scarcely fail to impress. But more importantly, each type opens a window onto a different segment of contemporary society – perhaps a different geographical area of the Hellenistic world, perhaps a new social division, or an unexpected preoccupation. Rarely can we be sure that we understand quite what, or whom, in each case, we are seeing. But even cautious awareness of the multiplicity of options and uncertainties can help to edge our understanding of Hellenistic society a little further on its way.

Chapter 3
Public Life: Hellenistic cities and sanctuaries

"The city as a whole is intersected by streets practicable for horse-riding and chariot-driving, and by two that are very wide, extending to more than a plethron in breadth, which cut one another into two sections at right angles. And the city contains most beautiful public precincts and also the royal palaces ... for just as each of the kings, from love of splendour, was in the habit of adding some adornment to the public monuments, so also he would invest himself at his own expense with a residence... The Museum too is part of the royal palaces; it has a public walk, an exedra with seats, and a large house, in which is the communal dining room of the men of learning who share the Museum." (Strabo, Geography, 17.1.10)

Cities and city plans
Strabo’s admiring description of the ancient city of Alexandria conjures up an image of a spacious, attractive and thoughtfully laid-out city, its broad, boulevard-style avenues lined with beautiful buildings, its shady porticoes and walkways frequented by a cultivated populace. So little of Alexandria has so far been excavated that it is difficult to decide how accurate this picture is – though other literary sources and the existing archaeological evidence suggest that it was indeed carefully planned and thoughtfully sited so as to catch the breezes from the sea. But was this characteristic of Hellenistic cities in general? And can we identify any other distinguishing features that Hellenistic cities had in common with each other, which at the same time mark them out from their predecessors?
of the Classical period! Outside cities, the other main areas where people would assemble in public were the extra-urban sanctuaries so there were ways in which these too differed or had developed from those of the Classical period!

In terms of the number of cities and their geographical extent there were certainly some very significant developments. In the Hellenistic period overall well over one hundred new cities were founded in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, and to a lesser extent further east and south. Some of these cities were new foundations on the sites of former native settlements, but all were 'Greek' in the sense that they contained sizable proportions of Greek settlers who expected to live in cities that would offer them the full range of 'normal' Greek social, cultural and legal institutions. To fulfill these expectations there would be a concomitant need for numerous characteristically Greek types of building or public spaces with specific and well-defined functions. Though the Hellenistic way of life in these new cities would naturally be coloured and enriched by elements of the foreign cultures that surrounded them, in many ways it would remain essentially Greek. In this determination many of the cities were assisted by their impressive size, another key area that saw significant changes between Classical and Hellenistic times. Although population statistics are notoriously difficult to secure for the ancient world, it seems clear that the largest Hellenistic cities, including Alexandria in Egypt, Seleucia on the Tigris and Antioch on the Orontes, were on a substantially larger scale than all but the largest of their Classical counterparts. Cities with more than a hundred thousand inhabitants were no longer a rarity, and many people would now live within relatively easy travelling distance of one; in other words there was probably more 'urbanism', in that far more people would have been able to experience life in a big city than ever before.

Obviously there were some aspects of civic life and the appearance of the city that remained constant from the Classical to the Hellenistic period. Grid plan designs for cities are traditionally associated with Hippodamas of Miletus, believed to have been born about 500 BC; although he probably did not invent the concept, he is likely to have developed it and put it into practice, and certainly evidence of grid-pattern layouts appears in various parts of the Greek world from the mid-fifth century BC. Grid designs continued to be favoured in the Hellenistic period; what was new now about town planning, however, was the care taken to integrate public buildings into key parts of the grid where they would both be convenient for access and make the best impression on citizens and visitors alike. At the same time, many of these public buildings were more monumentally planned, built and adorned than their Classical predecessors.

And in those cities that were built or rebuilt basically from scratch, far greater attempts were made to unite groups of buildings to create appropriate vistas, and much more thought was put into planning the approaches, the organisation of spaces and the linking of one group of buildings with another. Such deliberate planning had both practical and aesthetic results: it made the city more workable for its inhabitants while simultaneously creating a pleasing and impressive appearance from afar.

Defining the boundaries of open spaces and linking one group of buildings to another was largely achieved by the clever and prolific use of the stoa; a form of building that had originated in the Classical period but played its most popular and useful role in the Hellenistic age (figs 40 and 41). The basic shape of a stoa has been compared to that of a traditional lean-to bicycle shed: it was essentially a long, rectangular building with a solid back wall, a colonnaded front side and a pitched roof. A stoa was usually divided along its length into two or three aisles, and it could be constructed to provide between one and three storeys of accommodation. Stoa were highly adaptable, multipurpose buildings that could provide useful facilities for everything from public dining to shopping, storage of goods, shelter for pilgrims or room for philosophical conversations. Along with their practical uses, stoa helped to create a 'planned' look in Hellenistic cities by marking the boundaries of open spaces such as agora, or by linking one group of buildings with another. They were constructed in large numbers in virtually all Hellenistic cities – it is recorded that in fourth-century AD Alexandria there were no fewer than 456 of them! The
original appearance of a large stoa is easily appreciated from that of the Stoa of Attalos at Athens, reconstructed on its original site and to its original plan in the Agora by American archaeologists and architects for use as an excavation base and museum between 1955 and 1956 (see also fig. 97 and pp. 167–8).

A supreme example of the use of the stoa, and of careful and deliberate planning in general, is provided by the city of Pergamon. Here in the second century BC the city's Attalid rulers created a showpiece of contemporary architectural design (fig. 42). As the city lies on a steep hill that rises suddenly from the surrounding plain, terracing was needed to accommodate the monumental new buildings and enclosures, and here it was employed to astonishingly brilliant effect. The main view of the city is from the west, dominated by the huge theatre sunk into the side of the hill. The arc of the theatre seems to rest upon the giant stoa set below it that both served the practical function of a retaining balustrade and provided a panoramic walkway for strolling theatre-goers. The main terraces on which lay the other main public buildings of the city — the temples, the library and the altar of Zeus — radiated outwards from the theatre, and many of these structures too are defined and linked by stoa.

These changes in the concept of spatial management and planning radically altered the appearance of many cities. In detail, too, as well as in overall plan, the appearance of many Hellenistic cities and sanctuaries was much more splendid, in many ways more noticeably opulent, than that of their Classical predecessors. A city council (boule), for example, had been part of the government structure of many cities in the Classical period. But only in the Hellenistic period did it become the norm for the council to have its own dedicated building, a bouleuterion. At Miletus, for example, a bouleuterion was presented to the city by the Schiotic king Antiochus IV (175–164 BC). It takes the form of a small indoor theatre, accessed through a colonnaded courtyard, which was itself approached from the street by a colonnaded gateway. The remains of a similar, though more modest structure, can also be seen at Priene. Again, many Classical cities had had their own theatres, but most of the ruins that we can see today, such as the well-preserved examples at Epidaurus, Syracuse or Ephesus (fig. 43), actually date to the Hellenistic period. The circular orchestra of the Classical theatre remained unchanged, but the rough, grassy slopes where Classical audiences had assembled were utterly transformed in the Hellenistic age through the supply of regular rows of marble bench seats arranged in tiers and sections, with special comfortable chairs for the dignitaries in the front rows and elaborate, permanent stage buildings at the back of the orchestra.
Temples, sanctuaries and public sculpture

In terms of general architectural principles, the inclination already observed in fourth-century Macedon to pay less than strict attention to the Classical forms and canons was carried further. Taking advantage of this tendency there developed an interest in and an ability to use both architecture and sculpture to create feelings not just of awe and admiration but also of surprise, drama and excitement. The great Hellenistic temple of Apollo at Didyma in Asia Minor, for example, probably the largest temple project of the early Hellenistic period, was a building full of unexpected features and architectural novelties (figs 44 and 45).\(^3\) Built to house a cult statue, a sacred laurel tree and an ornamental spring, it looked from the outside more or less like a normal peristyle temple, albeit on a massive scale, and with unusually varied and richly elaborate decoration on the base pedestals of its 20 m-high Ionic columns. However, the porch at the ‘front’ end of the temple did not lead to a normal-sized cell or inner chamber. The apparent ‘door’ in its back wall was really rather a high, stage-like window at which a priest might appear to address a crowd of worshippers. The central area of the temple was a massive courtyard sunk below the level of the porch and open to the sky. Access was restricted to two narrow, sloping, barrel-vaulted corridors leading down from the front colonnade. Once inside the court, a vast staircase of monumental proportions led back up from ground level to the small room behind the porch. Present-day visitors to the site can readily re-create something of the dramatic experience of those worshippers who were allowed to enter the inner court: crowded into the unsurprisingly dark passages, they would have taken the dim light of the courts and the courtyards, a place quite distant from the world outside the temple walls, and as they got used to this they might turn to find themselves dwarfed by the unexpectedly monumental staircase behind them. The idiosyncratic design is likely to have resulted from the special needs of the cult and ritual that went on there; it must have provided a series of spectacular, theatrical settings in which to impress the worshippers and it is hard to resist the suggestion that the ritual involved some impressive performance by the priests, elevated high above the crowds.

The cult statue of Apollo from the great temple of Didyma is lost, but whatever it was of bronze or marble, the chances are that it was monumental in scale, and probably positioned so that viewers would look up at it from below. A modest reconstruction of this sort of elevated position has been contrived in the British Museum for a rather later cult statue of Apollo, found shattered into 121 pieces on the floor of a temple at Cyrene in North Africa (fig. 46).\(^7\) Although it probably dates to the second century AD, this colossal marble figure suggests one possible form that the Didyma figure could have taken. Seen from a distance, the size, striking pose and wealth of attributes of the Cyrene Apollo create an imposing effect. Close up, however, the god is less powerful-looking, with a swarthy, rather feminine face and long, curling hair that falls onto his shoulders. The himation, slipping below his hips, reveals a soft, rather fleshy physique and shows off the exaggerated curve of his torso. His lost right arm was originally raised; his missing left hand would loosely have supported the large lyre that proclaims his role as god of music, while the snake that twists round a tree-trunk below the lyre recalls the legendary serpent of Delphi that the god had once fought and defeated.
A bronze cult statue would not have needed the rather clumsy tree-trunk and system of struts that this marble version requires to support its weight. Few colossal bronze statues survive from any period of antiquity, because of the propensity for them to be melted down and reused. The British Museum is, therefore, fortunate to preserve one bronze head that comes almost certainly from a late Hellenistic cult statue (fig. 47). This head was discovered in the early 1870s by a man digging in a field on the site of the ancient city of Satala (modern Sadak) in north-east Asia Minor. Height: 38.1 cm.
Armenia. The head travelled via Constantinople to Italy, where it came into the hands of an Italian dealer and collector who sold it to the British Museum in 1873. Shortly afterwards a bronze hand, almost certainly from the same statue, was presented to the Museum. No more of the statue has ever surfaced. The head has been identified as that of the goddess Aphrodite from its resemblance to other heads on complete Aphrodite statues; it has been suggested that the statue was probably of the 'Cnidian Aphrodite' type, which showed the goddess naked, pulling drapery from a support by her side. The findspot however, has also suggested that the statue may alternatively represent the Iranian goddess Anahita, who was later assimilated with the Greek goddesses Aphrodite and Athena. The features of the full, rather heavy face are very regular, the modelling of the cheeks and chin subtle and rounded. The hair is extremely finely worked, its waves, curls and ringlets, including the wisps in the centre of the forehead, contrasting with and setting off the smoothness of the skin. The eyes, now empty sockets, would originally have been inlaid with either precious stones or glass paste, and the lips may have been coated with a copper veneer. A late Hellenistic date, perhaps in the first century BC, is suggested by the thin walls of the casting. Since no traces of a temple were ever found when the alleged site was excavated, the original setting of this statue remains a mystery; the exceptional quality of the surviving elements, however, suggest that it must have formed a highly impressive figure.

The Nike of Samothrace

The most dramatic of all known public settings for a piece of sculpture is surely that contrived for the most impressive free-standing sculpture of the Hellenistic age to have survived, the huge (3.25 m high) and magnificent figure of the Nike (Victory) of Samothrace (fig. 48). Now in the Louvre, the Nike originally stood in an open-fronted building at the top of the theatre in the Sanctuary of the Great Gods on Samothrace (fig. 49). She is shown alighting on a base in the form of a ship's prow; it is possible, though not certain, that this was originally set in a rock-surrounded basin of water - in other words, a miniature seascape of cliffs and waves. The Nike looks best when seen in left three-quarter view, the angle from which most viewers would originally have approached her. The figure was carved from one principal block of marble, extending from below the breasts to the feet, with a number of subsidiary blocks for the bust, head, wings and elements of the drapery; all these separate pieces were skillfully pieced

48 The Nike (Victory) of Samothrace, alighting on the deck of a ship. Various dates within the Hellenistic period have been proposed for this figure, which is likely to have been a thank-offering for some great naval victory. Height of the Nike herself c. 2.45 m.

49 This is the spectator view over which the Nike of Samothrace looked, across the Sanctuary of the Great Gods to the sea.
together. The Nike is a massive, muscular and powerful figure. With her huge, meticulously feathered wings outspread, she strides energetically forward, her taut twisted in one direction, her hips in the other, producing a boldly controlled effect as she battles against the wind to land on the deck of the ship. The full curves of her body are visible through her finely pleated chiton as it presses against and moulds her body and thighs, while her wind-blown cloak wraps itself around and between her legs in deeper, thicker folds. The circumstances of this figure's dedication are unknown. It is likely to have commemorated an important naval victory, but we do not know for certain whose, or even roughly when. Samothrace was a major sanctuary in the Hellenistic period, and as such it was controlled and patronised by various Hellenistic rulers in turn, including the Ptolemies (who built an unusual rotunda, the Aristeion, to house the cult of Queen Arsinoe) and the Antigonids of Macedonia. Some scholars argue that the Nike is most likely to have been dedicated by Antigonus Gonatas after his naval victory over the Ptolemies at Kos in the 250s BC. Another, perhaps rather over-ingeniously crafted hypothesis (which tries to link together a fragmentary sculptor’s name, the supposedly Rhodian type of ship portrayed and the possibly but not as yet demonstrably Rhodian origin of the grey stone used for it) suggests that instead the Nike commemorated the victory of the Roman fleet, assisted by that of Rhodes, over Antiochus III of Syria in 190 BC. This debate, very typical for the major monuments of the Hellenistic period, seems set to continue. Incontrovertible, however, is not just the magnificent quality of the sculpture but also the theatricality of the setting. The prominence of the chosen site, the thought that has gone into the effect of the figure on her viewers, the miniature seascape setting that would only be appreciated close at hand and the larger desire to use the landscape to enhance the sculpture and vice versa, are all typical of the grand planning tendencies of Hellenistic sculptors and architects, here realised to maximum effect.

Pergamon and the Great Altar

To appreciate Hellenistic civic architecture to the full, it is of course desirable to visit some of the sites of the Hellenistic cities and sanctuaries. To glimpse something of the original grandeur of Pergamon – and of Hellenistic public architectural sculpture in its most developed form – it is also advisable to view the Great Altar as reconstructed in the splendidum of the Pergamon Museum in Berlin (fig. 50). Here, however, divorced and isolated from its original city and sanctuary setting, it has acquired a rather different aura, one that is perhaps even more imposing than that of its original context. The architectural form of the Great Altar is in itself a Hellenistic development, a good example of the tendency of Hellenistic architects to adopt Classical forms but convert them into something rather different. Monumental altars on stepped platforms, though found in various East Greek sites in the Archaic period, were not favoured in Classical times. The preference then was for a relatively small altar placed in front of a temple; it was the temple itself, complete with columns and various forms of sculpture, that dominated most sanctuary precincts. The Pergamon Altar, however, was an independent structure in its own precinct. It consists of a large platform set on a massive podium on the front side the podium splits to create two projecting wings framing a monumental staircase. The platform
bears a colonnade and passing through this at the top of the staircase, the visitor would reach a courtyard that housed the real altar where sacrifices would be made. With its stepped podium, its colonnades, its enclosed inner courtyard and the elaborate sculptural ornament that is its most important and indeed its dominant feature, the Altar completely replaces a traditional temple building. The architectural form of the Altar seems to have been largely determined by the needs of the sculptural friezes; 2.3 m high and 110 m long, this represented the epic story of the battle between the gods and the giants. It ran straight round the outside of the podium on three sides, while on the fourth it turned at right angles to flank each side of the stairs. A second frieze ran round the three inner walls of the courtyard; its central subject was the life and adventures of a relatively obscure hero, Telephos, the legendary founder of Pergamon. Both these friezes would have been visible to the viewer in a way that earlier temple sculpture, located high up on a building, had never been. On the Pergamon Altar, the bottom of the gigantomachy frieze on the three unbroken sides of the monument was only about 2.5 m from the ground. Walking up the great staircase, some of the figures from the frieze surge alongside you: some even spill over onto the actual steps. The quieter Telephos frieze, too, was comfortably placed at eye level; this would have been seen by most people as a series of scenes framed through the columns of the inner colonnade, and its composition is suitably pictorial and episodic for such a setting.

This concern for visibility and display is a defining feature of Hellenistic public art, and for the sculpture of the Pergamon Altar it had important implications. It was possible to leave some of the sculptured friezes that ran high up above the architraves of Classical temples relatively roughly or slightly finished – think, for example, of the slightly rushed or blurred-seeming cavaliers from the south frieze of the Parthenon. But every detail of the Altar sculpture had to be able to stand up to intimate scrutiny and so every detail had to be completely finished (fig. 51). The surface detail of the figures is indeed amazing – the scales of the snake coils of the giants, feathers, hair, the texture of garments – all are intricately realised in marble in a manner more usually found only in bronze. The overall planning and design of the full length of the frieze, with its ebb and flow of battle, is both complex and masterful; it has been argued very plausibly that a contemporary epic account of the battle, perhaps one composed specially for the Attalid court, lies behind its arrangement and choice of themes. And above all, there is a terrific feeling of passion, of vigour and energy, despair and elation, with some figures so powerfully carved that they seem almost to burst out of the relief. This emotional style of carving is sometimes described as

‘Hellenistic baroque’: the Pergamon Altar reliefs are its most extreme and characteristic expression. In many ways the gigantomachy frieze is the surviving tour de force of Hellenistic public sculpture. Typically, as with the Nike of Samothrace, there is uncertainty over the date and circumstances of the Altar’s dedication. There was a long tradition in Greek art of using the theme of the gigantomachy to express the triumph of civilization over the barbarians. In Classical Athens the gigantomachy, along with the centauromachy or amazomachy, had been a popular metaphor (on the Parthenon metopes, for example) for the Athenian-led victory over the Persians in the earlier fifth century BC. The Great Altar frieze incorporated artistic quotations from the Parthenon (for example, the Athena and Zeus from the east frieze are adapted from the figures of Athena and Poseidon in the Parthenon’s west pediment), a visual expression of Pergamon’s claim to be the new Athens, the new centre for and leader of Greek culture and civilization. But the gigantomachy theme itself would have enjoyed a special resonance in Pergamon, whose forces enjoyed successive victories over the Gauls in the second century BC. For this reason, and also because of the fairly secure dating of various distinctive fragments of pottery found in the foundations of the Altar, some scholars think it should be dated after the Gallic war of

51 Detail from the east frieze of the Great Altar of Pergamon, with Athena presenting a giant and being greeted by Nike (Winged Victory). Or, the Earth and mother of the gods, looks on in despair in the lower part of the scene.
168–166 BC. Others, however, prefer a date rather earlier in the reign of the Pergamene king Eumenes II (197–159 BC), suggesting the Altar could have been a votive dedication after the Peace of Apamea in 188 BC, which put Attalid power on a secure footing and inspired a rush of building projects in the Attalid capital city.

Priene and Knidos

The British Museum cannot present Hellenistic public sculpture or architecture on the scale of the Great Altar of Pergamon. Its rich collections do, however, allow us to view characteristic elements of the public landscape of Hellenistic cities and sanctuaries in the sculpture and other items that it houses from two other significant Hellenistic sites, the city of Priene and the sanctuary of Demeter at Knidos.

Priene is—and was in antiquity—on a much more manageable scale than Pergamon. It was established on its present site, a steeply sloping, south-facing hillside, in the later fourth century BC (see fig. 2). Here the grid-pattern of the streets was sensitively adapted to the terrain, with broad streets running east to west across the slope, crossed by narrower, sometimes stepped, alleyways climbing up and down the hill. The public buildings were few in number compared to those of Pergamon, and relatively small in scale, yet no less well placed and integrated into the overall plan. The dedication of the temple of Athena Polias at Priene by Alexander the Great has already been mentioned. The architect of this temple was Pytheos, whose name is also associated with the design of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. The temple was built in the Ionic order, and the ceiling of the colonnade was decorated with coffers bearing figures carved in high relief. The site was first investigated in 1868–9 on behalf of the Society of Dilettanti, with the support and encouragement of the British Museum, by a British architect, R.P. Pullein. Numerous fragments of the ceiling coffers, and other pieces of sculpture from the site, are now in the British Museum. The site was subsequently re-excavated more extensively by German archaeologists in 1895–9, and German research still continues there today. In the later twentieth century the coffers are painstakingly examined by an American scholar, J.C. Carter, who was able to reconstruct around twenty-six separate compositions, mostly composed of figures of a piagnomachy. Difficult as these are to appreciate in their current fragmentary state, they should not be overlooked as examples of early Hellenistic sculpture, and some of the fully developed figures and groups appear to prefigure the more famous piagnomachy groups of the Great Altar of Pergamon.

In the Hellenistic age the temple precinct, situated near the centre of the city, would have been crowded with dedications including fine pieces of sculpture. Part of one such dedication is preserved in the British Museum: the elegantly elongated figure of a charioteer, dressed in the long robe associated with his role (fig. 52). As was often the case with Hellenistic sculpture, the arms and head were made separately and are now missing. It is clear, however, that the arms would originally have reached forward to grasp the reins. The charioteer wears a very full chiton, fastened at each shoulder and pulled and folded into numerous fine pleats by a high girdle—the holes that survive on this are probably the result of the attachment of a belt in gold or bronze. The garment and the dignified, columnar effect of the figure are not unlike those of the famous earlier Classical bronze charioteer from Delphi. The Priene figure would originally have stood in either a two- or a four-horse chariot group, and was probably a dedication offered by someone who had won a major chariot race victory.

Those who could not afford large-scale bronze or marble gifts for the goddess would leave more modest offerings. These might take the form of bronze or pottery vessels, or smaller figurines in marble, bronze, or terracotta. Many such figures were found in the German excavations, and a large female terracotta figure in the British Museum, also found on the site of the temple, is likely to have formed an offering of this type (fig. 53). Her head-dress and her finely detailed costume with its dotted border decoration indicate she is a queen or goddess. Excavations in various sanctuaries around the Hellenistic would have suggested that in many places there
would have been areas set aside for small-scale dedications such as terracotta figures, perhaps equipped with tables or benches where the gifts could be deposited. In some sanctuaries at least, it seems to have been the custom from time to time, perhaps at the end of one festival ‘season’ or in preparation for a new one, to sweep up the old dedications and bury them in pits, sometimes described as ‘ritual deposits’. Such deposits were certainly a feature of the sanctuary of Demeter and the Underworld gods at Knidos, in south-west Asia Minor (modern Turkey), excavated by Sir Charles Newton in 1857–8.14 This sanctuary appears to have been laid out at much the same time that the city of Knidos was re-founded on a new site around 560–550 BC. This new site, at the head of a long peninsula, was strategically and commercially advantageous, besides enjoying wonderful views out over the Gulf of Kos. Substantial remains of the city have continued to be excavated at various times since Newton’s explorations, up to the present day.15 The buildings found include a Hellenistic house, a stoa, and a round building that may be the temple of Aphrodite, in addition to later Roman structures. The sanctuary of Demeter and the others, who comprised Hades, god of the Underworld, Demeter’s own daughter Persephone and the messenger god Hermes, lay on a long platform set into the side of the acropolis hill, high above the city (fig. 54). The gods worshipped there are named in an inscription, and the well-known seated marble figure of Demeter that Newton found there has been identified as a cult statue of the goddess (fig. 55).16

Spanning the transition between the Classical and Hellenistic periods, the Demeter of Knidos was probably carved and dedicated in the early years of the sanctuary in the mid-fourth century BC. She sits in a calm and peaceful attitude, her head turned slightly to her left, one foot tucked behind the other.

She rests upon a cushioned throne, the back and arm-rests of which are now missing. Probably in one of her (now missing) hands she originally held a libation bowl or torch. Her head was carved separately from the rest of the figure (and was indeed found in a different part of the sanctuary). The smoothly polished surface of her face forms a strong contrast both to her roughly waving hair and to the deeply chiselled, rather ruthless drapery that crosses and recrosses her body in an elaborate series of pleats and folds.

Newton’s excavations revealed that for much of its existence the sanctuary must have been crowded with votive statues. Many of these survive only as fragments, presumably because of the regular clearance of the votive areas – hands holding staffs, for example, are found in enormous quantities. But there are also many substantially complete pieces that do convey an impression of what such a sanctuary would have looked like. Among these are numerous animal statues, principally calves and pigs, enshrining stone images of the real young animals that would have been sacrificed to Demeter, goddess of fertility, and the others.

We do not know how these marble votives would have been arranged in the sanctuary or how many would have been on display at any one time, but the quantities that survive and the homogeneity in the style of carving of quite a number of the more intact pieces suggest that considerable flocks or herds would have been visible at once. Among the more intact of the surviving statues is that of an elderly woman, identified as a priestess by her garments and veil;17 such a figure might have been dedicated posthumously by the woman’s family in memory of her service to the goddess, or by supplicants hoping for a favourable answer to their prayers.

As at Priene, many cheaper, smaller-scale offerings were also left in this sanctuary. Newton’s excavations uncovered several small rectangular terracotta chambers, some walled with rough masonry and roofed with tiles. These were packed with objects, carefully arranged in rows. It is uncertain whether these pits were constructed to form temporary shelter for votive offerings after the destruction of a proper treasury building, alternatively they might have been built in anticipation of an attack on the sanctuary, or else more simply may represent clearing deposits, the ritual burial places of previous season’s offerings. Spanning the late Classical, Hellenistic and early Roman periods, the deposits objects included glass
bottles, stone weights, pottery, terracotta figures and hundreds of clay lamps that made appropriate offerings for lightening the darkness of the Underworld. The lamps, pottery and terracotta were all made locally. Many of the lamps are distinctive, multi-nostrilled types, made in a fine, hard, metallic-grey fabric. The terracotta figures are of especial interest. Terracotta figures of *hydriophoroi*, young women who carry pitchers on their heads, were popular dedications to Demeter sanctuaries all around the Mediterranean, and were found in considerable numbers at Knidos.\(^{38}\) They most probably served a dual function, acting as images both of the votaries themselves and of the mythical daughters of Kales, king of Eleusis; according to legend these met Demeter, mourning the loss of her daughter Persephone, at a well where they had gone to draw water, and took her back with them to the shelter of their home. In addition to the *hydriophoroi*, the Knidian terracotta objects in the British Museum include the head of an old woman with a ritual cylindrical basket or *cista* on her head, a comic actor, and a pig.\(^{39}\) There are also some very fine, if fragmentary, draped female figures, the largest and best of which is a true sculpture in miniature of a type known on a larger scale to represent the goddess Persephone (fig. 56).\(^{40}\) The drapery of this terracotta, substantial elements of which have been built up and finished by hand, strongly resembles that of the seated marble statue of Demeter, and it has been suggested that it forms a small-scale version of a full-sized cult statue of Persephone that would originally have stood beside the statue of her mother.

The public areas of Hellenistic cities and sanctuaries played key roles in Hellenistic life. For the rulers they provided conspicuous opportunities to flaunt their wealth, culture and power. Many ordinary people must have appreciated the facilities offered in these public areas; they were places where the traditional ways of life, both sacred and secular, might go on as before. At the same time many would have enjoyed the sightseeing possibilities that the splendid new precincts offered. At all events a fragment of dialogue attributed to the mime-writer Herodas gives a vivid impression of two women happily engaged in this sort of activity, admiring the works of art displayed in a sanctuary of Asklepios:

'... Don't you see, dear Kynno, what works are here? You would say that Athens carved these lovely things... If I scratch this naked boy, won't he be wounded, Kynno?... and the silver fine tunics, if Myellos or Pataikos, son of Lampion, were to see them, wouldn't they think they were really silver?... And the ox... if I didn't think it would be behaving too boldly for a woman I would have cried out, in case the ox should harm me...' (Herodas 4,56–71)
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