal statue and two smaller ones on the same base, all three statues cut from the same block (*τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐόντος λίθου*).
Neandria in the Troad: 11
tόνδε τὸν ἄνδριάντα Ἀπόλλονα ὄνεθέ-κε Ὑρμέας ἀρσίσμενο τὸ ποιός, vacat Ὑγεμάχος (or Ὑγεμάχης). vacat

Hermeas son of Ogemachos (?) dedicated this Apollo statue, his son having vowed it.

The third inscription, also in prose, was carved on the thigh of a colossal kouros of the mid-sixth century found along the Sacred Way leading from Miletus to the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma. It refers to a group of andriantes displayed together: 12

tόσ<><>ς τὸς ἄνδριάνταμ[ας]

The Latmians dedicated these statues …

The andriantes might have consisted either of male statues exclusively or of a combination of male and female figures; pairs of votive kouroi and korai are attested elsewhere. 13 In light of a similar reference to multiple statues in the inscription on the Archaic seated male figure dedicated by Chares at Didyma, however, we should perhaps reconstruct the Latmian dedication as a group representing either a family or the members of a genos, predominantly male. Just such a statue group is now

11 E. Schwertheim, Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas (Asia Minor Studien 11 [1994]) 40–41, no. 2 [SEG XLIV 986]. Earlier editions are R. Koldewey, Neandria (Berlin 1891) 27–28 (who reported the discovery of fragments of a kouros near the base); Ad. Wilhelm, Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (Vienna 1909) 7–8; M. Lazzarini, Formule delle dediche votive (Rome 1976) no. 767 (who emended the accusative Ἀπόλλονα to dative Ἀπόλλωνα); and LSAG 2360 and 362, no. 9 (ca. 500–475 BCE).

12 I Didyma 12–13 [SEG XVI 711], with M. Wörrle, CRAI 2003, 1371 n.44; cf. LSAG 2332–333 and 342, no. 25.

13 Two nearly identical korai of ca. 570–560 were dedicated by Chermynes in the Samian Heraion, the so-called Hera from Samos now in the Louvre and a second statue found in 1984: J. Franssen, Votiv und Repräsentation: Statuarische Weihungen archaischer Zeit aus Samos und Attika (Heidelberg 2011) 65–69, nos. A5 and A6.
attested in the so-called Temenos along the Sacred Way between Didyma and Miletus, where several seated figures were placed on a semi-circular base in an enclosure along with a cult dining room.\(^{14}\)

As is well known, the term *kouros* for an Archaic, schematic, nude male figure in marble is a modern coinage.\(^{15}\) On the rare occasions when Archaic Greeks needed a term to refer to a *kouros* statue, they chose *andrias*.\(^{16}\) But that *andrias* simply meant “statue” is demonstrated by Herodotus’ usage in the last quarter of the fifth century.\(^{17}\) He used *agalma* to mean “divine image,” and this term occurs in his text about four times more frequently than either *andrias* or *eikon*; his particular interest in *agalmata* is consistent with his preoccupation with the divine and divine agency in history. Yet he also called the colossal bronze Apollo dedicated at Delphi by the Greeks from the Persian spoils from the battle of Salamis an *andrias* (8.121.2).\(^{18}\)


\(^{15}\) For the modern use of the term see M. Meyer and N. Brüggermann, *Kore und Kouros: Weihgaben für die Götter* (Vienna 2007) 93, with references to earlier scholarship. An ancient precedent is the reference to golden *kouroi* at Homer *Od.* 7.100–103.

\(^{16}\) Pace Meyer in Meyer and Brüggermann, *Kore und Kouros* 29, given the very small number of inscriptions associated with *kouros* it is probably not significant that only one *kouros* inscription (no. 290) uses the term *agalma*.


\(^{18}\) Herodotus’ contemporary Aristophanes refers to a statue of the Athenian hero Pandion as an *andrias* (*Pax* 1183). In the inscribed accounts of the *naupoi* at Delphi for 340/39 BCE, a statue of Apollo is referred to simply as

---
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He used both agalma and andrias to describe another Apollo, this one gilded (6.118.3), but elsewhere distinguished an agalma representing Apollo from the andrias representing the legendary mystic Aristeas of Proconnesos that stood beside it in the agora of Metapontum (4.15.4). In the temple of Bel (Zeus) at Babylon, Herodotus compared the seated gilded agalma of Zeus with a reported solid gold andrias twelve cubits tall that had previously stood there before Darius removed it (1.183); the comparison makes it clear that the andrias too was an image of Zeus.19 Mixed male/female statue pairs and groups in Herodotus can also be andriantes: the portraits of the pharaoh Sesostris and his wife in front of the temple of Ptah (Hephaistos) at Memphis (2.110.1–2); Mikkhos’ dedication at Olympia of gods, goddesses, divine personifications, and portraits (7.170.4); and the Phocian dedication at Delphi consisting of several statues of unknown type surrounding a tripod (8.27.5).

Just as andrias in Herodotus means “statue,” not “portrait,” he uses eikon for statues representing a variety of subjects: images of heroes (2.106, Memnon), animals (1.50.3, Croesus’

gilded lion at Delphi), as well as men and women, both sculpted (1.31.5, the statues of Kleobis and Biton at Delphi; 2.182.2, the wooden portraits of the pharaoh Amasis and his wife) and painted (2.182.1, an εἰκόνα ἐνωτοῦ γραφής εἰκασμένην of Amasis). It may be significant that the only time Herodotus chose to mention a non-agalma female statue on its own, he called it not an andrias but an eikon: he notes that a small golden εἴδωλον at Delphi—a term he uses only three times—was identified by the Delphians in his own time as an eikon (representation) of Croesus’ female bread baker (1.51.5).20

Though Herodotus did not use it, the term κόρη for female figures appears in some fifth- and fourth-century Athenian inscriptions as an alternative to andrias.21 The earliest occurrence of kore in this sense, on an inscribed statue base of ca. 480 on the Acropolis, inspired Theodoros Sophoulis and Henri Lechat to coin the term kore for the female equivalent of the kouros when large numbers of Archaic marble female statues were coming out of the Acropolis excavations.22 The inscription reads (IG I 3 828 = DAA 229 = CEG 266):

[τε]νδε κόρεν ἄνεθεκεν ἀπαρχὲν
[Ναύλοχος ἄγρας ἔπορεν]

20 For eidolon in Herodotus see also 6.58 (a body-replica of a Spartan king killed in battle is carried to the tomb on a bier) and 5.92 (the ghost of the Corinthian tyrant Periander’s murdered wife Melissa). For the possible significance of the appellation bread-baker for the female figure dedicated by Croesus see L. Kurke and A. Garrett, “Pudenda Asiae Minoris,” HSCP 96 (1994) 75–83, and A. Jacquemin, Offrandes monumentales à Delphes (Paris 1999) 198, no. 344. In reality, Croesus’ bread-baker may have been a figure of Artemis, or even a female support figure detached from one of the numerous precious metal vessels Croesus dedicated in the sanctuary.


---
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[Nau]lochos dedicated this female statue, first fruits of the catch which the sea-ruler with the golden trident provided to him. The statue dedicated by [Nau]lochos, now lost, might in fact have been made of bronze; in any case, the term kore reveals a female as opposed to a male figure. Like andrias in the Archaic inscriptions quoted above, kore did not in itself imply that the statue so described was anonymous. Athenian temple inventories and building accounts of the Classical period also used kore for female figures whose identity (for whatever reason) was not specified. Two examples of a gilded (κατάχρυσος or χρυσῆ) kore on a stele were listed among the golden objects stored in the Parthenon and the Hekatompedon beginning in 434/3; here stele refers to a small pillar base. Similarly, the Parthenon inventories of 369 (IG II² 1424a.279) and 368 (1425.380–381) mention eleven “korai from the baskets.” The building account for the Erechtheion dated to 409/8 (IG I² 474.86) refers to the six marble caryatids holding up the south...

23 Similarly, the funerary epitaph by Kleoboulos of Lindos for King Midas of Phrygia (quoted by Diogenes Laertius 1.89; PMG 581) refers to a female figure standing over the tomb as a parthenos (maiden): καὶ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τόν τὸ ἔπει Μίδα τούτον φασὶ ποιῆσαι χαλκῆ παρθένος εἶμι. Μίδα δ’ ἐπὶ σήματι κηλία ("And some say he [Kleoboulos] composed the epitaph for Midas: 'I am the bronze maiden set up over the tomb of Midas").


porch as korai. Herodotus used both andrias and eikon for portrait statues; eikon became the standard Greek term for a portrait statue only when honorific portraits emerged at the beginning of the fourth century BCE. The only pre-Herodotean epigraphic example of eikon occurs at Olympia in the epigram for Euthymos of Locri, a three-time victor in boxing who won his last known victory in 472 (I. Olympia 144 [CEG I 399]):

Εὐθύμος Λοκρὸς Ἀστυκλέος τρίς Ὀλύμπι’ ἐνίκον.
εἰκόνα δ’ ἐστησέν [τῆν δε βροτοῖς ἐσορᾶν.]
Euthymos the Locrian, son of Astykles, I won three times at Olympia.”

He set up this portrait for mortals to wonder at.
Euthymos the Zephyrian Locrian dedicated it.
Pythagoras the Samian made it.

The final words of the second and third lines were changed,

26 Nymphs, and statues of them, could also be called korai. In Pl. Phdr. 230b–c Socrates describes a rural sanctuary belonging to the nymphs and the river god Acheloös full of “korai and agalma.” Plutarch (Them. 31) reports that when Themistokles was in exile in the Persian Empire he visited the temple of Cybele in Sardis and saw a two-cubit tall bronze kore called the “water-carrier” (ὕδροφόρον κόρην χαλκήν) that he himself had dedicated on the Acropolis from fines he collected as commissioner of the Athenian water supply before the Persian Wars. For nymphs as korai see also CEG 331 = SEG XXII 404 (dedication of ca. 500–480 from Boiotia) and T. Hadziosteliou-Price, “Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought,” JHS 91 (1971) 56–57. Kore in a statue base inscription of the second century CE from Thrace may refer to the dedication of a statue of a nymph (I. Thrac. Ag. 431 = SEG LV 780): [Τιβέριος?] Κλαύδιος Φιλόμου[ν]ος κατ’ ὄνομα ἐνέθηκεν τὴν κόρην χαριστήριν θεοῖς συνάντησις μετὰ τέκναν καὶ συμβάντων, ἴερτον ἱερόν νομίσας [τοῦ δείνος] (“Tiberius Claudius Philomousos dedicated the kore, in accordance with a dream, as a thank-offering to the temple-sharing gods, with his children and retainers, the priest being —”). All that remains of the statue are the feet of a small female figure carved in one piece with the base.
probably soon after the portrait was set up in ca. 470, and the reason why is not clear. All the same, εἰκόν was there from the beginning, and the unprecedented use of this term for Euthymos’ portrait statue seems intended to stress its resemblance to its subject. The earliest surviving inscribed decrees awarding the honor of a portrait statue, those for Konon in 394/3, use εἰκόν as the technical term for this new category of civic honor. The relevant part of the decree of Erythrai reads (I. Erythrai 6.13–16 = GHI 8):

ποίησασθαι δὲ
[αὐτοῦ ε]ἰκόνα χαλκῆν
[ἐπίχρυσον καὶ στῆσαι
[ὁποῦ ἄν δόξηι] Κόνωνι·

And make a gilded bronze portrait of him and set it up wherever Konon decides.

The adoption of εἰκόν as the preferred term for an honorific portrait led to an explosion in its use in private dedicatory epigrams of the first half of the fourth century: CEG II includes 28 examples, while Euthymos’ inscription is the only example in the first volume.

Francis Piejko remarked that in the extant honorific decrees awarding a statue from the fourth century through ca. 50 BCE,

27 On the inscription see E. Loewy, Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer (Leipzig 1885) no. 23; J. Ebert, Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen (AbhLeip 63.2 [1972]) no. 16; Lazzarini, Formule delle dediche no. 853; LSAG 2 342, no. 19.


29 Cf. the fragmentary Athenian decree of 393 for Konon’s patron Euagoras of Salamis on Cyprus (GHI 11), where no term for the statue has been preserved on the stone; cf. D. M. Lewis and R. S. Stroud, “Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis,” Hesperia 48 (1979) 180–193.
the term andrias for an honorific portrait is subordinated to eikon: “the honor conferred is εἰκών, whereas contracting, fabrication, engineering, setting up, supervision, and costs of such an εἰκών will be often specified by the alternative word ἀνδριάς.” An early example of this pattern is the decree of Priene in honor of the Ephesian priest Megabyxos, son of Megabyxos, dating to 334–323 (I.K. Priene I 16 = I.Priene 3 = Syll. 282.II):

Let him [Megabyxos] be crowned by the demos with a golden crown and a bronze portrait [εἰκών] as fine as possible … And let there be for him also free meals in the prytaneion, and let the nomophylakes in office in the months Boedromion and Pyanopison when Diophanes is stephanephoros contract for the statue [andrias] in conjunction with Megabyxos; and let the statue [andrias] stand in the sanctuary of Athena in front of the façade of the temple and the stele upon which the nomophylakes have inscribed this decree stand alongside, and the neopoiai Admetos and – – will undertake to cover the expense for the statue [andrias] and the stele.

All the examples of andrias in the honorific decrees cited by Piejko refer to portraits of men, which raises the question:

when did female portraits begin to be called andriantes? One way to answer this question is to look at the small corpus of Classical and Hellenistic honorific decrees for women. The earliest decree that mentions an honorific portrait of a woman seems to be one from Erythrai in honor of Mausolus and his sister/wife Artemisia from the 360s or mid-350s (I.Erythrai 8.11–14 = GHI 56):32

στῆσαι δὲ α[ο]-
[τοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χαλκῆν ἐν τῇ ἄγ[α]-
[ρή]ς καὶ Αρτεμισίης εἰκόνα
[λιθί]νην ἐν τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ.

And set up both a bronze portrait of him [Mausolus] in the agora and a stone portrait of Artemisia in the Athena temple.

Though statue honors for women are otherwise attested by statue bases, as we can see from the list in the Appendix below extant honorific decrees mentioning portrait statues of women are very few before ca. 200 BCE; none of these uses andrias.33 Even after 200, when honorific portraits of women became

31 For discussion of selected examples see R. van Bremen, The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East (Amsterdam 1996) (second century BCE and later); A. Bielman, Femmes en public dans le monde hellénistique (Lausanne 2002).


33 For early honorific portraits of women generally see C. M. Keesling, “Syris, Diakonos of the Priestess Lysimache on the Athenian Acropolis (IG II' 3464),” Hesperia 81 (2012) 490–498. G. J. Oliver’s catalogue (“Space and the Visualization of Power in the Greek Polis: The Award of Portrait Statues in Decrees from Athens,” in Early Hellenistic Portraiture 184–188) of 86 Athenian honorific portraits before the Roman imperial period includes only four of women: one of these (no. S56 = Agora XVI 277 and XXXI 35, ca. 180 BCE) is a painted portrait, and only one (no. S49, the portrait of Glaukon included in the Appendix below) dates before ca. 200.
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more common, it is difficult to find any epigraphic reference to a female portrait as an *andrias*. In the Testament of Epikteta from Thera (*IG* XII.3 330), inscribed on the base for portraits of Epikteta and her two sons ca. 210–195, it is doubtful that references in the inscription to *andriantes* include Epikteta’s own portrait; instead, the statues of Epikteta and her sons are called *agalmata* because after Epikteta’s death all three were recipients of hero cult.34 In the dossier of decrees in honor of the local benefactor Archippe from Kyme in Aeolis soon after 130 (*I.Kyme* 13), a group of statues representing Archippe’s deceased father Dikaiogenes together with Archippe and a personification of the Demos crowning her are referred to as *andriantes*, but an individual portrait of Archippe is referred to only as an *eikon*.35 The earliest honorific text to call an individual female portrait statue an *andrias* may in fact be the one for Nikassa, a priestess of Athena Lindia on Rhodes, dated to 10 CE (*I.Lindos* II 392.7).36

Inscribed temple inventories support the notion that, though in the Archaic and Classical periods *andrias* meant “statue,” it was avoided in reference to female portraits, and female figures

---


35 The first decree (col. i.1–20), after voting a bronze *eikon* of Archippe crowned by Demos and a bronze *eikon* of Dikaiogenes, calls the three statues together *andriantes* (15). The sixth decree inscribed on the same stone (vi.17, 29–30, 39) mentions the subsequent award on a gilded *eikon* to Archippe. For discussion of the honors for Archippe see van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation* 13–18. In a decree of Kyzikos in Mysia from the late first century BCE (*CIG* 3657), Kleidike is awarded a bronze *eikon* that will stand beside the *andrias* of her brother Dionysios in the men’s agora of the city (van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation* 171–172 and 187).

36 Cf. *IG* V.2 436, a second-century BCE decree of Megalopolis in honor of a woman named Xenokrate, where the restoration (line 11) of *andrias* rather than *eikon* in a very fragmentary text seems doubtful.
in general, until late in the Hellenistic period. As we have seen, inventories of the temples on the Athenian Acropolis include female statues and statuettes called korai; they also include male figures called andriantes. In the Acropolis inventories of 369/8 and 368/7, for example, the helmets (κύναι) and helmet crests (λόφοι) detached from andriantes should come from bronze male portraits; other andriantes on the Acropolis, described as support figures attached to a lampstand or holding a water vessel, are similar to male figures mentioned by Pausanias and attested by extant Hellenistic and Roman bronzes. In an inventory of bronze statues on the Acropolis from the Lycurgan period (IG II² 1498–1501), a distinction is made between bearded (γενειῶν) and beardless (ἀγένειος) andriantes. On Delos, temple inventories began to be inscribed on stone in the fourth century when the island was controlled by an Athenian-dominated amphictyony and continued through the period of Delian independence (from 314 to 167), and on into the period of direct Athenian control (after 167); inventories of the contents of upwards of twenty different buildings survive.

37 Helmets from andriantes: IG II² 1424a.281; helmet crests: 1424a.284. Bronze lampstand and the andriantiskos from it: 1424a.271; gold unweighed aporrhanterion which the andrias holds: 1424a.362; gold perirrhanterion which the andrias holds: Harris, The Treasures VI.29. The mid-fifth century sculptor Lykios, son of Myron, made statues of a youth holding a perirrhanterion on the Athenian Acropolis (Paus. 1.23.8) and of a boy holding an incense burner (Plin. HN 34.79). For adolescent male support figures in Hellenistic and Roman bronze sculpture see e.g. B. S. Ridgway, Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture (Ann Arbor 1984) 83–84.


Athenian inventories of the fifth and fourth centuries, in the Delian inventories before 167 there is no reason to doubt that any of the individual statues or statuettes called ἀνδριάς, ἀνδριαντίσκος, or ἀνδριαντίδιον was a male figure. On Delos, though andrias and its diminutives appear frequently throughout the inventories, divine images were typically called either agalma or by the god’s name, as in the post-167 inventories of the Serapieion that include a Zeus, an Eros, an Aphroditiskos, an Apollonioskos, a Palladion, and a Paniskos, among other statues. The inventories frequently employ a cluster of related terms—ζῷον, ζῷδιον, and ζῳδάριον—to refer to human figures generically, without implying anything about their identity, gender, or material.

Until ca. 200 BCE, the Delian inventories in their usage of andrias are consistent with Greek authors and with other inscriptions: an andrias was a male figure, either a portrait or the

40 Cf. the frequent collective references to fragments of gold and silver fallen from andriantes in inventories of the Apollo temple beginning with I.Délos 379. Hamilton’s translations (Treasure Map 349–360) obscure the use of andrias-terms in the inventories. He translates eikon and zoidarion as “figure,” agalma as “statue,” and andriantiskos as “statuette.” Andrias and its diminutives, not included in Hamilton’s glossary, are generally translated as either “statue” or “figure.” For the use of diminutives as an example of linguistic creativity in the Delian inventories see C. Prêtre, “Un collier délien,” REA 99 (1997) 371–376, and “Imitation et miniature. Etude de quelques suffixes dans le vocabulaire délien de la parure,” BCH 121 (1997) 673–680.

41 See Hamilton, Treasure Map 223–240 (Serapieion Treasure D; I.Délos 1416.A.i.1 ff., 1417.A.ii.141 ff. (155 BCE), and 1442.A.1 ff. (146 BCE).

42 See for example the ζῳδάρια παιδικά (figures of children) in the Serapieion D inventories. ζῷον and ζῷδιον in Herodotus refer to figures carved in relief, painted, or used as textile decoration (e.g. 1.70.1, 2.148.7, 3.47.2, 3.88.3). In later periods, however, zōia were clearly freestanding statues. Aristotle’s will (Diog. Laert. 5.15–16) included provisions for the dedication both of portraits (eikones) of family members and of stone zōia four cubits tall of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira. In the Testament of Epikteta the zōia of the Muses interpreted by Wittenburg as reliefs should also be statues (Il testamento di Epikteta 144–147).
representation of a god or a hero. After ca. 200 on Delos, we see andrias used for both male and female figures, and this change can be related to important developments in Greek portraiture. In one notable instance, the same pair of silver statuettes of Apollo and Artemis dedicated by a woman named Kleino, stored in the temple of Apollo, were called ζῴδια from 279 through 224 BCE, but ἀνδριαντίδια from 195 onward. In the inventories from the period of Athenian domination after 167, we find for the first time the collocation ἀνδρίας γυναικεῖος for a female figure, which confirms both the normative assumption that an andrias was male and a new desire at this time to apply the term to female statues.

This broadening of the usage of andrias was not merely a response to the increasing popularity of female portraiture after ca. 200; rather, it seems to result from a desire to make a clear distinction between portrait statues and portrait paintings. Though painted portraits as votives are attested as early as the fifth century, when the sons of Themistokles dedicated a painting (γραφή) depicting their father inside the cella of the

43 Kleino’s Apollo and Artemis appear in 12 inventories, from 279 BCE [IG XI.2 161.B.1] through 145 [I.Delos 1449.e]. Kosmatou [Mnemosyne 57 [2004] 481] noticed the change in terminology, but concluded that the terms ζῴδια and ἀνδριαντίδια were interchangeable. This seems to be the case only in the second-century inventories, where both ζωι- and ἀνδρια-terms were used for female figures. For example, in an inventory of the temple of Agathe Tyche from 146 [I.Delos 1442.B.35] we find in line 44 a ζωιδίον Ἀφροδίτην λίθινον (stone Aphrodite figure) paired with an ἀνδριαντίδιον χαλκοῦν Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης (small bronze andrias of Agathe Tyche).

44 In the Thesmophorion in 155 [I.Delos 1417.A.i.49] appear an ἀνδριαντίδιον γυναικείον (59) and an ἀνδρίας γυναικείος (114–115). In the same year the inventory of the Letoion (1417.A.i.100) includes an ἀνδρίας γυναικείος on a base (114–115), and the Aphrodision (1417.A.ii.1) has a γυναικείος ἀνδρίας dedicated by Stesileos (119). The 155 BCE inventory associated with the gymnasium (1417.A.i.118) includes an ἀνδρίας τέλειος γυμνός (full-sized nude statue, 123), τῶν ἀνδριαντιδία (128, 132), and an ἀνδρίας γυναικείος with a cup in her hand (141).
Parthenon (Paus. 1.1.2), officially awarded painted portraits are first attested in the third century, becoming far more common in the second. As painted portraits were being awarded as a lesser honor than a portrait statue, honorific decrees began to refer to a portrait statue as an *andrias* and a painted portrait as an εἰκῶν γραπτή. The earliest examples of honorific decrees awarding both a statue and a painting, which date to the second century BCE, contradict Piejko’s generalization about the use of *andrias* in pre-50 BCE decrees. For example, in a decree of the Poseidoniasts of Berytus on Delos soon after 153/2 in honor of a Roman (*I.Delos* 1520), the γραπτὴ εἰκῶν (26–27 and 31) clearly refers to a painted portrait awarded in addition to an *andrias* (24 and 27), a portrait statue. In some inscriptions of the first century BCE and the first century CE, it also seems likely that an *eikon* without further specification, awarded at the same time as an *andrias*, should be understood as a portrait painting.

45 For painted portraits see M. Nowicka, *Le portrait dans la peinture antique* (Warsaw 1993) 121–126. The Delian inventories make a distinction between πίνακες ἀναθηματικοί (votive painted plaques) and πίνακες εἰκονικοί (portrait paintings); the latter are also attested in the Athenian Asklepieion (S. B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, their Dedications, and the Inventories* [Amsterdam 1989] 148). The earliest Athenian honorific painted portrait is the “*eikon* on a pinax, according to custom” awarded by a *thiasos* of Carian Zeus to its treasurer, Menis Mnésitheou of Herakleia, in 298/7 (*IG II²* 1271). See H. Blanck, “Porträt-Gemälde als Ehrendenkmäler,” *BjB* 168 (1968) 1–12, who however cites the decree of 178/7 for Hermaios Hermogenou Paionides (*IG II²* 1327) as the earliest example. Satyra, a priestess of the Thesmophoroi, was honored by her deme ca. 180 with an *eikon* on a pinax (*Agora* XVI 277 = XXXI 35).

46 Other early examples are *CIG* 3068.B.28 (Teos) and *I.Kourion* 34.23 (both mid-second century BCE).

47 Likely examples are *IG II²* 4193 (first century BCE), *IOSPE* I 34 from Olbia (early first century BCE), *TAM* V.2 920 from Thyateira (49 BCE?). In the Lindian statue base of 10 CE for the priestess Nikassa (*I. Lindos* II 392) the honors mentioned include an *eikon*, a gilded *eikon*, and a bronze *andrias*: the former two could be painted portraits, one with a gold background. An early imperial decree in honor of a female sacred official called a *hydrophoros*...
From the late Hellenistic period onward, epigraphic usage diverges somewhat from that of literary texts. In Polybius, *andrias* refers to any statue, divine or portrait, male or female, but Pausanias in the second century CE still preferred to call portrait statues *eikones*, not *andriantes*. In hundreds of Roman imperial inscriptions of various genres from mainland Greece, the Aegean islands, and Asia Minor, however, *andrias* should be translated “portrait statue.” These include, I would argue, some key epigraphic texts of the first century CE. In a decree of the *gerousia* of Cos (*IG XII.4 471 = Iscr.Cos ED 230*) authorizing the melting down of *andriantes*, the 17 male Coan citizens whose names are listed in the genitive case are best understood as the subjects of portrait statues to be removed from Didyma (*I.Didyma 381*) mentions the award of both *eikones* and *andriantes*; in a second, roughly contemporary *hydrophoros* decree of 17/6 BCE (*LDidyma 378*) an εἰκών χρυσή awarded by the demos is mentioned: is this a gilded bronze statue or a painted portrait with a gold background? Cf. T. Pekáry, “Statuen in kleinasiatischen Inschriften,” in S. Şahin et al. (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift F. K. Dörner II* (Leiden 1978) 730, who cautioned that “eine immer und überall gültige Definition von εἰκών und der angefügten Adjektive ist wohl nicht möglich. Das Wort bedeutet grundsächlich Porträt, bildnishaft Darstellung, und ohne Adjektiv wohl in den meisten Fällen, jedoch nicht ausschließlich, eine Statue.”

In at least two cases, Polybius seems to use *andrias* for portrait statues as opposed to divine images: 21.30.9 (*agalmata, andriantes, and graphai taken as plunder from Ambracia*) and 32.15.3 (both *andriantes* and stone *agalmata*). Cf. 4.78.3, where he refers to a bronze *andrias* of Athena. For statue terms in Pausanias see V. Pirenne-Delforge, “Image des dieux et rituel dans le discours de Pausanias. De l’‘axiologie’ à la théologie,” *MEFRA* 116 (2004) 811–825: “Les termes eikôn et andrias sont inadéquats pour décrire la statue d’un dieu parce que leur signification intègre l’idée de portrait” (816). The *eikonion* of Themistocles inside the temple of Artemis Aristoboule in Athens, described by Plutarch (*Them. 22.1–2*), could be either a statuette or a small painted portrait (P. Amandry, “Thémistocle à Mélié,” in Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον IV [Athens 1967–1968] 276–277; cf. Krumeich, *Bildnisse 78–79*). This diminutive is used for a cypress wood statuette in *LDelos 1442.A.i.56* (146/5–145/4 BCE), but all literary attestations date to the Roman imperial period.

---

From Didyma (*LDidyma 381*) mentions the award of both *eikones* and *andriantes*; in a second, roughly contemporary *hydrophoros* decree of 17/6 BCE (*LDidyma 378*) an εἰκών χρυσή awarded by the demos is mentioned: is this a gilded bronze statue or a painted portrait with a gold background? Cf. T. Pekáry, “Statuen in kleinasiatischen Inschriften,” in S. Şahin et al. (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift F. K. Dörner II* (Leiden 1978) 730, who cautioned that “eine immer und überall gültige Definition von εἰκών und der angefügten Adjektive ist wohl nicht möglich. Das Wort bedeutet grundsächlich Porträt, bildnishaft Darstellung, und ohne Adjektiv wohl in den meisten Fällen, jedoch nicht ausschließlich, eine Statue.”

In at least two cases, Polybius seems to use *andrias* for portrait statues as opposed to divine images: 21.30.9 (*agalmata, andriantes, and graphai taken as plunder from Ambracia*) and 32.15.3 (both *andriantes* and stone *agalmata*). Cf. 4.78.3, where he refers to a bronze *andrias* of Athena. For statue terms in Pausanias see V. Pirenne-Delforge, “Image des dieux et rituel dans le discours de Pausanias. De l’‘axiologie’ à la théologie,” *MEFRA* 116 (2004) 811–825: “Les termes eikôn et andrias sont inadéquats pour décrire la statue d’un dieu parce que leur signification intègre l’idée de portrait” (816). The *eikonion* of Themistocles inside the temple of Artemis Aristoboule in Athens, described by Plutarch (*Them. 22.1–2*), could be either a statuette or a small painted portrait (P. Amandry, “Thémistocle à Mélié,” in Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον IV [Athens 1967–1968] 276–277; cf. Krumeich, *Bildnisse 78–79*). This diminutive is used for a cypress wood statuette in *LDelos 1442.A.i.56* (146/5–145/4 BCE), but all literary attestations date to the Roman imperial period.
from display and their bronze melted down to mitigate a financial crisis.⁴⁹ Lindos II 419 (= LSCG Suppl. 90), a long and difficult decree of 22 CE, proposes auctioning off the right to put new inscriptions on the bases of andriantes on the acropolis of Lindos to generate revenue to pay for sacrifices and festivals.⁵⁰ Though andriantes here has most often been taken as a general reference to statues of all kinds, it is doubtful how many statues other than portraits would have been standing on the Acropolis and its approaches at this late date (30–44):

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἀνδριάντες
[τινές ἐντε ἐν τῇ ἁναβ[ά]σει καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ἁκρα ἀνεπίγραφοι καὶ ἀσαμοὶ, συνφέρον δὲ [ἐ]ςτι καὶ τοῦτος ἢμεῖν ἐπισάμους ἐπιγρ[α]φ[α]-[φ]όν ἐχοντος ὅτι θεο<ι>ς ἀνάκεινται, δεδόχθαι Λινδίοισι,
κυ(ροθέντος) τούδε
[τοῦ ψα(φίσματος)-] τοι αὑτοὶ ἐπιστάται μ[ιςθο]σάντω ἐκάστου ἀνδριάντος τάν
παραδόντω ἱερὸν
[Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέ][ος] [τοι δὲ] ὄνησά[με]νοι τὰς ἐπιγραφάς μὴ
[τρόπῳ μὴ]νεὶ μηδὲ παραφέρει τιμημεμία ἢ ἐνοχοί εὸντ[α]ς

⁴⁹ See the remarks of Chr. Habicht, “Neue Inschriften aus Kos,” ΖΠΕ 112 (1996) 86. Cf. IG XII.4 353 (= Iscr.Cos ED 257: first or second century CE), which prohibits the dedication of an eikon, agalma, or andrias on any exedra in the gymnasium of Cos, where eikon may mean a portrait painted on a pinax.

[ἀσεβείας ποιησάμενοι δὲ τῶν αἰτήσιν ἐξόντων ἐξουσίαν]
[ἀπενέκιείν ἃ καὶ συνχωρήσωσι διὰ τὰς αἰτήσις Λίνδο[ν]
And since there are some portrait statues [andriantes] along the ascent and on the top itself [of the acropolis], which are without inscription [ἀνεπίγραφοι] and undistinguished [ἀσάμοι], and it is expedient that these too shall be distinguished [ἐπισάμοι], bearing inscriptions (saying) that they are dedicated to gods, it was voted by the Lindians: when this decree has been sanctioned, the same epistatai shall lease out the inscription of each portrait statue [andrias], the Lindians deciding by vote whether the winning bid should be confirmed or not, and if it will be decided that the winning bid should be confirmed, they [the epistatai], after having made an account of the rate for which the inscription of each portrait statue [andrias] has been ceded, shall hand over the money accrued from these to be sacred to the fund of Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus. Those who have purchased the inscriptions shall not have permission in any wise nor under any pretext to remove portrait statues [andriates] from the top; otherwise they shall be liable to be accused of impiety. But if they make a request, they shall have permission to change (portrait statues) [ἀπενεκεῖν, largely restored]51 according to what the Lindians agree on account of the request (transl. Kajava, with “statue” changed to “portrait statue”).

Here the uninscribed and undistinguished andriantes that are to receive new inscriptions dedicating them to the gods should be interpreted as portraits whose subjects are no longer identifiable.52 Though the Lindian inscription specifies only that the

51 Alternatively, L. Robert, Hellenica 2 (1946) 110–111, restored [μετενεκεῖν], which would imply the exchange of the statue standing on the auctioned base for another statue.

52 Cf. Kajava, Arctos 37 (2003) 74 (“In fact, considering that it was normal for cultic and votive statues of deities to be without inscription, one may assume that the Lindian andriantes also included some belonging to this category”); J. Mylonopoulos, “Odysseus with a Trident? The Use of Attributes in Ancient Greek Imagery,” in Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome (Leiden 2010) 171–174, who takes the asamoci andriantes to be divine images unrecognizable owing to the absence or loss of attributes.
andriantes are to be inscribed with dedications to the gods, the terms used to describe the statues eligible for selection, ἀνεπιγραφοὶ and ἄσαµοι, anticipate the language used by Dio Chrysostom (31.72–74) later in the first century to describe honorific portrait statues in Rhodes town chosen for reinscription with the names of new portrait subjects. The same practice was likely envisioned at Lindos.

Finally, the related words ἀνδριαντοποιός and ἀνδριαντοποιικά take on new significance in light of the recent publication of Poseidippos’ poetry book of ca. 280 BCE, preserved on papyrus: the epigrams of the Andriantopoïka section concern bronze statues, mostly male, none of them female portraits.53 When Pindar in the first half of the fifth century compared himself to an andriantopoios who makes agalmata (Nem. 5.1–6), the natural inference is that he meant the sculptors of athletic victor portraits, but the reference is not yet specifically to bronze statuary, for he elsewhere (Pyth. 5.40) called a wooden statue (of Apollo?) at Delphi an andrias.54 Later in the fifth century, Gorgias’ Encomium of Helen (18) included the antithesis ἥδεῖα τῶν ἀνδριάντων ποιήσεις καὶ ἥδεῖα τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐργασία νόσουν ἡδεῖαν παρέσχετο τοῖς ὀμασιν (“the fashioning of andriantes and the working of agalmata provides a pleasant


disease for the eyes”). This seems to constitute a case in which “matter which does not contain any inherent contrast is split in half or duplicated for the sole purpose of producing a pair.”

Though Xenophon employed the term *andriantopoios* in reference to bronze statues and their sculptors, Plato clearly used *andriantopoios* and *agalmatopoios* interchangeably: the fifth-century sculptor Pheidias is called either an *andriantopoios* (*Meno* 91D) or an *agalmatopoios* (*Prt*. 311E); Pheidias and his contemporary Polykleitos of Argos are referred to in tandem as *agalmatopoioi* (*Prt*. 311C). The earliest instance in Greek literature in which an *andriantopoios* as a sculptor of human figures in bronze is clearly distinguished from a maker of divine images in stone occurs in Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (1141a11): τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἐν ταῖς τέχναις τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις τὰς τέχνας ὀποδίδομεν, οἰόν Φειδίαν λιθουργὸν σοφὸν καὶ Πολύκλειτον ἀνδριαντοποῖον (“wisdom in the arts we ascribe to those who practice the arts most perfectly, for example Pheidias the stone sculptor and Polykleitos the *andriantopoios*”). Lists of Greek sculptors that divide them into *agalmatopoioi*, sculptors specializing in divine images, and *andriantopoioi*, bronze portrait sculptors, seem to originate no earlier than the second century BCE, the same


56 See especially Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.2–4 (Polykleitos excels in *sophia* among *andriantopoioi*) and 3.10.6–8 (Kleiton the *andriantopoios* makes statues of runners, wrestlers, boxers, and pancratiasts). For the literary and epigraphical sources on Pheidias and Polykleitos see S. Kansteiner et al. (eds.), *Der neue Overbeck: Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen* (Berlin 2014) nos. 841–1075 (no. 1047 = Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 1141a9–12, see below) and 1205–1294. *Agalmatopoioi* appear in the Parthenon and Erechtheion building accounts (*IG* I 445–449 and 476); in the list of individuals and their occupations in the heroes of Phyle decree of 401/0 (*IG* II 10); and in inscribed accounts of the mid-fourth century (*IG* II 216, 217, 1508). In ca. 336–330 a Boiotian *andriantopoios* was hired by the Athenian state to repair a fifth-century (bronze?) *agalma* of Athena Nike (*IG* II 3 444, discussed by S. Lambert, “Connecting with the Past in Lykourgan Athens: An Epigraphical Perspective,” in L. Foxhall et al. [eds.], *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* [Stuttgart 2010] 226–228).
time that andrias began to be used in Greek inscriptions as a standard term for a portrait statue, male or female.\textsuperscript{57}

The Greeks did have a word for statue: ἄνδριάς. In origin an andrias’ male gender mattered more than its material or whom it represented. In the Archaic and Classical periods at least, andrias was simply less common in literature and inscriptions than other terms, agalma and eikon, with more specific denotations. In these periods female portraits, uncommon before ca. 200 BCE, were not referred to as andriantes. Though a full study of the Delian inventories as a source for Greek sculpture remains to be written, their language reflects a shift in the meaning of andrias over time that comes through most clearly in late Hellenistic and Roman imperial honorific decrees, where we see a new concern to make a distinction between portrait paintings and portrait statues. The painted—and sometimes gilded—eikones that proliferate in honorific texts of these periods set the stage for the icon paintings of Byzantine Christianity.\textsuperscript{58}

APPENDIX: Pre-200 BCE honorific decrees mentioning portrait statues of women

1. RO 56 = LEsyrhrai 8 (360s or mid-350s BCE): Mausolus honored with a bronze eikon in the agora of Erythrai and Artemisia with a stone eikon in the sanctuary/temple of Athena (Athenaion).
2. IG XI.4 514; H. Kotsidu, Τιμή καὶ δόξα: Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher (Berlin 2000), no. 123 (soon after 300): agalmata of Asklepios and of Stratonike, daughter of Demetrios I, on Delos.
3. I.Didyma 480 = SEG XXXIV 1075; Kotsidu no. 269; Bielman, Femmes en public 64–68, no. 10 (299/8): Apame (first wife of Seleu-


\textsuperscript{58} S. Sande, “The Icon and its Origin in Graeco-Roman Portraiture,” in L. Rydén and J. O. Rosenqvist (eds.), Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium 75–84, esp. 77–80.
kos I) honored by Miletus with an eikon.

4. SEG XXXVI 1218; Kotsidu no. 293 (243/2): eikones of Ptolemy III and Berenike II in the Letoön at Xanthos.

5. I. Oropos 175 = IG VII 297 = OGIS 81; Kotsidu no. 82 (215–204): decree ending with reference to eikones of Ptolemy IV and Arsinoe, inscribed on the base for their portrait statues (I. Oropos 427).

6. IG II² 1314 (213/2): eikon of Glaukon, chosen by lot to be annual priestess, in the temple (naos), awarded by orgones.

7. SEG XLI 1003.8, 32, 45; Kotsidu no. 239 (204/3): marble agalmata for Antiochos III and Laodike III in Teos; also an agalma in bronze and a gilded eikon for Antiochos.⁵⁹
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⁵⁹ I would like to offer my warmest thanks to J. W. Day, who made comments on a draft of this paper, to an anonymous reader, and to the editors of GRBS. Any mistakes or misunderstandings that remain are my own.