Macedonia – Alexandria

Monumental funerary complexes of the late Classical and Hellenistic age

Dorota Gorzelany

NARODOWY PROGRAM
ROZWOJU HUMANISTYKI

To My Parents

Contents

List of Figures

Introduction

Diverse cultural aspects are reflected in the manner in which a society buries its dead. Studying grave goods reveals differences in economic and social status among the deceased, although the resultant picture need not always express true status, being sometimes intended as an idealised vision of the deceased's identity. The type of burial is instrumental for reconstructions and interpretation of burial rites and customs associated with the passage from life to death. It also brings coded information on eschatological questions: the end of life, life after death and the yearning for immortality, rituals of death and mourning, and commemoration of the dead. The attitude toward death was described by a set of beliefs contained in myths and by historical factors impacting the interpenetration of different religions and the intensity of intercultural contacts. Architecture and its decoration decode an ideology that gave the tombs their specific form.

A monumental tomb likewise bears a message for the living, emphasizing the social status of the deceased and acting as a means of commemoration. The simplest form of funerary monument was the tumulus. In Macedonia, it concealed a monumental structure founded by members of an aristocratic elite; less affluent families invested in a more modest cist tomb or rock-cut grave. The 'Macedonian tomb' – a term referring to masonry structures of stone blocks set partly in a pit below ground level, consisting of a burial chamber with a preceding vestibule, the complex barrel-vaulted and furnished with an architecturally elaborate facade or a dromos and covered with a tumulus – exemplifies a special category of funerary architecture specific to Macedonia alone. Tombs of this kind are undoubtedly among the most impressive Greek burial complexes, owing to their manner of construction, their decoration, and rich grave furnishings. Their form reflects an assimilation of Greek eschatological beliefs characterizing the mystery religions and the kingdom's social ideology. Their importance for ancient art studies in general lies in the information they bring on late Classical and early Hellenistic architecture and even more significantly, on the monumental painting of the period. Indeed, the painted decoration of these tombs is the only preserved example in Greece of large-format painted compositions, preceding Pompeian wall painting. Most of the grave furnishings have been looted, but even the remaining objects, when considered in the light of a few undisturbed assemblages, demonstrate the importance of certain items for the deceased and their role in beliefs concerning life in the underworld.

A complex idea that took shape under the influence of the Macedonian and Egyptian traditions was instrumental in shaping the Alexandrian funerary establishments. Discovered for the most part in the late 19th and early 20th century, these subterranean tombs have since suffered extensive deterioration of their historical substance; in many cases all that remains today are the preliminary reports and excavation publications. Just as in Macedonia, they hardly ever yielded any grave goods of substance, but it was their form that made them an extremely important link in the history of sepulchral architecture. These rock-cut hypogea, not as numerous as the Macedonian tombs, anticipated in form the later catacomb tomb complexes that gained in popularity in Egypt and Rome.

The chronological frame of this study starts with the floruit of the Macedonian kingdom in the times of Phillip II and Alexander the Great, taking into consideration data from earlier cemeteries with tombs that could have shaped the form of the Macedonian type of sepulcher and the ideology associated with it, as well as examples from the 3rd century BC, which witnessed the emergence of the Alexandrian monumental complexes. The political and socio-economic situation of the period impacted the making of elaborate tombs in Macedonia as much as it fostered the continuation of the form under entirely different conditions in Alexandria, where it was carried out by the Macedonian hetairoi. The study ends with tombs from the first half of the 2nd century BC. In Macedonia these were tombs of modest architectural form and few grave goods, corresponding to a period of economic decline terminating in the fall of the kingdom after the Battle of Pydna in 168 BC. In Alexandria, the tombs in question already demonstrated a palpable increase of Egyptianizing motifs in their decoration, corresponding to weakening Ptolemaic authority.

The preserved monuments demonstrate an evolution of burial form and a correspondence between the structure of the monumental Macedonian tombs and the rock-cut funerary hypogea of Alexandria. The following text provides a comparative study of ornamental motifs and the themes of the scenes decorating the tombs. The grave furnishings of both the Macedonian and Alexandrian tombs will also be presented, or as much as was left behind after the extensive looting of these sepulchers in antiquity. This will be done in the form of a discussion of a representative group of artifacts, moving on to conclusions of a more general nature on the characteristics of the sets of grave goods.

Aspects of Greco-Macedonian religious ideas and beliefs on death and the Underworld, which contributed to the shaping of the ultimate resting places of the dead in Macedonia and Alexandria, will receive special attention. This issue reflects the role of the tomb and how it was perceived by the inhabitants of these two regions. Expressions of this are found in the architectural form, the decoration and iconography of the sepulchral paintings, the manner of burial, and the selection of grave goods buried with the deceased. Also related to this is the symbolism of particular elements making up the sepulchral complex: tomb size, doors, facades, painted decoration, and the presence of textiles and their imitations in the interior decoration of the tombs. With regard to the Alexandrian tombs, it is important in this context to recognise the coexistence and popularity of Egyptian beliefs introduced in Alexandrian sepulchral art, while noting the differences in the perceptions of the tomb's role in the consciousness of Macedonians and Egyptians respectively.

The first investigation[1] of ancient remains in the territory of Macedonia was carried out by L. Heuzey. Traveling there first in 1855 and then again in 1861 with the architect H. Daumet, Heuzey prepared an extensive report for Napoleon III, including a detailed description of the region around Philippi, the Hellenistic palatial complex in Palatitsa, and other sites in central and western Macedonia and on the Albanian coast. During World War I, Macedonia was occupied by British and French armies; members of the British School at Athens

---

[1] Works by earlier travelers concern the topography of Macedonia (Cousinéry 1831), fortresses, sea harbors and the 'political and military views of the population' (Lake 1835). Successive articles by the Briton A.J.B. Wace shared observations from his travels in Macedonia in 1906–1912 (Wace, Woodward 1911–12, 166–188; Wace 1909–10, 232–53; Wace, 1913–14, 123–32; Wace 1914–15/1915–16, 11–15).

enlisted in these occupational forces conducted explorations on a broader scale, publishing their results in British and French periodicals.[2] This work was continued on a larger scale in the 1920s on Tazos and in Philippi,[3] in Chauchitsa in the central part of the Axios valley,[4] and in Olynthus,[5] where a cist tomb, erroneously identified then as a Macedonian tomb, was discovered during fieldwork near the modern village of Myriophyto and excavated in 1928, 1931, and 1934. The prehistoric period was also investigated on a regular basis.[6] Most of the excavation work since the 1950s has been carried out by Greeks.

Heuzey and Daumet produced the first publication of Macedonian tombs in 1876.[7] The tombs they had investigated in Palatitsa, Pella and Pydna shared enough features in common to warrant a description of a single type: tombs with subterranean vaulted burial chambers, an architecturally developed facade, and stuccowork wall decoration of the burial chamber furnished with a *kline*. Successive discoveries of tombs with similar features confirmed this definition; these monuments are referred to by the names of their discoverers: Kinch's Tomb in Lefkadia[8] and Perdizet's in Amphipolis.[9] Further discoveries, such as the tomb in Dion, published in 1930 by G. Sotiriadis,[10] demonstrated how these tombs differed despite having so many features in common. The first list of these tombs to be published was that of B. Filow,[11] who also included in it the domed tombs as an earlier, in his opinion, version of the vaulted form.

The ultimate definition of the Macedonian tomb as a type was provided by W. Hoepfner. The characteristic features of this type include a tumulus, facade and vestibule, and these last two elements may not occur in the simple tombs; the main diagnostic feature is a barrel vault.[12] This definition fits most monuments, also those of a more modest architectural form, and does not use burial type as a criterium.

The first typology of Macedonian tombs, taking into consideration complexes departing from Hoepfner's definition and situated outside Macedonia, was presented by D. Pandermalis in 1972.[13] It encompassed 44 known monuments, divided into four groups by burial chamber size. Emphasizing the diversity of Macedonian tombs, the author observed that more than half of these tombs shared one characteristic: a square burial chamber, measuring 3 m by 3 m, its form and size resulting from the arrangement of two or three beds.

---

[2]   These investigations included studies of prehistoric tumuli, historical monuments, artifactual material, and preparing archaeological maps and plans, among others, Picard 1918–19, 1–9; Casson 1916, 293–297; Mendel 1918, 9–17; Rey 1916, 257–292; Rey 1917–1919; Gardner, Casson 1918–19, 10–43.

[3]   Published in *Études Thasiennes*, *Guide de Thasos*; Collart 1937.

[4]   Casson 1926.

[5]   British excavations, see Wace, 1914–15/1915–16, 11–15; American project, see Robinson et al. 1929–1952; Robinson 1935, 289ff.

[6]   Heurtley 1939. During this time N.G.L. Hammond, author of the most numerous studies concerning the region, started journeying in and exploring Macedonia, see the bibliography.

[7]   Heuzey, Daumet 1876.

[8]   Kinch 1920.

[9]   Perdrizet 1898, 335–353.

[10]   Sotiriadis 1930, 36–51.

[11]   Filow 1937, 115.

[12]   Höpfner 1971, 137f.

[13]   Pandermalis 1972, 177ff.; for a listing of tombs divided by chamber size, see below, page 62f.

The question of the model for the Macedonian tomb and the origin of particular characteristics was treated cursorily by the first researchers. Heuzey[14] compared the facades of the tombs in Pydna and Palatitsa to residential architecture, emphasizing the importance of the doors. K.A. Rhomaios[15] was of the opinion that the facade of the tomb in Vergina, which he was studying, copied the front of a temple. The similarity between the tiered facade of the Tomb of the Judgment in Lefkadia and residential architecture was first observed by P. Petsas,[16] noting that the parallel need not hold for all complexes of this kind. The architectural elements of the facade of the palace in Vergina, discovered a few years later,[17] confirmed this idea.

The vaulting of Macedonian tombs was widely discussed among researchers. The first to study the issue was A.K. Orlandos,[18] based on Plato (Laws 947d–e) and Seneca (Letters 90, 32), and on the shape of the arches in Akarnania. Orlandos assumed that arches and vaults, adopted from Egypt and the Near East, appeared in Greece for the first time in the 5th century BC. He believed that these elements, sporadic at first, became widespread after Alexander the Great's expedition.

T.D. Boyd shared Orlandos's view on the origins of the vault.[19] In his doctoral treatise written prior to the discoveries in Vergina, he examined the vaulted structures known from Greece. The issue was also undertaken by K. Dornisch[20] in his work on Greek vaulted gates. He believed the evidence of the ancient written sources was sufficient to assume that vaulted roofs appeared in tombs in the first half of the 4th century BC, and that the architectural theory behind this construction was borrowed from Egypt.

Macedonian tombs were also discussed by D.C. Kurtz and J. Boardman,[21] who derived the form of the tomb from the plan of the Greek house or megaron, enriched with more elements of architectural decoration. These were described in greater detail by S.G. Miller[22] in her analysis of the facades of a few Macedonian tombs accompanying a general discussion of the eclectic and innovative form of Macedonian architecture. She did not go at that time into the question of the origin of the facade in subterranean tombs. She presented the architecture of the facades as an example of a typical element of Macedonian architecture in an article published in 1982.[23]

The spectacular discovery made by M. Andronikos in 1977/78 of four royal tombs under the Great Tumulus in Vergina (Figure 20) gave rise to a growing interest in Macedonian tombs, resulting in a flood of publications on the subject. The cist tomb, which was excavated first, contained a wall painting showing the abduction of Persephone, which proved of

---

[14] Heuzey, Daumet 1876, 253, pls 15, 18.
[15] Rhomaios 1951, 20.
[16] Petsas 1966a, 87f.
[17] See page 126.
[18] Orlandos 1968, 235–254.
[19] Boyd 1978, 83–100.
[20] Dornisch 1992.
[21] Kurtz, Boardman 1971, 271–306.
[22] Miller 1970.
[23] Miller 1982, 153–171.

great importance for the history of Greek painting.[24] Tombs II and III,[25] which had not been looted, contained not only remains of wall paintings, but also a rich set of grave goods that yielded information on objects of everyday use and those included among the offerings to the dead. The largely destroyed tomb IV with a freestanding portico is an example of the emergence and evolution of Macedonian sepulchral architecture. Regardless of the many controversies surrounding the subject, the largest of the tombs in the Great Tumulus, tomb II, is identified as the burial place of the Macedonian king Phillip II,[26] while tomb III was the last resting place of Alexander's son, Alexander IV, with the Sogdian princess Roxana (323–310 BC).

The first general characteristics, and a catalogue of 43 Macedonian tombs, was presented by B. Gossel in her dissertation of 1980.[27] The chronological issue was treated summarily in her study, as was the distribution of buildings of this type and particular characteristic elements: barrel vault, facade and tumulus. Gossel was the first to distinguish tombs with dromoi as typical of eastern Macedonia, and she presented a typological division of the tombs. In view of the diversity of these monuments, only about half of the known tombs were covered by this typology. They were divided into tombs of the oikos type and the heroon type. Gossel assumed that the prototype of the tomb facade was either a temple portico, a house of the prostas type, or a propylon. She explained the presence of a tumulus above the tomb as influenced by Asia Minor in terms of the monumentality of the form, but the structural side was in her view strictly Macedonian. She considered the issue of the vault in the light of Plato's treaty (*Laws* 947d–e), not excluding the possibility that Plato's ψαλίς actually meant a corbel vault. Following Boyd's reasoning,[28] Gossel also pointed to an Eastern origin for the vault, but she considered it an outcome of earlier contacts between the Macedonians and the Achaemenids.[29]

K.L. Sismanidis also presented general characteristics of the Macedonian tombs.[30] He believed that their facades imitated a temple front and he emphasised the diversity of the monuments, which made it so difficult to qualify them by type. The distribution of the tombs also shows that it is impossible to assume that they were always built in specific locations: they could be grouped near important ancient urban centres or could stand alone. However, he did observe that these tombs tended to be concentrated next to ancient roads.

M. Andronikos also took up the subject of Macedonian tombs and their provenience.[31] He was critical of using architectural elements for the dating of the tombs, considering that study of the pottery would yield more certain results. With regard to the vault and facade,

---

[24] Andronikos 1994.
[25] Andronikos 1997.
[26] For a review of the arguments, see below, pages 158ff.
[27] Gossel 1981.
[28] See below.
[29] Similarly, Tomlinson (1987, 305–312), who does not decide about the origins of the vault but believes it to be an improved version of Eastern vaults or else a spontaneous invention preceding Alexander's expedition.
[30] Sismanidis 1985, 35–70.
[31] Andronikos 1987a, 1–16; Andronikos 1997, 218ff.

he demonstrated a theoretical evolution from the cist tomb,[32] through an enlarged chamber and the related issues of roofing a larger space and depositing the burial, to the concept of a vault. Citing literary accounts and archaeological evidence, he rejected Boyd's theory that the earliest vaults originated in 305 BC. He considered the application of the arch in Macedonia as a reaction to a practical structural problem and linked it to the subterranean form of the building.[33] The facade was introduced for aesthetic reasons in order to conceal the arching vault. Its form was modeled on a propylon with a portico leading to the heroon of the deceased or his or her eternal home, and a real portico may have initially been constructed in this place instead of a facade.

An extensive study of the Macedonian type of tomb appeared in S.G. Miller's monograph on the Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles in Lefkadia.[34] Miller discussed the chronology, architectural elements and structure of the tombs, enriching her work with numerous comments and providing references to other writings on the various issues. She listed 83 tombs with an exhaustive bibliography, including 11 similarly constructed tombs from outside the territory of Macedonia.

The most important Macedonian tombs were reviewed and described in a collective work edited by B. Barr-Sharrar and E.N. Borzy[35], and another written by R. Ginouvès[36] on the history and art of Macedonia from the Paleolithic through Hellenistic times. Separate chapters written by experts on given issues, such as history, architecture, mosaics, pottery and jewellery, constitute an expert presentation of Greco-Macedonian culture as a whole.

Recent years have seen the publication of a number of the tomb complexes in separate monographs.[37] Painted representations on the facade of the tomb and in its interiors were also an important research question, in technological as well as iconographic terms.[38] Ongoing excavations have brought new finds significantly impacting research on the Macedonian tombs. A tumulus with three burials was explored recently in the royal necropolis in Vergina[39], and another Macedonian tomb from the end of the 4th century BC was discovered in Amphipolis-Kastas, provisionally identified as the tomb of Roxana and either her son Alexander IV or Alexander the Great's General Laomedon from Mythilene.[40]

Rock-cut tombs from Macedonia are located near Veroia, Pella, Amphipolis, and Edessa, with a few more around Pydna. The highest number of tombs was found in Veroia, owing to intensified construction works after World War II. Some of them were described by S.

---

[32] Similarly, Hammond 1991, 62–82 (with a discussion of the identification of the dead buried in the Great Tumulus). On cist graves, see Themelis, Touratsoglou 1997 (necropolis in Derveni); see Vokotopoulou 1990 (necropolis in Aiani).
[33] Similarly, Wesenberg (1991, 252–258) who sees the barrel vault as an improvement of the segment technique but does not exclude the possibility of the Egyptian vault construction techniques influencing Greek building theory.
[34] Miller 1993a.
[35] Barr-Sharrar, Borza 1982.
[36] Ginouvès 1993a.
[37] Tsimbidou-Avloniti 2005; Rhomiopoulou, Schmidt-Dounas 2010.
[38] Brecoulaki 2006; Descamps-Lequime 2007.
[39] http://www.archaiologia.gr/en/blog/2013/03/21/new-finds-at-aigai/ [8.09.2014]
[40] http://greece.greekreporter.com/2014/08/13/two-scenarios-for-the-great-tomb-in-amphipolis/[8.09.2014]

Drougou and I. Touratsoglou in a monograph covering an analysis of the architectural form and a catalogue of the grave goods.[41] A second large set of rock-cut and cist tombs is located in the vicinity of Pella. These tombs were discovered relatively late compared with other monuments of this type in other parts of Macedonia. In the 19th century, a large burial chamber was discovered; it was described by the travelers W.M. Leake and A. Delacoulonche.[42] In 1976, agricultural works led to the discovery of a second tomb and eight more in the next two years. They were studied exhaustively by M. Lilimbaki–Akamati,[43] who also listed the rock-cut tombs from Macedonia and briefly presented this type of tomb found outside Macedonia.

Particular categories of artifacts making up the grave goods have been studied to various degrees in a few monographs and articles on the subject.[44]

The first Hellenistic tombs discovered in Alexandria were those in Hadra, which were found in 1874 during the construction of a new road to Cairo. They were explored and described by T.D. Neroutsos.[45] Excavations were carried out without any control until the inauguration of the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria. Chance finds were described by Neroutsos in his brochure L'Ancienne Alexandrie.[46] Regular excavations started in 1892, either directed or supervised by the successive museum directors.[47] Annual excavation reports were published from 1898 in the Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Alexandrie48 (BSAA), established by G. Botti in 1893, in the Bulletin de la corespondance hellénique, and recently also in Études alexandrines-Alexandrina, a publication edited by J.-Y. Empereur since 1998 and issued by the Institut Francais d'Archéologie Orientale.[49]

The earliest investigated necropolis with many small tombs cut into the soft bedrock was in Hadra/Eleusis and in the coastal Shatby extending to the north of it. Two larger hypogea, A and B, were discovered during G. Botti's and E. Breccia's excavations in 1904–1910, as well

---

[41] Drougou, Touratsoglou 1980.
[42] Leake 1835, 260; Delacoulonche 1859, 138.
[43] Lilimbaki-Akamati 1994.
[44] Pottery: Drougou 1991a; stele from the Great Tumulus: Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1984; metal vessels: Barr-Sharrar 1982, 123–139; Barr-Sharrar 1986, 71–82; jewellery: Higgins 1982, 141–151. See also below, chapters II and IV.
[45] Neroutsos (1875) refers to the first topographical description of the city, published in 1866 by Mahmoud-Bey el Falaki. The next study of the topography of Alexandria was made by E. von Sieglin together with W. Dörpfeld in 1898. Sieglin then financed two campaigns conducted by T. Schreiber. The first one in 1898/99, field directed by F. Noack, was dedicated to exploring the Roman necropolis in Kom-esh-Shukafa. The second one in 1900/1901 was carried out by A. Thiersch, H. Thiersch and A. Schiff and E. Fichter; test trenches were dug in the Serapeion, a tomb in Gabbari and another tomb in Hadra. Artifacts from these excavations were published in 1908–1927 in the series *Expedition Ernst von Sieglin. Ausgrabungen in Alexandria* (vol. I, 1908: T. Schreiber, *Die Nekropole von Kom-Esch-Schukâfa. Expedition Ernst von Sieglin. Die griechisch-ägyptische Sammlung,* vol. II 1 A 1923: R. Pagenstecher, *Malerei und Plastik*; vol. II1 B, 1927: C. Watzinger, *Malerei und Plastik*; vol. II 2, 1924: J. Vogt, *Terrakotten*; vol. II 3, 1913: R. Pagenstecher, *Die Gefäße in Stein und Ton. Knochenschnitzereien*). On the urban topography, see Tkaczow 1977, 47–57; Tkaczow 1986, 1–25; Tkaczow 1993.
[46] Neroutsos 1888.
[47] Giuseppe Botti (1892–1907), Evaristo Breccia (1908–1934), Achille Adriani (1934–1953).
[48] The Museum journal *Le Musée gréco-romain* published reports from the excavations: *Rapports sur la marche du Service du Musée.* BSAA was published from 1898, in later years under the title *Rapport sur la marche du Service du Musée*, and then *Le musée gréco-romain d'Alexandrie.* In 1932–1952 Adriani published reports in the journal *Annuario del Museo Greco-Romano;* he also served as editor of BSAA (1933–1939).
[49] Particular volumes in the series constituted separate studies of artifact groups, see, among others, Nenna, Seif el-Din 2000 (faience vessels from the Greco-Roman period) and Empereur, Nenna 2001 (Gabbari necropolis).

as the cemetery in Ibrahimieh located further to the east.[50] Botti initiated work in Hadra in 1874 and 1875, and continued it in 1894;[51] subsequent excavations were continued by D.G. Hogarth and E.F. Benson. Successively, the cemeteries of Alexandria were excavated by the Ernst von Sieglin Expedition[52] (1900–1901), E. Breccia (1905–1906, 1912–1916, 1925–1933), Achilles Adriani[53] (1939–1940 and 1950–1952) and Dorea Said[54] (1987). One of the earliest of the big tombs to be discovered was the Tomb of the Soldiers in Ibrahimieh, published by T. Neroutsos.[55]

The Sidi Gaber tombs located further to the east, on the shore, were mentioned first by Neroutsos[56] and then described by H. Thiersch at the beginning of the 20th century; at the time they were already partly damaged by seawater.[57] The farthest cemetery to the east of Alexandria is the Mustapha Pasha (Mustapha Kamel) necropolis, discovered during leveling and cleaning work. During two years of excavations by Adriani (1933–1935), seven monumental rock-cut chamber tombs were discovered. Of these, three were in excellent condition.[58]

Monumental blocks of alabaster were discovered in 1907 in the area of the modern Latin Cemetery in eastern Alexandria, within the ancient city walls. In 1936, the vestibule and half of the burial chamber were reconstructed from these blocks.[59] The form, resembling the architecture of Macedonian tombs, and the expensive material suggested to the discoverers that it was the tomb of Alexander the Great, but data from recent excavations have challenged this theory.[60]

The district of Faros contains two other ancient necropoleis, one of them from the 2nd century BC.[61] Anfushy spreads out in the northern part of the island. Hypogea I and II were explored in 1901 and the results were published by Botti.[62] In 1919–1920, four more tombs (III–VI) were uncovered and studied by Breccia,[63] while Adriani published an extensive drawing and photographic documentation of the necropolis.[64]

---

[50] Breccia 1905, 55–100; Breccia 1912.
[51] Botti 1898a, 76; Botti 1898b, 54; Hogarth, Benson 1894–1895.
[52] See above note 45; Schreiber 1908, vol. I, 172f. and 183.
[53] Adriani 1940, 65–83, 83–122.
[54] Preliminary report published by Leclant, Clerc 1988, 309f.
[55] Neroutsos 1887, 291–298; Neroutsos 1888, 81f., 102–109; Brown 1957, 4–12 (with a discussion of the form of the tomb); Adriani 1966, 123. Slabs closing the loculi and the Hadra hydriae with the ashes of the dead deposited in them first became part of E.E. Farman's collection and were then purchased by the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
[56] Neroutsos 1875, 46f.
[57] Thiersch 1904, 1–6.
[58] Adriani 1936.
[59] Breccia 1907c, 7; Adriani 1940, 15–23; Bernhard 1956, 129ff.; Adriani 1966, 140–143; Leclant, Clerc 1985, 339f.; Adriani 2000, 102 note 72 and 104 note 75, pls XXIV–XXVI. For the key bibliography to the Alabaster Tomb, see Adriani 2000, 5 note 2.
[60] Limnaiou-Papakosta 2001, 66ff.; see also below, page 102.
[61] Ras el-Tin is the second, later established necropolis that was discovered in 1913–1914, see Adriani 1952, 48–54.
[62] Botti 1901a, 335–337; Botti 1902, 9–36; also the dissertation by Schiff 1905.
[63] Breccia 1913.
[64] Adriani 1952, 55–128.

The earliest tombs (3rd/2nd century BC) in western Alexandria are found in the region of Gabbari, where excavations were carried out at the end of the 19th century by Botti,[65] Breccia[66] and Henri Riad.[67] In 1975, Gunther Grimm undertook excavations in this area, investigating 11 subterranean tombs during four seasons of fieldwork.[68] Further excavations were carried out by the Egyptian Antiquities Organisation in the 1990s,[69] headed by the Director of the Greco-Roman Museum Ahmed Abd el-Fattah and Jean-Yves Empereur. The results of excavations in Suk el-Wardian/Mafrousa, an area located further to the west, were published by Breccia,[70] while work in the nearby hypogea in Minet el Bassal was conducted by Adriani in 1950–1951.[71]

The Alexandrian tombs, their architecture, tomb markers and preserved grave furnishings were treated collectively in a study published in 1919 by Pagenstecher, which also includes a broader discussion of particular issues; in part of Noshy's study[72] of 1937 on the subject of Ptolemaic art; and in catalogue form in a volume of the Repertorio d'arte dell'Egitto Greco--Romano by Adriani, published in 1966. The most recent discussion of Alexandrian tombs is the 2002 book by M.S. Venit,[73] which gathers all the data from extant publications on the tombs, starting from the Hellenistic period through late Roman times. The descriptions are accompanied by a discussion of their dating, the burial practices of particular ethnic groups of Alexandrian residents, and the heritage of Alexandrian funerary art in Egypt and beyond, in terms of the iconography as well as style. An alphabetical list of the tombs from both the eastern and western necropoleis, along with exhaustive references to each, appears in the appendix to this volume.

The most important category of finds[74] from the Alexandrian tombs are the Hadra hydriae and the steles and slabs closing the loculi. Key publications on the hydriae are articles by L. Guerrini, B.F. Cook and A. Enklaar.[75] This last author presented an extensive typology of these vessels, and discussed the painters, execution techniques and the activity of workshops producing particular groups of hydriae.

The first steles with figural painting were discovered in the 1880s and were linked to the merchant and antiquary G. Puglioli.[76] Brief studies of the loculi slabs and steles were included in works by Botti,[77] Breccia,[78] and Noshy.[79] Breccia commissioned M. Bartocci[80]

---

[65] Botti 1899, 37–56.
[66] Breccia 1932, 36f.
[67] Riad 1967, 89–96.
[68] Sabottka 1983, 195–203, pls 38–43.
[69] Empereur 1998a, 622–630.
[70] Breccia, 1907b.
[71] Adriani 1956, 1–48.
[72] For the architecture, Noshy 1937, 16–40.
[73] Venit 2002; see also a review by Babraj, Gorzelany 2003, 166–169 and Kerkeslager 2003.
[74] For references to artifact groups other than the ones mentioned above, see also chapter III.
[75] Guerrini 1964; Cook 1966a; Cook 1966b, 325–330; Callaghan, Jones 1985, 1–17; Enklaar 1985, 106–151; Enklaar 1986, 41–65.
[76] Parakenings Bozkurt 1998, 321ff.
[77] Botti 1898; Botti 1901b.
[78] Breccia 1905, 58ff.; Breccia 1906, 46ff.; Breccia 1907a, 35ff.; Breccia 1930, 99ff. and Breccia 1922, 131ff.
[79] Noshy 1937.
[80] Parakenings Bozkurt 1998, 321f.

to prepare watercolour and drawing documentation of the state of preservation of these delicate paintings;[81] a few of these were presented in his publication of the Shatby necropolis.[82] Next is a dissertation by Barbara Brown,[83] who catalogued some of the known Alexandrian steles, paintings and mosaics, and reviewed the debate on the finds from the Tomb of the Soldiers and the style of the steles. The collection of steles kept in the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria was studied and published by S. Schmidt.[84]

This book was prepared during visits to the library collection of the Institute of the History of Art and Archaeology of the Aristoteles University in Thessaloniki, the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Athens, and the libraries of the Karl Ruprecht University in Heidelberg and Vienna University. It was funded by scholarships from the Greek Ministry of Education, the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, and the Lanckorońscy from Brzezia Foundation. The principal part of the manuscript was completed by 2004; later additions were made only to bibliographical references concerning selected publications from the body of writing on the subject. I would like to thank Prof. Ewdoksia Papuci–Władyka, Prof. Zsolt Kiss, Prof. Marek Jan Olbrycht and Prof. Janusz A. Ostrowski for reading the manuscript and their valuable remarks.

The English edition of the book would not have been possible without the outstanding assistance of Dr Kamilla Twardowska.

---

[81] Ibidem. Copies of the drawings are now in the collection of the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria, inv. nos 20082–20091, 20197–20208.
[82] Breccia 1912, fig. 20, pls 23, 26, 31, 32a.
[83] Brown 1957.
[84] Schmidt 2003.