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The gymnasium was one of the key monuments for the formation of urban space and identity in Greek culture, and its transformation was closely interlinked with changing concepts of cityscaping. Knowledge as well as transfer of knowledge, ideas and concepts were crucial for the spread and long-lasting importance of gymnasia within and beyond the Greek and Roman world.

The contributions investigate the relationship between gymnasia and cityscapes in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial period as well as in the eastern and western Mediterranean, revealing chronological (dis)continuities and geographical (dis)similarities. The focus in the much-neglected west is on Sicily and South Italy (Akrai, Cuma, Herculaneum, Megara Hyblaea, Morgantina, Neatton, Pompeii, Segesta, Syracuse), while many major sites with gymnasia from the entire eastern Mediterranean are included (Athens, Eretria, Olympia, Pergamon, Rhodes).

Central topics comprise the critical reevaluation of specific sites and building types, the discussion of recent fieldwork, the assessment of sculptural decoration, and new insights about the gymnasiarchy and ruler cult in gymnasia.
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1 Introduction

This publication is based on an international Topoi conference that was held in Berlin from the 4th to 6th February 2016 and emerged from the research group C-6 on Cityscaping, notably the project C-6-8 on Bathing Culture and the Development of Urban Space: Case Study Pompeii. The term ‘cityscaping’ denotes the process by which urban spaces were actively shaped, modeled, and appropriated in ancient cultures. Cityscaping embraces two perspectives: physical modeling and functionalizing of urban spaces through their architectural and urban planning configurations (physical cityscaping), as well as literary modeling and functionalizing of urban spaces in texts that either concern the human actors and agents within these spaces or are composed by them (literary cityscaping).

The project in Pompeii investigates two public baths, the Republican Baths and the Stabian Baths, both built in the 2nd century BC, thus in Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii, and still used after 86 BC, when Pompeii became a Roman colony. While the Stabian Baths from the beginning included a palaestra, explicitly referred to as such in an inscription, the Republican Baths have been identified as key element of a large complex that resembled Greek gymnasia and included palaestra(e), running tracks and bathing facilities. Therefore, the project is much concerned with the significance of Greek gymnasia or, more generally, sports facilities in different cultural (Samnite, Roman) contexts. This, in turn, sparked interest in a wider contextualization and the importance of gymnasia in the western Mediterranean in the Hellenistic/Republican and Roman Imperial periods, which is overall little studied.

An important reference for the phenomenon of physical and intellectual education in the western Mediterranean, for the institution and concept as well as space and building, is the Greek gymnasium in the eastern Mediterranean. While this has received much more attention than institutions and facilities in the west, the Greek gymnasium in the east requires a comprehensive reassessment. Ulrich Mania has recently taken up this challenge and completed a study on Gymnasia in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial times in the east.

Inspired by the concept of cityscaping, and by the complementary expertise on eastern (Mania) and western (Trümper) gymnasia, the aim of this conference was to examine the development of gymnasia and their impact on cityscapes and urban culture across the Mediterranean world. The gymnasium was one of the key mon-
ments for the formation of urban space and identity in Greek culture, and its transformation was closely interlinked with changing concepts of cityscaping. Knowledge as well as transfer of knowledge, ideas and concepts were crucial for the spread and long-lasting importance of gymnasia within and beyond the Greek and Roman world.

While the Greek gymnasium has been intensely investigated, the following brief overview reveals important gaps, which motivated the concept and structure of this conference.

2 State of Research

In 1960, J. Delorme published a comprehensive study on the Greek gymnasium, including discussion of all archaeological and written evidence known at this time. In the following decades, little research was carried out, apart from an unpublished PhD dissertation on the architecture of palaestra and gymnasium, written by G. L. Glass in 1981. From the 1990s onwards scholars started to ask more fundamental and evolutionary questions about the gymnasium. For example, in conference proceedings from 1995 H. von Hesberg published a short paper on the relationship between Greek gymnasium and polis. In the same volume, Ph. Gauthier investigated the institutional role of the gymnasium in the polis state and its significance as a place of sport and education, on the basis of inscriptions. Individual gymnasia such as those of Delos, Eretria, Messene, and Olympia were reassessed, discussing the relationship between epigraphic testimonies and archaeological evidence or dealing with the development of the buildings and their function in the post Hellenistic era. An important stimulus for research came from historical investigations like the commented edition of the gymnasiyal law from Beroia by Ph. Gauthier and M. B. Chatzopoulos, N. M. Kennel’s work on the institution of the gymnasium and its user groups, and Ch. Mann’s search for the origins of the gymnasium in the nexus of the military, sport and the social elite.

In 2002 and 2007, the Frankfurt research group Wissenschaft und gesellschaftlicher Wandel organized two international conferences, on the gymnasium in the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial periods, respectively. The focus of both conferences was on ancient historical topics and an analysis of written sources, including discussion of military and intellectual training, ephebate, gymnasiarchy and gymnasarchs, and benefactors. Archaeological remains also played a significant role, however, and new questions were addressed, among these particularly the sculptural decoration of gymnasia. The new holistic approach to gymnasia emphasized that the gymnasium gained in public importance and perception in the Hellenistic period which scholars associated with an increasingly bourgeois character of the institution.

The importance and use of the gymnasium in the Roman Imperial period had long been neglected in literature, but received significant attention in the last decade. In the context of his research on Roman bath-gymnasium, M. Steskal focused on the development of gymnasia in this period. He interpreted the bath-gymnasium of Asia Minor in the tradition of the Hellenistic gymnasium. Also M. Trümper studied functional shifts of gymnasia between Hellenistic and Roman times and investigated the examples of Priene, Pergamon and Miletus, focusing on bathing facilities. Developments of the ephebate as a central part of the Hellenistic-Roman gymnasium were investigated by A. S. Chankowski and U. Wiemer. Wiemer demonstrated that the Athenian ephebate continued in Roman imperial times initially with even higher attendance figures and with the institution acquiring a more private and exclusive character with a high social reputation.

Most recently, C. Trombetti published a monograph on gymnasium in Greece with a special focus on their cultural and religious functions in the Hellenistic era. Another, yet unpublished dissertation on the built space and social dynamics of the gymnasium as a polis institution also focused on the Hellenistic era and did not include later developments.

While research on gymnasia since the 1990s is impressive and rich, significant gaps remain. The distinction between gymnasia in the Classical and Hellenistic ('Greek') periods vs. those of the Roman imperial period is maintained in most publications, as is obvious from recent studies focused on the Greek gymnasia and the concept of the two Frankfurt conferences. This distinction conceals developments, continuities and discontinuities between the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Apart from the recent focus on sculptural decoration, imagery related to the gymnasia has been little studied. Hardly investigated is the significance of the late Archaic and Classical images in vase painting for the early gymnasia. The same is true of many reliefs and especially grave reliefs which show sceneries understandable in the context of gymnasiial activities. Finally, there is a lack of studies that focus on gymnasia outside the Greek world in the eastern Mediterranean, but most notably in the western Mediterranean.

Finally, archaeological evidence of several important and well-preserved gymnasia remains largely unpublished or requires significant reassessment because of new fieldwork and methods. This also calls for a new synthesis of gymnasia, which would update Delorme’s masterly study, using modern approaches and questions. This is the very aim of Mania’s above mentioned comprehensive study.

3 Structure of Conference

Within the overarching framework of cityscaping, the conference tried to address some of the major gaps in research on gymnasia. It brought 26 scholars to Berlin, who gave 22 papers, organized in four thematic sessions that explored recently reassessed case-studies (I); self-perception and self-representation within the context of gymnasiial activities. Finally, there is a lack of studies that focus on gymnasia outside the Greek world in the eastern Mediterranean, notably Sicily and southern Italy, five papers discuss the debated issue of identification; the layout, architecture and decoration; the significance in different socio-cultural and ethnic contexts (Avagliano and Montalbano; Cannistraci and Olivito; Trümper on Pompeii and on Sicily); as well as the sculptural decoration (Henzel and Trümper).

Seven papers deal with gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean, discussing the emergence and significance of the palaestra as a building type (Emme); much debated questions of gymnasia in Athenian topography (Caruso, Di Cesare); recent fieldwork and reassessments of important case studies in Eretria (Ackermann and Reber) and Olympia (Mania); and aspects of the sculptural decoration, namely posthumous depictions of youths in Greek gymnasia (Kasakidi) and ruler portraits and ruler cult in Pergamon (von den Hoff).

17 Kah and Scholz 2004; Scholz and Wiegardt 2015; see, in contrast, the above-mentioned approaches and works that try to bridge these periods by M. Steskal, M. Trümper, U. Wiemer.
18 W. Raeck called for increased efforts to include visual studies in the research on gymnasia Raeck 2004, 364.
19 K. Weber tackled this topic in her master thesis submitted in Frankfurt/Main in 2008 (Weber 2008).
20 See contributions on the importance of gymnasia for Hellenizing the east, Groß-Albenhausen 2004; or of gymnasia and gymnasiiarchs in the Roman provinces Syria and Arabia; Dubiner 2015.
21 Little published e.g.: palaestrae/gymnasia of Amphipolis and Solunto; new fieldwork and research: e.g. gymnasium of Eretria.
Finally, two papers discuss the important office of the gymnasiarchy in Rhodes (Kah) and more generally in Asia Minor (Vitale) where it was closely linked with the ruler cult.

While some papers focus on the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Ackermann and Reber; Emme; Mania), most papers discuss the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial times, thus providing the much required approach and perspective that bridge these seemingly distinct periods. This is not the space for a comprehensive assessment of cultural continuity and discontinuity of the gymnasium in different regions of the ancient world. Papers in this volume provide important contributions, however, for embarking on such studies in the near future, when yet more archaeological and written evidence of individual sites and regions has been thoroughly investigated.

This conference would not have been possible without the generous support and help of many people and institutions whom we would like to acknowledge here: first and foremost, the Excellence Cluster Topoi and its directors, Gerd Graßhoff and Michael Meyer; the members of the Topoi research group C-6 on Cityscaping; Johanna Fabricius, Hans-Rupprecht Goette, Stephan Schmid and Claudia Tiersch, who led the four sessions of the conference; many persons who helped to organize the conference, most notably Katrin Siebel; and those persons who supported the publication of this book, among them particularly Kristina Bolz and the team of Edition Topoi, especially Nina Kraus and Dominika Szafraniec. Particular thanks are owed to the Gerda Henkel Foundation which funded Ulrich Mania’s research visit to the University of Oxford between 2013 and 2015. During this visit, he significantly advanced his above-mentioned study of gymnasia and also came up with the idea of this conference.
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Oriana Silia Cannistraci, Riccardo Olivito

A Gymnasion at Segesta? A Review of the Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence

Summary

Despite numerous inscriptions related to gymnasia and their magistracies in Sicily, our knowledge of their architecture is still fragmentary because safe identification of gymnasia is difficult and often debated. This exemplarily regards the Hellenistic city of Segesta, where excavations of the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa since the 1990s have exposed epigraphic evidence relating to a gymnasium and a peristyle building, next to the bouleuterion, that has been attributed to a gymnasium. This paper critically reviews this epigraphic and archaeological evidence and investigates what the sources really reveal and whether they can rightly be correlated. It is argued that currently only one single inscription testifies to the existence of the gymnasiarchy in Segesta, and that the peristyle building did not belong to a gymnasium, but to a coherently planned and built complex of political-administrative buildings.

Keywords: Segesta; epigraphy; gymnasium; bouleuterion; agora

Obwohl zahlreiche Inschriften aus Sizilien Gymnasia und ihre Ämter erwähnen, ist die Kenntnis der zugehörigen Architektur spärlich, weil die Identifizierung von Gymnasia oft umstritten ist. Das betrifft exemplarisch die hellenistische Stadt Segesta, in der Ausgrabungen der Scuola Normale Superiore Inschriften mit Bezug zu einem Gymnasion und einen Peristylbau freigelegt haben, der als Teil eines Gymnasions identifiziert worden ist. Dieser Beitrag untersucht kritisch die entsprechenden epigraphischen und archäologischen Quellen und diskutiert, was sie aussagen und ob sie begründet verbunden werden können. Er zeigt, dass nur eine Inschrift die Existenz der Gymnasiarchie in Segesta belegt und der Peristylbau eher zu einem einheitlich geplanten Komplex politisch-administrativer Bauten gehörte.

Keywords: Segesta; Epigraphik; gymnasium; bouleuterion; agora

We would really like to thank the organizers of the Conference for giving us the opportunity to discuss some of the hypotheses we have formulated during our research in the agora of Segesta, Sicily. Besides, we are grateful to Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra, directors of the excavations, for allowing us to present the results of the investigations in this area of the agora of Segesta and for their very helpful considerations. We are also grateful to the Servizio Parco Archeologico di Segesta and its director, for their support and kindness in all the different phases of our research. Last but not least, we want to thank Agata Abate and Donatella Erdas for the very useful suggestions they gave us while working on this paper. Although this paper results from a common work, the overview, the paragraphs on methodological premises and epigraphic evidence as well as the conclusion are by Riccardo Olivito, and the others by Oriana Silia Cannistraci.
The wide and very interesting amount of critical issues and stimulating ideas that emerged from the conference held in Berlin in February 2016, has strongly encouraged us in presenting a review and new interpretation of the poor remains of a building in the agora of Segesta, by some scholars interpreted as the περίστυλος or palaestra of the local gymnasion.

Indeed, the question mark in the title of our paper not only aims at stressing the still existing problem of the presence of a gymnasion in the Sicilian town, but also at emphasizing the need for a thorough analysis of all the available data before identifying this kind of building on the ground.

As will be seen, the Segestan gymnasion can in fact represent a very interesting case study from an epigraphic, archaeological and hermeneutic point of view since its identification, as well as its existence, can be hypothesized, or even rejected, only on the basis of a deep examination of all the architectural, planimetric, topographical, and epigraphic evidence.

Thus, as far as Segesta is concerned, in this paper we will try to sum up the most recent findings in these different fields. The final goal is to verify whether or not the hypothesis of a Segestan gymnasion can be maintained.

After a brief overview of the urban context of the presumable Segestan gymnasion, namely the agora of Segesta, the epigraphic and archaeological evidence, which has been linked with a gymnasion, will be presented; in a second step, this evidence will be critically reassessed.

1 The agora of Segesta: an overview

The research by the Scuola Normale Superiore in the agora of Segesta started at the very beginning of the 90s, directed by Giuseppe Nenci and, after a long break, since 2001 they have been pursued under the direction of Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra (Pls. 1, 2).

The area involved in the excavation activities is characterized by a series of wide terraces, on different altimetric levels, resulting from the huge anthropic operations that, especially in the late Hellenistic period, were pursued in order to better define the monumental aspect of the agora (Fig. 1). Although occupied since the protohistoric age, and then more intensively in the archaic and classical periods, the main archaeological evidence dates back to the early Hellenistic, late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. Indeed, at the beginning of the 3rd century AD the agora, and more generally speaking, the whole urban center was destroyed and had to be abandoned, probably due to a terrific earthquake. Only during the medieval age the three terraces were reoccupied and the ancient structures deeply spoliated in order to get new building material.

Although this paper will be mainly focused on the so-called ‘area of the bouleuterion’, that is the uppermost terrace of the agora, it is necessary to give a brief preliminary summary of the most recent excavations in the intermediate terrace, where the monumental remains of a more than 80 m long stoa have been discovered. This will be of great importance: indeed, it would be quite impossible to achieve a more complete reconstruction of the very articulated architectural design of the Segestan public square without bearing in mind that this portico, built at the end of the 2nd century BC, used to play a fundamental role in linking not only all the different altimetric levels involved in the monumentalization of the city center, but also the several buildings lying on them.

The portico was a building with two aisles and two stories, set up on a three stepped stylobate. The lower colonnade, of Doric order, was ca. 6.6 m high (from the upper face of the stylobate to the upper face of the geison), whereas the upper Ionic colonnade, ca. 4.3 m high, was completed with a sima and lion head waterspouts. The total height of the stoa was ca. 11 m (Fig. 2). An intermediate row of octagonal pilasters divided the external aisle (ca. 5.80 m deep) from the internal one (ca. 5.5 m deep). The northern side of the building was 82 m long.

As to the internal planimetric organization, currently available data seem to demonstrate that the northern side of the stoa did not have rooms along the back wall. On the contrary, along the rear wall of the northern portico, some stone arches had been built in order to sustain and strengthen those points where the rock had been cut before the construction of the stoa.

The eastern wing, although still not completely investigated, was ca. 20 m long and, in addition to the western wing, see Abata and Cannistraci 2012.

1 Ampolo and Parra 2012; Parra 2006.
2 For the preliminary architectural study of the stoa, and in particular of the western wing, see Abata and Cannistraci 2012.
3 Facella and Olivito 2013; Olivito and Serra 2014.
vertical sequence of Doric and Ionic colonnades, it was completed with at least one or perhaps two other stories, partially underground, open on the southern side of the square with a series of windows and doors, and probably used as stores and shops.\footnote{4 Ampolo and Parra 2016; Perna 2016.}

The eastern wing is also the only area of the \textit{stoa} where the presence of internal rooms has been verified. Indeed, a threshold has been discovered, demonstrating the presence of at least one small room in this part of the \textit{ala}. Furthermore, at the intersection between the eastern
and the northern portico, a large room has been identified (the so-called ‘Ambiente I’), whose main entrance was marked by pilasters with semi-columns. Although its function is still unknown, the presence of burnt remains along the walls of the room, probably to be related to wooden shelves, might suggest an identification of the so-called ‘Ambiente I’ with an archive or a document depository.

The western wing, ca. 20 m long, is the only one that has been completely investigated. Together with the two colonnaded stories, the west ala is characterized by the presence of stairs lying in the northwestern corner of the building and leading to the upper floor of the stoa. While demonstrating the physical link between the two stories of the portico, the presence of stairs, together with the total height of the stoa and the topographical relation with the near upper terrace, might demonstrate the existence of a connection between the buildings of the ‘area of the bouleuterion’ and the main sector of the Segestan agora, i.e. the one defined by the stoa. These two areas had to be part of a more articulated architectural complex in which the Council House and the peristyyle building that we will examine in the following pages had to play a fundamental role.

Indeed, the two sectors were partially divided by a monumental road leading to the theater. As far as the agora is concerned, the monumental road was partially covered due to the presence of a cryptoporticus, in the southernmost part of the square, and had to be partially open in the area behind the western wing of the stoa.

The planimetric and archaeological features of the road in the area south of the agora are more clearly articulated and easily reconstructed. Here, in fact, the new archaeological investigations have shown different structural elements, allowing us to clarify the intricate evolution of this urban sector.

The earliest traces of monuments in this area can be dated back to the end of the 2nd century BC, when a portico was built. Its main function during the late Hellenistic period was the creation of a monumental scenography at the entrance of the agora.

Between the end of the 1st century BC and the very early years of the 1st century AD this area assumed greater importance, due to the construction of a small triangular square and the monumentalization of an already existing road leading to the theater, now paved with stone slabs. At the same time, about 2 m south of the stylobate of the late Hellenistic stoa, a circular building with a single door was built.

The construction of the circular building can be dated to the early 1st century AD, while the abandonment of this area and of the entire agora took place at the beginning of the 3rd century AD. Together with topographic considerations, the very abundant presence of butchered bones found in the floor levels within the building allowed for its identification as a tholos macelli, used as a slaughterhouse.

Near the macellum, during the first decades of the 1st century AD a small triangular square was built, due to the euergetic activity of two local notables, Onasus and Sopolis, honored in an inscription, over 5 m long, incised on the slabs of this small square.

Finally, the macellum and the triangular square were separated by the already mentioned monumental paved street, which passed through the cryptoporticus and behind the western wing of the stoa, leading to the theater.

So far, we have quickly illustrated the main buildings of the agora and of the area south of the public square. With these structures and topographic features in mind, we can thus move to the upper terrace and the hypothetical presence of a gymnasion in this area of the town.

2 Methodological premises

The hypothetical identification of the so-called gymnasion of Segesta is an interesting example of archaeological hermeneutics. On the one hand, old readings of epigraphic documents that had been known for many centuries have been used in order to interpret the poor ar-

---

5 For the architectural study of the entrance to the ‘Ambiente I’ see Abate and Cannistraci 2013.
7 For the road system of this urban sector see Facella and Olivito 2012; Olivito 2014b; Olivito 2017 [2018].
8 It is still uncertain how the presence of the road behind the western wing of the stoa influenced the physical connection between the upper terrace and the late Hellenistic portico. Unfortunately, this issue is hardly investigable due to the construction, during the 50s of the 20th century, of a road leading to the theater. We will come back to this point in the following pages.
9 Facella and Olivito 2012; Olivito 2017 [2018].
10 Olivito 2014a.
archaeological remains of a peristyle building as part of a gymnasium.

On the other hand, the interpretation of the poor archaeological remains as traces of a gymnasium have been considered as an element validating old epigraphic readings. This circular process has led to the hypothesis of a gymnasium on the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta, close to the Council House (Pl. 3–4). As will be seen, the most recent findings in the epigraphic field, and a new analysis of the archaeological and topographical data, independent of the epigraphic ones, allow us to formulate new hypotheses. The main question is not whether or not Segesta had its own gymnasium, but rather whether or not we can identify the poor remains of the above mentioned peristyle building on the upper terrace with the περίστυλος, or palaestra, of the gymnasium.

3 Epigraphic and archaeological evidence: the construction of a hypothesis

3.1 Epigraphic evidence

As far as the Segestan epigraphic documentation is concerned, we rely on a corpus composed of five inscriptions concerning the organization and funding of public works at Segesta. All of the inscriptions – dating back to the period between the 4th and the 2nd century BC – have been studied by Giuseppe Nenci, who first formulated the hypothesis of the Segestan gymnasium. Presently, the whole epigraphic dossier is under re-examination by Carmine Ampolo and Donatella Erdas.

IGDSII, no. 85 (SEG XLI, 827) represents the starting point for the assumption of a gymnasial institution at Segesta.

Though already mentioned by Giacomo Manganaro, the document was first published by Nenci, who discovered it in the repository of the Soprintendenza of Marsala. Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about the discovery of the inscription, except for the fact that it seems to have been discovered along the modern street leading to the theater. The text is inscribed on an architrave block of limestone, decorated with moldings on both the upper and lower parts. These features, together with the text itself, led Laurent Dubois to interpret it as a statue base.

IGDSII, no. 85 (SEG XLI, 827)

Ed. IGDSII, no. 85:

[Ἀρτεμίδωρα Νύμφονος τὸν αὐτάστα πατέρα
[Ἀρτέμωνα Ἀλείδα γυμνασιαρχήναν
[ἀνέθηκε κατὰ διαθήκαν.

Artemidora (i.e. wife) of Nymphon, in accordance with a disposition by will, dedicated the statue of her own father, Artemon son of Aleidas, who was gymnasarch.

The inscription, to be dated around the 4th and the 3rd century BC, or more precisely in the second half of the 3rd century BC, presents several interesting elements as regards Segestan onomastics, which cannot be further investigated here.

As far as the Segestan gymnasium is concerned, we would like to stress that Artemidora is a very common anthroponym in Segesta, quite certainly linked with Artemis. Although we do not have any further information on Aleidas, Dubois has correctly suggested that the patronymic is typically Segestan and of local origin. Then, we can conclude that the inscription IGDSII, no. 85 demonstrates the existence of the gymnasial magistracy at Segesta, but it does not refer to any specific building, even less in the area of the agora.

Two other inscriptions with similar content have been traditionally linked with the gymnasium.

The first one is IG XIV, 291, unfortunately of unknown provenance, which has been dated by Margherita Guarducci to not before the middle of the 3rd century BC.

IG XIV, 291 (IGDS, no. 216)

Ed. IGDS, no. 216:

13 This is the only information that G. Nenci was able to collect from an oral communication with the custodian of the archaeological site.
14 IGDSII, 165–166.
15 Nenci 1991, 926.
16 IGDSII, 166.
While being hieromnamon, Titteloς son of Artemidoros took care of the works at the andreon and the proedra, together with the hierophylakes.

In addition to the important onomastic information, the text is particularly interesting for the references to the words ἄνδρεων and προεδρα.

As to the term ἄνδρεων, corresponding to the Attic form ἄνδρών, that is men’s apartment, Dubois suggested to interpret it as a possible equivalent to the Cretan word ἄνδρηιον, to be identified as the banqueting-hall where the Cretan μισσίτια took place. In this regard, the association with the word προεδρα, interpreted as a reference to the front and most important seats in a building (especially a theater), was of great importance for thinking of the Segestan ἄνδρεων as a particular building, that is a meeting hall for the town magistrates (i.e. a sort of πρυτανείον), furnished with at least one row of front seats.

Dubois’s thesis was firmly rejected by Nenci, who indeed suggested linking IG XIV, 291 to the presence of a gymnasion at Segesta, on the basis of another Segestan inscription, that is IGDSII, no. 89.

IGDSII, no. 89 (Marconi 1931, 397–399)
Ed. Ampolo and Parra 2012:


The inscription records work activities for the covering of the δίπυλον, the ἄνδρεων, and the προεδρα: then, its object is similar to that of the previous document, although they are not contemporary, since, according to Ampolo and Erdas, IGDSII, no. 89 dates back to the 2nd century BC. Thus, in Nenci’s view, similarly to the singular ἄνδρεων, the plural ἄνδρεωνες might refer to the presence of several male rooms, as well as of a προεδρα, within the gymnasion of Segesta: “[…] nel qual caso non andranno ricercati a Segesta i resti di un ginnasio e di un ἄνδρεων, ma solo del ginnasio.”

At the same time, differently from what he stated in the case of the singular ἄνδρεων, Dubois suggested that: “Les ἄνδρεωνες pourraient être ici des salles du gymnase dévolues à la catégorie des ἄνδρες.”

On the contrary, in commenting on the inscription, Guarducci linked it with the theater, thinking of additions to this building by the hieromnamon Artemidoros.

In particular, Guarducci thought the ἄνδρεωνες to be a sort of banqueting rooms reserved for the men of the town, whereas the προεδρα would have been a space reserved for the meeting of the proedri. Indeed, well noticed by Ampolo, in this case it is important to consider that the indication of a roof as the object of the work activity, seems in fact to allow us to exclude that we are dealing with a row of seats: in fact, it is more likely that
we are dealing here with covered rooms and/or structures, composing a larger and more articulated architectural complex.

A further probable evidence of the interesting role played by the ἄνδρεῶνες at Segesta might be represented by the most fragmentary inscription of the whole Segestan dossier, published by Nenci in 1991.31

Nenci 1991, 921, no. 1 (SEG XLI, 826)

Ed. Nenci 1991, 921, no. 1:

[τοῖς] Δ[ιοσκούροις]
[οἱ τριτίρενες καὶ οἱ ἄνδρ[ες]]
[συγκατασκευάσθεντες]

The text, inscribed on a limestone block whose original context is unknown, was interpreted by Nenci as a dedication to the Dioskouroi by two groups of people, that is the τριτίρενες (i.e. the epheboi of the third year) and the ἄνδρες. The obvious deduction was that these two groups were part of those attending the Segestan gymnasion and that the final verb had to be restored as [συγκατασκευάσθεντες], or, as an alternative as [κατασκευάσθεντες]. Thus, a further link with gymnastic activity was stated by Nenci, on the basis of the association between the κατασκευή and the Greek gymnasion.32

More recently, Ampolo has reexamined this document noting that although the readings by Nenci are correct, the restoration of the missing text, and consequently its interpretation, is highly hypothetical.33 In particular, rather than reading οἱ ἄνδρ[ες] and restoring it as οἱ ἄνδρ[ες], it can be restored as οἱ ἄνδρε[ῶνες].34 The final verb is more convincingly identified as the third person plural of the passive aorist tense of ἐπισκευάζω. Therefore, the inscription would have no direct link to the gymnasia.

Finally, the last but still most important document that Nenci used in order to strengthen the thesis of the Segestan gymnasion is IG XIV, 292 (IGDS, 215).34

Similarly to the previously examined documents, also in this case we have to remember that the original provenance of the inscription, now stored in the public library of Calatafimi (TP, Sicily), is unknown. At the same time, the chronology of the inscription can only be stated on the basis of a paleographic analysis. This is obviously a fairly problematic issue, as demonstrated by the different hypothetical dates suggested for the document: end of the 4th century BC according to Nenci,35 2nd century BC, according to Ampolo.36

The text is inscribed on a tabula ansata and was first published by Nenci, still lacking its left side.

IG XIV, 292 (IGDS, 215):

[ιεροθετέοντος Φάωνος]
[τοῦ Νύμφωνος Σωπολιανοῦ,
[ἀγορανομέοντος Ξενάρχου]
[τοῦ Διοσκούρου καὶ τῶν ἐπιμέλεων]
[ποιήσαμένου τῶν ἔργων]
[τοῦ ξυστοῦ ἔργων]
[τοῦ ξυστοῦ κατασκευάσθη]

While being ιεροθετα Philon son of Nymphos Sopolianos, while being agoranomos Xenarchos son of Diodoros, he (i.e. Xenarchos) took care of the works realized to the xystos.

It is obvious that in this case the most important element for our discussion is in line 6. Indeed, since the work of Désiré Raoul Rochette,37 this part of the text has been restored with the word ζυστοῦ. Although this reading had been already rejected by Jean Delorme,38 both Nenci39 and Dubois accepted the restoration by Raoul Rochette and, consequently, used it as a very meaningful and convincing element supporting the thesis of a gymnasion at Segesta.

It is important to recall this element since, as we will see later, the general sense of the inscription has been

32 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 279.
33 As to the τριτίρενες, this is a very rare term, only attested in a 2nd century BC ephelic list from the Messenian town of Thouria (IG V, 1, 1386). For this reason, Nenci’s restoration seems to be unlikely. For a review of this term and the others linked to it, see Lanières 2008.
34 The inscription was already known to Gualtherus; Gualtherus 1624, 49, no. 322.
35 Nenci 1991, 924.
36 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278.
37 Raoul Rochette 1836, 94.
38 Delorme 1960, 288 n. 71, 487.
40 IGDS, 273.
3.2 Archaeological evidence

The upper terrace of the agora of Segesta (Pl. 1) occupies a wide plateau south of the Hellenistic theater, which is located on a higher level than the terrace of the stoa. In the 1990s, excavations revealed monuments belonging to different epochs: in particular, a fortified medieval village set directly upon the remains of a late Hellenistic bouleuterion, a peristyle building, and a late Archaic structure (perhaps a temple). Scanty remains of a prehistoric settlement complete the archaeological frame, whereas remains from the Roman Imperial period are conspicuously absent. This suggests continuous use of the Hellenistic buildings in the Roman period or complete abandonment after the ‘Romanization’ of Segesta, in the first decades of the 1st century AD.

As to the ancient structures, the best preserved building is the bouleuterion, whose maximum capacity was 150–200 seats (Pl. 5).

From a typological point of view, the Segestan Council House can be inserted into the group of Sicilian bouleuteria (among others that of Soluntum and Agrigentum) characterized by a semicircular cavea inscribed within a rectangular building, and completed with a frontal portico. Indeed, this type can be directly compared with the Hellenistic bouleuterion of Miletus and, more generally speaking, with other bouleuteria in Asia Minor such as those of Iasos and Nysa. Like the latter, the bouleuterion of Segesta had an ambulacrum running under the last two rows of seats, accessible from the north and allowing the council members to reach the summa cavea through a small staircase.

A small tetrastyle portico and a monumental inscription, to be dated to the 2nd century BC, emphasized the main entrance to the bouleuterion. The text, inscribed on four limestone slabs, recorded the dedication of the building by the ἐπιστάτης Asklapos, son of Diorodos, and the architect Bibakos, son of Tittelos.

Further investigations allowed archaeologists to verify that two slabs of a stylobate, discovered on the southeastern side of the bouleuterion, were part of a portico running in front of the western wing of the stoa and, perhaps, along the road leading to the theater (Pls. 3–5). Two different architectural phases have been identified: the first dated to the end of the 4th century or the early 3rd century BC; and the second dated to the end of the 2nd century BC. Whereas elements of the first phase are very poorly preserved, the second phase is well represented by stratigraphic evidence, architectural features and epigraphic evidence (i.e. the above mentioned monumental inscription).

To the southwest of the bouleuterion, since 1989, remains of a peristyle building with paved floor, colonnade, and rear wall were revealed under various walls of the medieval Swabian village (Pl. 3, Fig. 3). The peristyle building is partially preserved. Only four limestone slabs of the stylobate are still visible on the ground. The analysis of the stylobate allowed a reconstruction of a column with smooth shaft and a lower diameter of ca. 0.75 m. The interaxial span is not homogeneous, ranging from 2.5 to 2.7 m, probably because of subsequent modifications. The preserved length of the stylobate on the northern side of the peristyle is 11.30 m. On the southeastern side of the building a monumental threshold for a door with two leaves has been discovered (Fig. 4). In front of it, traces of a drainpipe were found. Unfortunately, it is still impossible to assign any of the architectural elements that were found during the excavations or were reused in the medieval walls to this portico.

In addition to the remains of the colonnade and the threshold, a small portion of a wall running from east to west, probably part of the rear wall of the building, and some portions of a floor composed of square bricks, 20 cm large and 8 cm thick (Fig. 5), are the only other surviving components of the peristyle complex. This kind of pavement, discovered in two points along the northern and eastern areas of the peristyle, can be well compared to other examples from Segesta. It also has parallels in Hellenistic buildings outside Segesta, such as

---

41 Parra 1997. The complete publication of the bouleuterion and all the structures on the upper terrace is forthcoming.
44 Besides, it is likely that the ambulacrum led to an underground room that may have been an archive or a storage room.
45 For the inscription see: Nenci 2000, 810–811; IGDSII, 167, no. 88. This inscription is also under re-examination by Ampolo.
46 Cf. the brick floor in the so-called Southwestern stoa, near the tholos macelli; Benelli et al. 1995, 685; or the well-preserved floor in the eastern ala of the stoa in the agora; Cannistraci and Perna 2013, 19–20; Abate and Giaccone 2014, 33–35.
Fig. 3  Aerial view of the remains of the peristyle building on the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta.

Fig. 4  Peristyle building: the threshold at the main entrance.

Fig. 5  Floor with square bricks in the area of the peristyle building.
the *stoa* in the *agora* of Halaesa\textsuperscript{47} and the *agora* of Soluntum.\textsuperscript{48}

As frequently attested at Segesta, the area of the peristyle was heavily reused in the medieval age. Spoliation and reuse of the Hellenistic structures were not limited to the walls, but also involved the central paved courtyard, whose *lacunae* were filled with smaller slabs recovered in other buildings. For this reason, we have no evidence allowing for the reconstruction of the original size of the peristyle and, consequently, of the general plan of the building.

Despite the poor state of preservation, the remains can be identified as a four-sided peristyle, of which only two colonnades survived. The building had a monumental entrance with a large threshold on its eastern side, possibly along the road leading to the theater. Rooms with brick pavements may have opened to the northeastern side of the peristyle. While this building can safely be interpreted as a *περίστυλος*, its proposed identification as a *palaestra* of a *gymnasion*,\textsuperscript{49} requires critical revision.

4 Epigraphic and archaeological evidence: reassessment

4.1 Epigraphic evidence: reassessment

It is obvious that the identification of a *gymnasion* in Segesta is based on a circular interpretative process, where the inscriptions have been interpreted and restored on the basis of the poor archaeological remains and, at the same time, the architectural evidence has been read with the aid of a highly lacunose epigraphic dossier. Both epigraphic and archaeological evidence require careful independent reassessment.

We would first like to highlight a few very meaningful points derived from Ampolo’s new readings and interpretations of some of the above-mentioned inscriptions.\textsuperscript{50} As we have seen, the most significant epigraphic evidence for the hypothesis of the Segestan *gymnasion* has been the reference to the ξυστός in the inscription IG XIV, 290.\textsuperscript{51} Nevertheless, in 2003 a very important discovery was made during the excavations in the *agora*:\textsuperscript{52} the missing left part of the inscribed stone, which has allowed Ampolo to correct the previous reading of the text (Fig. 6). On the basis of the new fragment we can now correctly reconstruct the name of the *agoranomos*, which is Xenarchos, son of Apollodoros, rather than the previously read Diodoros son of Apollodoros.\textsuperscript{53} More importantly, the new fragment has allowed Ampolo to definitively exclude the presence of the genitive τοῦ ξυστοῦ in line 6. The first letter of line 6 is an α, whereas the following letter, partially preserved, can be only intended either as a second α or, more likely, as a λ. Although this means that the possibility to validate the restoration of this term on the basis of the *περίστυλος* on the upper terrace of the *agora* cannot be considered valid anymore, it does not mean that the connection with a *gymnasion* at Segesta has to be completely rejected.

In this sense, granted that at the beginning of line 6 the letters αλ can be read, and that Gualtherus’ and Nenci’s reading of the first letters of the other block of the inscription is correct (i.e. τοῦ), could we still think of an inscription somehow connected with the Segestan *gymnasion*? Ampolo has convincingly shown that the genitive form of the term τὸ ἀλειπτήριον (that is the place for anointing in *gymnasia*) must be excluded because this word is too long.\textsuperscript{54} However, it is difficult to think of other possible restorations without risking misunderstanding the actual and original sense of the inscription. Thus, while waiting for the forthcoming edition of the Segestan epigraphic corpus, it will be better to simply consider this document as a further demonstration of the activity by an outstanding citizen, Xenarchos, who personally funded the construction and care of several works, though not necessarily those in the *gymnasion*.\textsuperscript{55} Ampolo succinctly summarizes the significance of the epigraphic evidence as follows:

\textsuperscript{47} Tignano 2012, 138.
\textsuperscript{48} Cutroni Tusa et al. 1994, 31–32; Wolf 2013, 21–22.
\textsuperscript{49} First hypothesized by Nenci 1991, the identification of this structure with the Segestan *gymnasion* on the upper terrace of the *agora* has been later supported by other scholars: see Michelini 1997, 1148–1150; De Cesare and Parra 2000, 278; Mango 2009, 764–765.
\textsuperscript{50} As we have already pointed out, a new edition of the whole Segestan epigraphic dossier by Ampolo and Erdas is forthcoming (see fn. 17). Though, some of the most innovative elements derived from his examination have been preliminarily presented in Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278–280.
\textsuperscript{51} See above.
\textsuperscript{52} Erdas and Gagliardi 2003, 437–438.
\textsuperscript{53} Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278.
\textsuperscript{54} Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278. As far as the *gymnasion* is concerned, the term τὸ ἀλειπτήριον is attested among others at Delos (IG XI, 2 199, l. 105) and Thera (IG XII, 3, 1134).
\textsuperscript{55} On the meaning of the verb κατασκευάζειν in this kind of inscription see also Ampolo 2008, 25–26.
Questo gruppo di iscrizioni menziona sia la cura (epimeleia) dei lavori di costruzione di alcune strutture sia la costruzione od esecuzione di alcune opere. Le iscrizioni sono simili per forma (i.e mainly in form of tabulae ansatae) e caratteri, ma non totalmente identiche. Probabilmente sono vicine nel tempo, ma non furono eseguite contemporaneamente. Esse coinvolgono personaggi diversi per varie operazioni di cura di lavori o di esecuzione vera e propria, che ricevettero per questo una statua onoraria e l’iscrizione.56

Thus, reassessment of the epigraphic evidence yields the following picture:

1. The inscriptions which mention a δίπυλον, the ἀνδρεών or ἄνδρεωνες and the προέδρα are of unknown provenance (IG XIV, 291 and SEG XLI, 826) or seem to have been discovered in the area of the theater (IGDSII, no. 89). Consequently, the possibility of linking them with a gymnasium lying in the area of the public square, and in particular with the peristyle building near the bouleuterion, must be very carefully re-considered. As a hypothesis, we cannot even exclude a connection with structures lying in the area close to the theater.

2. Rather than automatically suggesting a relation between the terms ἀνδρεών/ἀνδρεῶνες and the local gymnasium, we can refer them to rooms reserved to male citizens, possibly having a political or administrative function (e.g. as prytaneion) and totally independent from the gymnasial institutions. The inscription SEG XLI, 826, where a possible reference to the τριτίρενες and the ἄνδρες was reconstructed, has recently been interpreted as further evidence of work activity involving the ἄνδρεωνες.

3. Only IGDSII, no. 85 can demonstrate that in the 3rd century BC the institution of the γυμνασιαρχία did exist in Segesta.57 Nevertheless, it cannot be connected with a specific building of the town, let alone the peristyle building near the bouleuterion.

4. Most importantly, the hypothesis of a ξυστός at Segesta, so far considered as the most important proof of the existence of a gymnasium, is refuted by the recent discovery of a new fragment of IG XIV, 292.

4.2 Archaeological evidence: reassessment

Based on new evidence derived from an up-to-date analysis of the epigraphic dossier, and especially after having demonstrated how the hypothetical identification of the gymnasium with the structures on the upper terrace of the agora actually relied on a wrong reconstruction of the epigraphic texts, we would like to definitively separate the epigraphic data from the peristyle near the bouleuterion, suggesting a new interpretation of the archaeo-
logical evidence on the basis of its topographic and architectural nature.

With regard to this, we need to mention some archaeological features that have not been sufficiently highlighted so far:

1. First, the floors of the bouleuterion and of the peristyle building lie at the same level. In our view, this suggests unity of planning (Pl. 6).

2. Second, while delimiting the southwestern side of the bouleuterion, the western wall of the ambulacrum of the Council House had to define also the north-eastern side of the peristyle building. In our view, this element can allow for the hypothesis of a common architectural project which linked these buildings planimetrically and structurally with one another.

3. Third, the southern wall of the bouleuterion is aligned with the monumental threshold of the peristyle, so that we can imagine a long common front wall for the two buildings.

4. Finally, a further element which speaks for a unified plan is represented by the poorly preserved stylobate blocks that we think of as part of a colonnade running ca. 3.5 m south of the two buildings. Indeed, two limestone slabs with traces of the lowest part of the column are preserved, allowing us to reconstruct a base diameter of 60 cm. This measure is comparable with the lower diameter of the columns composing the portico in front of the tholos macelli. Thus, we can reconstruct a colonnade running quite perfectly parallel to the southern wall of the bouleuterion and, more importantly, partially facing the peristyle building with its southernmost stylobate block. On the basis of this assumption, we can then imagine a long single-aisled portico, its final purpose being the creation of an architecturally unifying scene for the road leading to the theater? Such an urban planning solution would not be without parallels since, as already shown by Roland Martin, especially in the Hellenistic period colonnades and porticoes were increasingly used as tools for the unification of the front walls of spaces and buildings with different functions, especially those playing a political role. Indeed, as Burkhard Emme has correctly noticed: “Erst in der nachfolgenden, hellenistischen Zeit ist verschiedentlich eine Tendenz zur Vereinheitlichung der Agora-Randbebauung zu erkennen, indem verschiedenen Gebäuden politischer Funktion eine einheitliche Säulenhalle vorgelegt wurde.” Similarly, Barbara Sielhorst has recently argued that, in the Hellenistic period, the stoa: “sorgen für eine Vereinheitlichung der Gebäudefronten”.

Once we have assumed a possible project unity for the two above-mentioned buildings, it is not hard to find comparisons for a combination between a bouleuterion and a peristyle complex. Generally speaking, several late Hellenistic bouleutaria and particularly that of Miletus (Fig. 7), which became a model for many of the Sicilian Council Houses, show that the bouleuterion was often completed with a portico devoted to the activities of the bouleutai.

As far as the Sicilian examples are concerned, we would first like to recall the case of the earlier bouleuterion of Iaitas (Fig. 8). Here a small bouleuterion, whose construction has been differently dated from the end of the 4th century BC to the middle of the 2nd century BC, has been discovered at the northwestern corner of the public square. Similarly to the bouleuterion of Segesta, that of Iaitas had a cavea (60–70 seats maximum) inscribed in a small rectangular room. The Council House was accessible directly from the portico defining the northern side of the agora (the so-called ‘North stoa’), through a wide

59 Emme 2013, 92.
60 Sielhorst 2015, 54.
61 Knackfuß 1928; Schaaf 1992, 37–60, with previous literature.
62 On the influence of the bouleuterion of Miletus on the Sicilian Council Houses see Campagna 2006, 28.
64 On the earlier bouleuterion of Iaitas see Isler 2012, 230–231 with earlier literature. A later bouleuterion, larger than the first, has been discovered on the western side of the agora: see Isler 2012, 232–233.
opening that led to the rear part of the cavea. Apart from the analogies with the Segestan bouleuterion, the combination of the bouleuterion with a peristyle building are of particular interest here. Indeed, joined to the eastern wall of the Iatias Council House and, accessible from the 'North stoas', an open court with 4 x 5 columns has been discovered. Still, on the western wall of the peristyle, a partially preserved threshold connecting the peristyle with the orchestra of the bouleuterion, definitely demonstrates the existence of a planimetric, and consequently functional unity between the two buildings.

Furthermore, the unity existing between the Iatias bouleuterion and the peristyle, was emphasized due to

---

66 According to Isler, during the 2nd century BC the width of the entrance to the bouleuterion was drastically reduced, due to the construction of a podium with a small staircase in the northwestern corner of the stoa. This structure has been interpreted as the tribunal of the new Roman town: see Isler 2012, 230.
the role played by the ‘North stoa’, which, as correctly pointed out by Hans Peter Isler, was not un elemento autonomo, ma formava un complesso monumentale insieme ad un edificio pubblico retrostante con il quale ha il muro occidentale in comune. Il complesso retrostante si compone della prima sala di consiglio di laitas [...] e di un cortile a colonne, cioè un peristilio, antistante i due locali, con quattro colonne in senso Nord-Sud e cinque in senso Est-Ovest.67

Without a doubt, there is a strong analogy in the use of a columned façade unifying the bouleuterion and the peristyle building in both the cases of Segesta and laitas. In our view, this is a very meaningful element for the interpretation of the peristyle as a space somehow functionally connected to, or depending on, the Council House rather than as a gymnasium.

The comparison between laitas and Segesta is even more revealing if we look at the building that we have already defined as the model for many of the Sicilian bouleuteria, i.e. is the bouleuterion of Miletus. One of the main architectural features of this building was the presence of a wide columned open courtyard preceding the main entrances to the Council House. Here the relation between the bouleuterion and the peristyle is so intrinsic that they have to be conceived as a single unity.68 A very similar relation seems to characterize the cases of Segesta and laitas, although in the former the peristyle is not preceding the main entrance to the bouleuterion but rather completing its rear side.

Furthermore, we are well informed about the combination of the bouleuterion with other buildings, mainly having a central open courtyard, from both epigraphic and archaeological sources.69 As Maria Cecilia Parra has noticed,70 from an epigraphic point of view a very interesting comparison for such an architectural and planimetric composition can be found in the decrees in honor of Archippe, benefactress of Kyme who funded the construction and repairs of the bouleuterion and the sanctuary of Homonoia.71 On the one hand, the decrees refer to celebrations offered by Archippe, to be held within the bouleuterion; on the other hand, while recalling the thanksgiving for the extraordinary energetic activity of Archippe, one of the inscriptions refers to the dedication of the golden bronze statue of the benefactress, set up on a marble column standing in the enclosure of the bouleuterion (ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου).72 According to Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, the celebrations recorded in these decrees had to be not only limited to the very Council House, but also to the nearby area and in particular to the περίβολος, to be understood as a large open courtyard surrounded by covered porticoes on at least three sides.73 Thus, this structure would appear as a component of the bouleuterion complex or, in other words, as a well-equipped monumental space integrating the small area of the auditorium itself. In this sense, Parra is probably right in thinking of a structure preceding the bouleuterion,74 similar to what we have seen in the case of the peristyle preceding the bouleuterion of Miletus (which is thought to have represented the model also for the bouleuterion of Kyme)75 and laitas.

Still on the basis of Parra’s considerations, we could recall other famous combinations of bouleuterion and περίβολος/peristyle.76 This is the case of Iasos, with the Council House joined to the περίβολος of Artemis Astías,77 and that of the ‘A and ‘F buildings’, joint to the peristyle of the Asklepieion of Messene, which have been identified with the local ekklesiasterion/odeion and bouleuterion/synedrion.78

67 Isler 2012, 250.
68 Tuchelt 1975, 114, 120.
69 On the frequent combination of bouleuterion and buildings with an open courtyard see Hamon 2005. We also know of buildings that are commonly interpreted as bouleuteria but could have had a different function, see Kockel 1995, 35–37. Parra 2006, 109.
72 The inscription in question is SEG XXXII, 1359, ll. 27–29: ‘[…] στήσα τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν χρυσὴν ἐπὶ στυλίδος | μαρμαρίνης ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου ϑ ἀνατεθεῖσαν Ἀρχίπης ἐπί | γραφὴν ἔχουσιν- […]’.
75 The possible derivation from the bouleuterion of Miletus is also suggested by Bremen 2008, 371–372.
76 Parra 2006, 108.
77 Laviosa 1995, 83; Berti 2011, 320.
78 The identification of the two buildings with the local ekklesiasterion and bouleuterion was first suggested by Gheorghios Oikonomos, Oikonomos 1909, and has been more recently supported by Petros Themelis, Themelis 2004, 69–73. Contra Hellmann 2013, 174. For an up-to-date analysis of the architectural remains of the Asklepieion and a revision of the interpretations concerning these two buildings see Emme 2013, 39–49, 340–341; Sielhorst 2015, 100–105, 251–253.
If we move to the archaeological evidence, we would like to add a couple of further possible examples of such an architectural complex, composed of bouleuterion and buildings articulated around a central columned court. The first example we would like to recall is the one composed of the bouleuterion and the so-called prytaneion, in the northeastern corner of the agora of Priene (Fig. 9). Although not in direct communication with one another, the two buildings can be considered as part of a harmonious complex. In this sense, a crucial role is without doubt played by the huge ‘North stoa’. This building not only defines the northern side of the agora, but also contributes to linking all the different structures of this side of the square (i.e. the square rooms on the western half of the portico and the bouleuterion/prytaneion complex on the eastern half), shaping a coherent and homogeneous whole.

A second interesting example of such a planimetric composition is in the western side of the agora of Megalopolis (Fig. 10). Here, south of the bouleuterion occupying the northwestern corner of the public square, a building composed of six ‘Dreiraumgruppen’ units, is set up around a central columned court. For the sake of clarity, it is necessary to say that, in terms of plan, the bouleuterion of Megalopolis is totally different from that of Segesta, and there are no traces of a portico or a stoa creating a common façade toward the agora, as we have in fact seen in the cases of Segesta, Iaitas and Priene. Despite this, it seems to us that the physical and functional relation between the two buildings of Megalopolis cannot be underestimated. While there is no doubt about the identification of the Council House, not the same can be said of the other building, though it has been generally identified with the town prytaneion or damiorgion. Whether we accept one term or the other, or even Lauter’s more articulated designation of ‘demosia

---

80 For a complete study of the political buildings on the western side of the agora of Megalopolis see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011. See also Osanna 2003; Emme 2013, 89–92, 140; Sielhorst 2015, 96–100, 246–250.
81 The bouleuterion of Megalopolis is indeed planimetrically and architecturally comparable to a different kind of Council House, more similar to ‘hypostyle halls’ such as the bouleuterion of Assos, Arslan and Eren 2012, and the above-mentioned ‘building’ at Messene, rather than to that of Miletus.
82 The identification was already suggested by Lauter 2005, 238. See also Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011, 77–79. Contra: Hellmann 2013, 174. For an up-to-date analysis, with previous literature, see Emme 2013, 91; Sielhorst 2015, 248.
5 Conclusions

Our reconsideration of the Segestan dossier does not overcome the basic difficulty represented by a lacunose archaeological and epigraphic documentation. Indeed, it aims at focusing our attention on the need not to force the meaning and interpretation of fragmentary data in order to create univocal connections between different kinds of sources.

Thus, on the basis of the re-examination of the epigraphic and archaeological data, we question the hypothesis of a gymnasium at Segesta and, above all, its identification with the peristyle building near the bouleuterion.

At first glance, the dedication to the gymnasiusarch Artemon son of Aleidas (IGDSII, no. 85) is the only element possibly demonstrating that Segesta had its own gymnasium. Unfortunately, this does not allow us to automatically identify where the building devoted to the gymnastic activities was set up. Besides, we do not aim at investigating here the role played by the gymnasium and the γυμνασιαρχος in the Hellenistic World and, more specifically, speaking, in Sicily. Still, it cannot be underestimated that, especially since the late Hellenistic period and the Roman conquest, the role of the gymnasium and the γυμνασιαρχος seems to have been increasingly linked with the military activity of cities. Not surprisingly, Philippe Gauthier described the gymnasium as: “servant d’abord à la formation du citoyen-soldat, là ou substituait une armée civique”. As far as Sicily is concerned, such a close relationship between military and gymnastic activities is well-demonstrated by an inscription from Solunto which records a dedication to the γυμνασιαρχος Antallos Ornias by three units of infantry (τάξες τρεῖς), in association with the ephesia. Remarkably, for Solunto epigraphic and archaeological evidence were also correlated, leading to the initial identification of the gymnasium with a building on the so-called Via dell’aora (the so-called Ginnasio). Although the interpretation of this structure as the local gymnasium was first stimulated by the discovery of the γυμνασιαρχος inscription near the building, the presence of a columned courtyard provided a key feature for this identification, similar to the case in Segesta. More recently, the Solunte ‘Ginnasio’ has been correctly identified as the house of a wealthy local notable. The actual gymnasium of Solunto has been correctly identified in a peristyle building next to the theater.

Both the examples from Segesta and Soluntum show in fact how in the case of the gymnasium different sources must be separately examined and their possible connection carefully assessed. Even if one would expect a separate gymnasium building in a monumentalized city center like that of late Hellenistic Segesta, the presence of a γυμνασιαρχος was not necessarily connected to a specific and actual building within the urban area. This seems to be true for the Roman period, especially in the eastern Mediterranean, and suggests that the equation γυμνασιαρχείο - gymnasium (understood as a specific building within the urban context) should be critically revised. This has already been observed by Delorme:

[…] magistrat et monument ne sont pas indissolublement unis. A vrai dire, le cas inverse, c’est-à-dire l’existence de la fonction sans l’édifice serait plus convaincant encore. […]

---

83 As we have already noticed, a further epigraphic element supporting the thesis of the Segestan gymnasium might be represented by a still unpublished inscription, possibly of an ephelic nature: see above.
84 In addition to Delorme’s still valid overview on the Greek gymnasium, Delorme 1962, we want to recall Philippe Gauthier’s and Henner von Hesberg’s considerations on the gymnastic institution and the corresponding magistrates and buildings; Gauthier 1995; von Hesberg 1995. More recently, these issues have been investigated by Ralf von den Hoff (von den Hoff 2009), and in several contributions to the volume Kah and Scholz 2013.
85 Jonathan Prag has correctly noticed and carefully examined this peculiar feature of the Sicilian gymnasium during the Hellenistic and especially the Roman period: Prag 2007.
86 Gauthier 1995, 10.
87 IG XIV, 311 = SEG XXXVIII, 964. Among others see: Manni Piraino 1973, 144-147; Cordiano 1997, 70-72.
88 The peristyle building was supposed to be the Solunte gymnasium by Francesco Saverio Cavallari: Cavallari 1875, 3.
89 Wolf 2005, 3-52, resuming an identification proposed already by Salinas 1884, 25.
91 See M. Vitale in this volume.
Whether or not this was the case in Segesta, a hypothetical gymnasion must be reconstructed in a place different from the area of the agora. Indeed, the most recent archaeological investigations have shown that there is not enough space for such a building, neither on the upper terrace of the agora nor on the intermediate terrace. Alternatively, we might rather think of a structure in the area of the theater. This urban sector had its main architectural development in the Hellenistic period, when the theater was set up. While only further archaeological investigations will allow for a better planimetric definition of this area, this hypothesis would be supported by the possible provenance of the inscription IGDSII, no. 85 from this area. Furthermore, the connection of the theater and gymnasion would find a good parallel in the city center of Solunto.

The suggested identification of the palaestra of the Segestan gymnasion with the peristyle building on the upper terrace of the agora must be rejected, once and for all. On the basis of the above mentioned bouleuteria/prytaneia complexes, a similar interpretation may be suggested for the complex in Segesta. The hypothetical presence of a prytaneion near the bouleuterion could explain the references to ἀνδρεῶνες in various inscriptions discussed here. Still, basing a new interpretation solely on the rather generic feature of the peristyle courtyard would be tricky, and indeed a repetition of questionable methodological procedures and hermeneutic attempts that we have criticized here.

Thus, instead of looking at a single architectural feature, we should better think of the topographic context and the proximity with other buildings. With such an approach, we can recognize the bouleuterion-peristyle complex on the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta as a functionally coherent ensemble and as a further strong demonstration of the Micro-Asiatic (and particularly Milesian) influences on Sicilian architecture and urban planning in the late Hellenistic period.

### 5.1 Postscriptum

Only after the final submission of this paper we have had the chance to read a very recent and stimulating article by S. De Vido, in which the Segestan hierophylakes and the inscription IG XIV, 291 are thoroughly examined. Although the article is mainly devoted to an epigraphic analysis of this and other documents, the author suggests the possibility of identifying the περίστυλος near the Segestan bouleuterion with the local prytaneion due to its possible connection with the above-mentioned inscription. As already noticed, IG XIV, 291, as well as many of the documents with which De Vido deals, are unfortunately of unknown provenance. Still, the final remarks of De Vido’s article could represent a further element supporting our hypothesis of a bouleuterion/prytaneion complex on the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta.

---

92 Delorme 1960, 5–6. The same idea was supported by Gauthier 1995, 6, no. 1. See also Campagna 2006, 31, and De Vincenzo 2013, 185.
93 IG XIV, 291; SEG XLI, 826, and IGDSII, no. 89.
94 As B. Emme has recently re-asserted, Emme 2013, 4–5, the peristyle had several different functions: as a result, it used to represent a very versatile element that, similarly to the stoa, was adapted to the surrounding context.
95 De Vido 2016.
General plan of the agora of Segesta.
Pl. 2  Aerial view of the agora of Segesta.
Pl. 3  Plan of the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta, i.e. the ‘area of the bouleuterion’.
Aerial view of the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta, i.e. the 'area of the bouleuterion'.
Pl. 5 Plan of the bouleuteron of Segesta.
Pl. 6  Digital Elevation Model (DEM) with contour lines of the upper terrace of the agora of Segesta.
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Summary

According to literary and epigraphic sources, the institution of the gymnasion thrived in Sicily from the 3rd century BC onwards, in the realm of Hieron II as well as in the Late Republican Roman province. This paper critically discusses whether the boom of the gymnasion is also reflected in the archaeological record and the emergence of a clearly discernible building typology. Focusing on five cities of Hieron’s realm in eastern Sicily (Syracuse, Morgantina, Megara Hyblaea, Neaion, and Akrai), it is examined whether gymnasia can be safely identified, what plan, decoration, and function they had, and whether changes between the 3rd century BC and later periods can be observed. It is shown that none of these cities provides evidence of a securely identifiable, fully known gymnasion, however.

Keywords: gymnasion; palaistra; Syracuse; Morgantina; Megara Hyblaea; Neaion; Akrai
According to literary and epigraphic sources, the institution of the gymnasion thrived in Sicily from the 3rd century BC onwards at the latest. Based on this evidence, scholars formulated two hypotheses: first, that King Hieron II of Syracuse systematically promoted the gymnasion in the cities of his realm for strategic-military purposes, in order to train loyal, competent citizen-soldiers; and second, that “Roman rule in Sicily entailed the continuity, indeed the encouragement of traditional norms, in the form of local military activities and their institutional concomitants, in particular the gymnasion.” Consequently, the importance of the gymnasion should be reflected in the archaeological record, both in quantity and typology: one could expect to find a functional standard type, developed and systematically propagated under Hieron and then adopted by the Roman rulers, a kind of model kit gymnasion. Accordingly, J. Prag recently assumed that all 65 cities of Late Republican Sicily provided a gymnasion. With view to the astonishingly scarce archaeological remains of gymnasia, L. Campagna argued, however, that the epigraphic evidence of gymnasiarchs would not necessarily require corresponding monumental built complexes. The office of the gymnasiarch may have been “più genericamente onorifico e liturgico e meno connesso con gli aspetti specifici del training atletico e militare.” Gymnasion structures could have been simple, lacking a distinct architectural design that makes them safely identifiable today. A clearly recognizable building type ‘gymnasion’ (or palaistra) may only have been introduced during the monumental restyling of Sicilian cities in the late Hellenistic period.

It is the aim of this paper to critically discuss whether the archaeological evidence of gymnasia in Sicily supports these assumptions, focusing on the following questions: Where and how can gymnasia be safely identified; where (cities/urban context), when and by whom were they built, what did they look like (size/plan/decoration), and what was their function; can significant changes be observed, e.g. between the period of Hieron’s reign in the 3rd century BC and later periods, notably the 2nd and 1st centuries BC? And finally, what do gymnasia contribute to the current vivid debate about the urban and cultural development of Hellenistic Sicily?

While the archaeological evidence of gymnasia in Sicily recently received some attention in scholarship, important remains are still unpublished and a comprehensive study is missing, so far. This gap can certainly not be filled here. Instead, complementing E. Mango’s recent assessment of gymnasia in western Sicily, focus is here on gymnasia in eastern Sicily, more particularly even those in Hieron’s realm. Space allows only for a discussion of those cities where archaeological evidence of gymnasia has been identified and is still being debated. These include Syracuse, Morgantina, Megara Hyblaea, Neaion, and Akrai. In contrast, sites such as Taormina, where identification of a gymnasion has already been convincingly refuted, and Cava d’Ispica where recently discovered evidence is not yet sufficiently published, will be omitted.

Discussion of the sites is mainly based on published literature and on visits to the sites. For easier reference and comparative overview, the main data of the discussed sites are summarized in a table (Tab. 1).

---

2 Prag 2007, 93.
3 Campagna 2006, 31.
4 Archaeological remains are discussed, in varying detail by Ferruti 2004; Lehmler 2005, 103, 119, 159-161; Campagna 2006, 29-31; Prag 2007; Fiorentini 2009; Mango 2009; Wilson 2013, 112; Mistrutta 2013; A. Mistrutta has submitted a PhD dissertation about Gymnasia in Sicily at the University of Hamburg in 2012, which is not yet published, however, and was not accessible to me.
5 Mango 2009.
7 Trigilla 2011, 100-101 briefly relates that archaeologists identified a newly discovered complex of several grottoes under the grotto of S. Maria as a gymnasion. These grottoes were excavated under the supervision of Annamaria Sammito and Vittorio Rizzone, who will provide full publication in the near future; meanwhile for a brief preliminary assessment, see Sammito and Fiorilla 2013, 212-214; Sammito and Rizzone 2014, fig. 8 pl. IX. I am very much indebted to Annamaria Sammito for showing these caves to me in April 2017, for generously sharing information and publications with me, and for inspiring discussions about this highly unusual site and monument. While there is compelling evidence for identifying the complex of caves as a gymnasion while it provides an intriguing comparison to the complex in Noto, the remains of Cava d’Ispica cannot be discussed in any detail here.
8 For comparison, this table also includes the sites of Tauromenion/Taormina and Solunto, but not the yet unpublished example in Cava d’Ispica.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Epigraphic evidence</th>
<th>Literary evidence</th>
<th>Palaistra / Rooms</th>
<th>Paradosmos / Race track</th>
<th>Bathing facilities / Water supply</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akrai</td>
<td>x, 2nd half of 2nd c BC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x, courtyard with at least one portico or probably peristyle courtyard with rooms on at least one side</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Laconicum, 2 cisterns</td>
<td>25 × 34 m = 850 m²</td>
<td>2nd c BC (typology only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara Hyblaia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?, courtyard with at least one portico and rooms on at least 2 sides</td>
<td>3rd c BC or later?</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>23 × 22 m = 506 m²</td>
<td>(no conclusive evidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neaiton/ Notoantica</td>
<td>x, 3rd c BC?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?, 5 rock cut rooms</td>
<td>3rd c BC (inscription only)</td>
<td>Cistern, channel system</td>
<td>23 × 22 m = 506 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solunto</td>
<td>x, mid-1st c BC or AD²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x, peristyle courtyard surrounded by rooms on 3 sides</td>
<td>2nd c BC (relative chronology; built after the theater, over earlier residential structures)</td>
<td>Laconicum, cisterns</td>
<td>24 × 42 m = 1008 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>?, fragmentary inscriptions of unknown date</td>
<td>For at least 3 different gymnasia, from 4th–1st c BC</td>
<td>1) ?, peristyle courtyard next to altar of Hieron 2) ?, 1st phase of “Roman gymnasium”, peristyle courtyard / quadriporticus</td>
<td>1) Swimming pool 2) Unknown</td>
<td>Courtyard with porticoes 174 × 40.90 m = 7,117 m²</td>
<td>2) 76 × c. 66 m = 5,016 m²</td>
<td>1) 2nd half of 3rd c BC or later? (architecture vs. stratigraphy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromenion/Taormina</td>
<td>x, referring to 3rd c BC onwards (“tavole finanziarie”, not found in the peristyle building)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?, peristyle courtyard (9.50 × 7 m), with rooms on at least one side, and at least 2 rooms on a higher terrace; one of these rooms (or entire building) = library according to painted stucco inscriptions</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2 cisterns (channel and conduits possibly outside the building)</td>
<td>Peristyle section c. 24 × 17 m = 408 m²; upper terrace c. 22 × 13.5 m = 297 m²; total = at least 705 m²</td>
<td>Hellenistic (3rd c BC according to stucco inscriptions?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 Sites in Sicily with identified gymasia/palaistrai (x = securely identified; ? identification questionable and debated).
While the terminology of structures for athletic and educational activities is debated, the generally accepted identification is followed here: confined buildings with a courtyard and rooms are referred to as palaistra, complexes that include space and structures for running are called gymnasia.

1 Syracuse

Literary sources suggest that Syracuse was provided with different gymnasia that were built from the 4th century BC onwards.7 Dionysios the Older built large gymnasium in the 4th century BC close to the Anapos River that flowed into the southwest end of the great harbor.8 Another gymnasium was constructed at the end of the 4th century BC around the tomb of Timoleon, close to the agora, in the Achradina quarter; this was called Timoleonteion.11 A very large example, located, in the Tyche quarter, is mentioned by Cicero.12 Finally, it is debated whether a Latin inscription of the Imperial period that almost certainly contains the word gymnasium really came from Syracuse. While J. R. A. Wilson was the first to contest a provenance from Syracuse, arguing that the inscription came from Rome via Noto to Syracuse, J. R. W. Prag recently ascribed this very inscription to Syracuse again.13 Several inscriptions referring to activities in gymnasium were found all over Syracuse and linked with the gymnasium in the Tyche quarter.14

Interestingly, none of the Syracusan gymnasia could safely be linked with the patronage of Hieron II, although he is particularly known as a builder of temples and gymnasia and famous for having greatly embellished the city of Syracuse.15

While now there is general agreement about where the various quarters of Hellenistic Syracuse were located (Pl. 1), correlation of the archaeological evidence with gymnasium known from textual sources is not possible and no gymnasium has been safely identified, so far.16 Three sites deserve brief discussion.

1. The site around the great altar of Hieron II that is located in the Neapolis has cautiously been identified as a palaistra, from 1954 onwards until recently.17 The altar (195.85 × 20.85 m) was bordered by a large square in the west (174 × 40.9 m) that was surrounded by Doric porticoes, which included a centrally placed Ionic portico in the west (Fig. 1).

The square itself included a centrally placed large pool (27 × 12.75 m, ca. 1.3–1.8 m deep) that was provided with waterproof revetment, stairs in two corners, and a base in its center (0.9 × 1.7).18 Five parallel rows of cavities found in the open square were originally interpreted as evidence of trees.19 While the altar is safely dated to the Hieronian period, the ensemble of

---

7 Ferruti 2004, 225; cf. also Ernst 2015.
8 Diod. Sic. 15.13.3–5; really mentions the plural, gymnaiai: κατασκεύασε δὲ καὶ γυμναία μεγάλα παρὰ τὸν Δαμοκλέος ποταμόν. 
9 Plut. Tim. 39: ἐποίησαν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν πλατείαν τοῦ συρακοσίου βασιλέως ἡμέραν ἄγοράς, καὶ στοὰς ὕστερον περιβαλόντες καὶ παλαίστρας ἐνοικοδομήσαντες γυμναία.
10 J. R. W. Prag recently ascribed this very inscription to the gymnasia, but was also a zealous shipbuilder, constructing wheat-transports “Πράγης Ειρήνης Σύρακος, μεγάλη σφοδρής κατασκευασμένης. “But Hieron, the king of Syracuse, he who was in all respects friendly to Rome, not only interested himself in the building of temples and gymnasia, but was also a zealous shipbuilder, constructing wheat-transports” (translation Gulick 2002). While this statement has often been related to Hieron’s building activities in Syracuse, see e.g. Campagna 2004: Campagna 2006, 19, it is rather generic and does not explicitly mention the city; consequently, it is also cited as evidence of Hieron’s cultural politics in his realm; e.g. Ferruti 2004, 191. Hieron’s large ship, the Syrakosia, included a gymnasion; Athen. 5.206e–209e.
11 Dimartino 2011, 94, following Manganaro 1999, lists five inscriptions (lists of youths, reference to competitions, dedication of a gymnasiarch’s statue), but does not explain why these would have belonged to the gymnasium in the Tyche quarter and not one of the other gymnasia. Cf. also Dimartino 2011, 122. Cordiano 1997 did not list any evidence of gymnasia in Syracuse. The inscriptions identified as references to gymnasium by Manganaro 1999, 67–69 nos. 57–62, are all very fragmentary and they cannot be safely reconstructed and dated. I am very grateful to Jonathan Prag for discussion of these inscriptions.
12 Cic. Ver. 2.4.53 §119; Lehmler 2005, 98, 123.
13 CIL X, 7135; Wilson 1988; Prag 2007, 96 n. 164 without reference to Wilson 1988. This inscription was found in the so-called Roman gymnasium. Since Wilson provides a convincing detailed discussion, he is followed here.
14 For reconstructed plans of Hellenistic Syracuse, see Lehmler 2005, 100 fig. 40; Mertens 2006, 311 fig. 567; Veit 2013, 10.
15 First by Gentili 1954, 353: palaistra for the iuvenes and maybe even exer-
16 While this pool is provided with one channel in its northwest corner, which served most likely as a supply channel (the level of its floor being about 0.60 m above the floor of the pool), no second channel (for drainage) has been found; this is nowhere commented upon; see, e.g., Parisi Presicce 2004; Wolff 2016, 40.
17 Gentili 1954, 354 mentions only several ditches whose function he could not explain. Stucchi 1954, 173 mentions five rows of trees. Neutsch 1954, 600–601 fig. 71, provides a plan with these five rows of cavae, including 140 in total.
porticoes, pool, and trees was originally identified as an Augustan addition, based on finds. According to G. V. Gentili, this very ensemble would have been reminiscent of the Augustan Great Palaestra in Pompeii and could have served similar purposes; however, he does not explain the rather strange combination with a monumental altar, which is missing in the Pompeian complex.

Both the date of the ensemble and its configuration and function remain, indeed, debated. Most recently, C. Parisi Presicce and M. Wolf argued that the parallel rows of cavities would have housed stones with iron rings for fixing sacrificial animals. While, remarkably, no such stone was found here, evidence from other sites such as Klaros, Magnesia on Maeander, and Dion is cited as a possible parallel. Furthermore, the ensemble of stoai, pool, and cavities is now generally dated to the Hieronian period, for various reasons: because it is assumed that the monumental altar required some equally monumental enclosure; because the design of the porticus would correlate remarkably with that of the altar; because the architectural elements of the Ionic propylon would resemble those of the altar in material and execution; and because the stratigraphic context would suggest a Hellenistic date. As a unified concept, the complex would have served as a monumental site for cults and festivals, appropriate for hecatomb sacrifices and a large audience that assembled in the porticoes. Regular athletic training can hardly be reconciled with this concept. Furthermore, literary sources mention the altar, but no gymnasium or palaistra in connection with this.

The debated chronology notwithstanding, both interpretations are intriguing, yet problematic: for the cult site theory, the precise function of the monumental pool and the absence of any of the over 100 stones for fixing animals require further explanation. The pool is certainly large and deep enough for swimming. In the eastern Mediterranean, such pools were built from the 4th century BC in gymasia and Panhellenic sanctuaries, where they had no obvious cultic function but served for...
athletic and leisure swimming. For the palaistra theory, the combination of athletic facilities with a monumental altar remains unique in the ancient world and evidence of trees in the open square should be provided. Furthermore, clear labeling of the complex is challenging since it is neither a typical Greek palaistra, lacking the common rooms around the peristyle courtyard, nor a gymnasion with separate race track and rooms for other athletic activities. A hybrid complex with sufficiently long porticoes and open courtyard space for running and with a swimming pool would be without any comparison in the 3rd century BC and is indeed only known from later periods.

2. The identification of the so-called Roman Gymnasium in the Achradina as a gymnasium has long been refuted, partially based on the design with a combination of theater, temple, and porticoes. Recent excavations showed, however, that the complex was originally built as a quadriporticus in the late Hellenistic period; the theater and temple were only added later, in the post-Tiberian period. It is still assumed, however, that the late Hellenistic quadriporticus already included a funerary monument, a temple, or a heroon, of which no evidence has survived though. The size of the quadriporticus would certainly have been sufficient for a palaistra, but the Late Hellenistic date excludes that this is the Timoleonteion mentioned in literary sources.

3. In 1900, P. Orsi described “una specie di grandiosa vasca” that he excavated “sulla parte alta e pianeggiante dell’Acradina.” Today, this area is identified as “all’interno delle mura dell’Epipole”, but the structure excavated by Orsi can apparently no longer be identified. This structure had a size of 29.75 × 21.8 m and its rock-cut walls were strengthened with seven buttresses on the short and nine on the long sides, which “sporgevano dalla linea perimetrale verso l’interno” (0.90 × 1.35 m). All vertical and horizontal surfaces were covered with a double layer of excellent cocciopesto. Four steps led down to the structure in the northeast corner, and a half-elliptical, rock-cut and heavily cemented conduit (1.15 × 0.5 m) was found in the center of the north wall. While the “vasca” was discovered in an elevation of 1.5 m under the modern level, its original depth is not indicated nor whether it was really fully excavated. In the fill were found many architectural elements that came probably from surrounding structures: lion waterpots of different sizes, many cornice fragments with different moldings, fragments of figurative reliefs, all mostly made of limestone with stucco; and some colored stucco fragments. Orsi assumed that the space discovered by him was the palaistra of a quite lavishly decorated gymnasium, probably even the gymnasium in Tyche mentioned by Cicero.

J. Delorme discussed Orsi’s note in his study of gymnasium. He identified the structure as a pool (‘piscine’), but doubted that it belonged to a palaistra or gymnasium. Shortly later, R. Ginouvès cautiously proposed that this pool could be ‘tardive’ because of its unusual size. Neither Delorme nor Ginouvès seem to have visited the site, and it saw no further discussion after 1962. While the space with its waterproof coating most likely contained water, the interior buttresses clearly speak against its use as a purpose-built swimming pool and suggest that this was a large roofed cistern or reservoir, possibly with additional interior supports. Therefore, this structure, whose date (Hellenistic, Roman Imperial or later period?) must remain open, cannot serve as evidence of a palaistra or gymnasium.

In sum, the design and typology of gymnasium in Syracuse currently cannot be determined. At best, one
can cautiously infer from the description of the Timoleonteion that features known from gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean also appeared in this Syracusean gymnasium, namely porticoes/stoai and palaistrai. Literary sources suggest that gymnasias were popular at least from the 4th to 1st century BC. While the archaeological evidence presently does not allow for enriching this rather fragmentary picture with safely identifiable remains, future investigations in the courtyard of Hieron’s altar, the so-called Roman gymnasium, or in other areas might change this.

2 Morgantina

While Morgantina is not mentioned among the cities that, according to Diodorus Siculus, belonged to Hieron’s realm after his treaty with the Romans in 263 BC, it is commonly attributed to his kingdom. Archaeological evidence suggests that the city thrived in the second half of the 3rd century BC when it was provided with a ‘standard kit’ of Hellenistic cities. Even though there is no epigraphic evidence testifying to the existence of a gymnasium in Morgantina, the early excavators identified the North stoa of the agora as a gymnasium that was built in the mid-3rd century BC by Hieron II. The terrace in front of the stoa would have served as a paradromis, a racetrack under the open sky, and the various rooms of the stoa as apodyterion, loutron, ephebeion etc. This idea was convincingly rejected by M. Bell who showed that this was a highly symmetrically organized stoa with rooms for political-administrative functions, including probably a ptyaneion.

Since Morgantina saw a major urban boom under the reign of Hieron II and was generously endowed with different public amenities (theater, stoai, bouleuterion, granaries, baths etc.) it seemed reasonable to keep looking for a gymnasium. Based on excavations in 2004/2005, a potential candidate was identified in a quarter at the western border of the built city (Pl. 2).

This is the so-called Southeast Building on the northwestern lot (lot 1) of the insula W13/14S, which is surrounded by two public baths, the North Baths across Plateia B, and the South Baths across Stenopos W14. Arguments for an identification included: 1. a centrally placed wide entrance, flanked by two monumental structures, probably benches, 2. the vicinity of two public baths that would have been used in connection with the gymnasium; and 3. a strangely oblique wall in the south of the adjacent insula W14/15 S that could have delimited a race track.

None of these arguments are conclusive and convincing, however, and recent and ongoing fieldwork further refutes this identification: With a surface area of ca. 324 m², one lot of the orthogonal grid plan would have been astonishingly small for a palaistra building, especially in a city, where other public buildings are monumental. The race track would have been strangely placed in relation to the palaistra; at best, the entire insula with at least eight lots of 2592 m² (or even more) could have served as a gymnasium, but archaeological fieldwork does not support this idea. A geophysical survey performed in 2012 suggested that the entire insula was densely built with small structures. This is confirmed by the ongoing Contrada Agnese Project under direction of A. D. Walthall, which identified the Southeast Building as an independent building with a central courtyard. While this may have included a colonnade (‘peristyle’), finds such as several large pithoi point to storage, and not to any athletic or intellectual use. The strangely oblique southern facades of insula W14/15S and possibly also of insula W13/14S are most likely due to the topography of the area and not visibly to the definition of any race track.

34 Diod. Sic. 23.4.1.
35 Bell 1988; Bell 1999; Bell 2007, esp. 195 n. 35; Campagna 2004, 156 n. 14 (critical discussion of the arguments); Walthall 2011, esp. 166 n. 41.
38 Except for a brief reference in Prag 2007, 89 n. 113, this identification was not published in print so far, but was discussed as an intriguing idea by the team of the American Excavations at Morgantina. The South Baths – West Sanctuary Project, directed by S. K. Lucore and myself, also started with the assumption that this quarter (Contrada Agnese quarter) may have been particularly designed and reserved for public facilities for athletic training, bathing, and other leisure or entertainment activities; Lucore 2015; Trümper 2015; preliminary reports on https://morgantina.org (visited on 27/11/2017).
39 Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2014; Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2016; Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2015; Benton et al. 2015.
40 While the southern border of insula W14/15S was revealed in 1971, see Allen 1974, 373 fig. 11, the southern border of insula W13/14S is unknown; the geophysical survey carried out in 2012 showed similarly oblique walls in the south of this insula, which could not be safely identified as a border or external wall, however.
So far, not a single safely identified gymnasion of the Hellenistic period is connected, spatially and functionally, with an independent public bath, because the form of ‘decadent’ hot bathing provided in public baths was incompatible with the notion of an ascetic toughening athletic lifestyle.\(^{41}\) Finally, residential use of the quarter with buildings occupying a standard lot of the orthogonal grid plan was recently confirmed by excavations in the insula to the west of the Southeast Building where a residential complex with central courtyard could be identified.\(^{42}\)

In sum, there is currently no evidence that the building boom in 3rd century BC Morgantina or any building activities in the 2nd/1st century BC included a gymnasion.

## 3 Megara Hyblaea

Megara Hyblaea certainly belonged to Hieron’s realm and also provides clear evidence of Hellenistic building activity. While the Hellenistic city was much smaller than its famous Archaic predecessor, it also was endowed with certain urban amenities, if not as lavishly as Morgantina. Despite the lack of epigraphic evidence of a gymnasion, a building at the southeastern border of the excavated city was identified “without doubt” as a gymnasion or palaistra of the Hellenistic period in the French guidebook of the site, obviously because of its size and plan (Pl. 3. 1–2).\(^ {43}\) On a surface area of 850 m\(^2\) (25 \(\times\) 34 m), the building includes a large courtyard with a single colonnade in the north and rooms opening off to the north and east. The courtyard would have been used for exercise, the large northern rooms b-d (with surface areas of 40 and 52 m\(^2\)) for intellectual education, and maybe the adjacent northern street B, the largest street of the city, as a racetrack. The entrance would have been in the east, from street D\(\text{3}\). A well in the colonnade would have provided the water necessary for a palais tra, whereas the corresponding basins and channels vanished probably when the building was destroyed by the Romans in 214 BC. “Murs tardifs” in rooms b-d suggest that the building was reused for a different function “à l’époque romaine”.\(^ {44}\)

While the size of the building is certainly impressive, it is not without comparison in local domestic architecture: the nearby house 49,19 had a similar size and also similarly large rooms.\(^ {45}\) Since the southern part of the so-called palais tra-lot was never excavated, it cannot be excluded that the courtyard was bordered by rooms in the south and southeast, thus conforming even more to typical courtyard houses. Indeed, trenches along the south and east walls of the building revealed stretches of walls that could have delineated further rooms.\(^ {46}\)

The building has never been studied in detail, and the published stone plan includes no elevations. The currently visible remains suggest, however, that the building cannot easily be reconstructed as described above, because the levels of several central features do not correlate (Fig. 2). The southern walls of rooms b, c, and d are preserved at a homogeneous level, made of large fairly well worked blocks; while the row of blocks includes no thresholds, “la disposition des marques de pose et de trous de pince autorisent la restitution de large portes de 3 m environ.”\(^ {47}\) The preserved (original?) threshold between rooms d and e is at the same (or even slightly lower) level as the row of southern blocks of room. This suggests that rooms b, c, and d had no separate thresholds and thus no lockable doors, or that at least room d had a lower level, requiring steps down from the entrance into the room (of which nothing survives). The stylobate of the colonnade is at a much higher level than both the south wall of rooms b-d and the preserved border of the well.\(^ {48}\) The well and the elevated stylo-

41 Trümper 2009; Trümper 2014a; Trümper 2014b.
42 The South Baths – West Sanctuary project, identified the West Sanctuary as a house with a size of about 360 m\(^2\) (see Monika Trümper, „Morgantina under Roman Rule. Recent Research in the Contra Agnese Quarter“, in: O. Belvedere and J. Bergemann (eds.), Römisches Sizilien: Stadt und Land zwischen Monumentalisierung und Ökonomie, Krise und Entwicklung, Forthcoming.)
45 Haug and Steuernagel 2014: rooms B15 and D2 had surface areas of 39 m\(^2\), the house had a surface area of 16–26 \(\times\) 36 m (c. 790 m\(^2\)) in its first phase, see Haug and Steuernagel 2014, 62 fig. 70. Cf. also e.g. House 23,14 (ca. 844 m\(^2\)), with at least five rooms of up to 44 m\(^2\) surface area that partially open onto a single colonnade; Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 19, fig. 17. Tréziny 2018, 155–202.
46 Clearly visible on the stone plan in Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976, plans 63, 64, 69, 70. Tréziny 2018, 234 fig. 352.
47 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 43. These are not visible today (without cleaning), and they are not marked on the stone plan, Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976, plan 63.
48 This is mentioned, but not further explained by Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 43. No traces of columns are visible on the rather uneven (weathered) surfaces of the blocks, and none are marked on Vallet,
bante cannot have functioned simultaneously, unless the
colonnade did not allow for free circulation between
the courtyard and the porticus, which would have sig-
nificantly hindered or even prevented access from the
main entrance in the east to all rooms in the north and
east (b–g), and would certainly have been detrimental
to the functioning of a palaistra. The ‘stylobate’ seems
strange, however, consisting of three layers of blocks, the
uppermost protruding above the middle, and the mid-
dle partially protruding above the lowest visible layer. It
seems that the level of the stylobate was raised in a sec-
ond phase of use, probably with spoils. The position of
the well that the reconstructed plan locates right in front
of the entrance to the largest room b (Pl. 3. 1) is rather
inconvenient for circulation in the porticus and the use
of room b. While no evidence of a loutron survives (wa-
terproof pavement, stucco, drainage, basins) this would
be expected in a remote corner room, such as rooms e,
f, or maybe g. Carrying water from the well to any of
these rooms for filling potential wash basins would have
been suboptimal, at best. Finally, using one of the ma-
ajor streets of the city for regular training (in the nude?)
seems problematic, and in any case like a rather unfor-
tunate makeshift solution.

In sum, identification of this building as a gymna-
sion or palaistra “sans aucun doute”49 seems rather opti-
mistic. Comprehensive examination of this building and
an evaluation of its complex history may provide more
substantial proof for determining its (changing?) func-
tion. Until then, the building should probably be taken
off the list of safely identified gymnasium.

4 Neaiton

Neaiton or Noto antica, another Hieronian city, is the
key example in the debate about Hieronian gymna-
sion politics because of an inscription found in situ,
which records an unspecified dedication of the Hiero-
nian Neaniskoi (youths) under the two gymnasiarchs
Ariston, son of Agath... and Philistion, son of Epikrates,
at an unknown date.50

ἐπὶ γυμνασιάρχω[ν]
Ἀριστίωνος τοῦ Ἀγαθ[—],
Πηλιστίωνος τοῦ Ἐπικράτ[εος]
νεανίσ[κοι Ἱε]ρώνειο[ι].

The inscription was carved into the rock, into a slightly
recessed and crudely framed field of 0.65 × 2.12 m. It
served as a kind of lintel or architrave “nello sfondo di un
padiglione o protiro d’ingresso (prof. m. 1.6), alla porta

\[Villard, and Auberson 1976, plan 63. Cf. now also Tréziny 2018, 235-236.\]

\[Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 41. See doubts expressed by Cam-
pagna 2006, 29 n. 7, and now also by Tréziny 2018, 242.\]

\[IG XIV, 242; Manganaro 1963, 55-56 n. 32; Cordiano 1997, 61; \(ISic 1260\); \( http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/ISic1260 \) (visited on 10/11/2018).\]
che metteva ad un camerone di m. 6 × 4.65.\footnote{Orsi 1897, 81.} Since the inscription was sawed out and brought to the Biblioteca civica of Noto in 1894, and no photo or drawing documents its original position, the original context and function can no longer be evaluated. Today, a copy of the inscription is visible on site, carved into a large detached rock that shows some signs of working and dowel holes and may originally have belonged to the ceiling of one of the nearby rock-cut rooms (Fig. 3). Two aspects of the inscription are debated: first, whether Hieron is mentioned as the ‘owner’ of the neaniskoi, or as the founder of the gymnasion; second, whether the inscription was carved during the reign of Hieron, thus before 215 BC, or at a later date.\footnote{See discussion in Ferruti 2004, 193: gymnasion called after Hieron; Cordiano 1997, 61–63, votes for groups of youth called after Hieron; Lehmler 2005, 183, who generally doubts that Hieron pursued a program of cultural politics and systematically dedicated buildings in the cities of his realm, argues without further reference: “Es wurde in der Forschung sicherlich zu Recht nie daran gezweifelt, daß die nach Hieron II. benannten Neaniskoi in einem von Hieron gestifteten Gymnasion untergebracht waren.” Similarly Campagna 2006, 29. Date 2nd century BC: Mangano 1963, 55–56; La Rosa 1987–1988; Lehmler 2005, 185; ISic 1060, http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/Sic1060 (visited on 10/11/2018); date 3rd century BC: Cordiano 1997, 61; implicitly also Ferruti 2004, Prag 2007, 91, does not really discuss the date, but seems to assume a Hieronian date.} Both problems cannot be discussed in detail here, even if a date before 215 BC seems more likely. As a reference to a gymnasion built by Hieron himself, the inscription would be highly astonishing as Hieron is not mentioned either as an active donor and euergetes in the nominative nor as the recipient of honors in the dative. In contrast to other gymnasia that presumably carried the names of their donors\footnote{The evidence was last assembled by Ameling 2007, 134–135 n. 34, who points out that only the Athenian Ptolemaion, which can safely be identified as a gymnasion, was demonstrably called after its donor.} the term Hieroneion is specifically not used here. And for no other example, Ptolemaic, Antiocheian or similar youths are known as reference to a gymnasion built by these rulers.

Even if the original position of the inscription remains unknown, the site where it was found can be assessed for its design and possible function. While the site was explored with some trenches and cleaning in 1972 and 1974, no comprehensive examination of all surviving features was ever published.\footnote{Published by La Rosa 1987–1988; otherwise, see Orsi 1897, 81–82; La Rosa 1971, 58, 87–88; Arcifa 1993, 410; Ferruti 2004, 196–198.}

The complex identified as the gymnasion of Neaiton is located on the eastern slope of the city and includes a group of differently oriented and sized rock cut rooms, and an impressive terrace wall system, excavated for a length of about 80 m. The latter was dated to the Hieronian period, based on the wall technique and “pochi frammenti a vernice opaca raccolti sporadicamente nella zona.”\footnote{Arcifa 1993, 410.} The terrain between the rooms and terrace wall is about 28 m wide, but structures partially excavated on this terrace all belonged to post-ancient periods. The
bottom of the terrace wall is significantly lower than the openings of the rock cut rooms. Since the level of the rock cut rooms is nowhere indicated, however, it cannot be safely determined whether there was ever a wide terrace at one single level to the east of the rock cut rooms, and at what level this would have been in relation to the rock cut rooms.\(^56\)

It was assumed that the rock cut rooms served various functions related with the gymnasion, such as for administration (office of the gymnasiarchs), cult, changing (apodyterion), and education, and that the open terrace housed a dromos, paradromis or xystos.\(^57\) Since a terrace of 28 m width seems generous for a simple racetrack, F. Ferruti argued that this could have housed the courtyard of the palaistra, whereas the paradromis should be located further south.\(^58\)

The currently visible remains cannot easily be reconciled with the typology, design and function of well-known gymnasia of the Late Classical and Hellenistic period. A brief overview of the features reveals numerous problems and questions that are not addressed in literature.\(^59\)

Five rooms or caves can be identified (Fig. 4, nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8), of which the largest two are still accessible (Fig. 4, nos. 2, 7); between these rooms, a built staircase with 13 steps (Fig. 4, no. 4) leads to the arched opening of a cistern. The site obviously suffered from some destruction by natural catastrophes (among them probably the famous earthquake in 1693 that destroyed the baroque city), which is most obvious in the area between the staircase and room 7 (Fig. 3; Fig. 4, no. 6); here, several large fragments seem to have broken off the natural rock, among them the worked piece with the copy of the inscription. Nevertheless, apart from this short stretch, the façade of the rock cut rooms seems largely preserved in its original (ancient) state. This is obvious from several facts: the rock was worked and smoothed in many places; the staircase seems fully preserved in a corner between the facades of stretches 3 and 6 (Fig. 3); and, most importantly, all stretches of the façade, except for the broken stretch no. 6, show various cuttings: round, rectangular or arched holes that may (at least partially) have served as (votive) niches; and a well-made channel that runs over

---

\(^56\) The stone plan in La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III includes only elevations for the remains of the terrace wall system. The published section pl. XI shows only the pavement of a 16th century house on the terrace, which is almost 3 m above the bottom of the terrace wall. Since the rock cut rooms are significantly higher, the terrace wall must have been at least 12 m high in order to support a flat terrain at the level of the rock cut rooms.


\(^58\) Ferruti 2004, 198.

\(^59\) The following observations are based on a brief visit to the site in August 2016, when vegetation was still high and dense. For easier reference, rooms and features discussed here are marked with numbers on the plan Fig. 4.
the openings of rooms 7 and 8, through a large rectangular niche between these two rooms. Similar cuttings are visible in the rooms themselves, which will briefly be described.\textsuperscript{60}

- Room 1 has, according to the published plan, a size of $2.5 \times 3.4$ m ($8.5$ m$^2$); its slightly arched wide opening is at least 2 m lower than that of the adjacent room 2, and it is almost entirely blocked with debris (Fig. 5). The smoothed rock façade above the opening shows an oblique groove, and on top the remains of a well-made ashlar wall (at least four layers).

- Room 2 has a size of at least $8.7 \times 4.3$ m ($37.4$ m$^2$) and is 3.8 m high.\textsuperscript{61} The opening of about 8 m width is supported by a large central pillar that supports

\textsuperscript{60} No detailed description is provided in literature.

\textsuperscript{61} Measures provided in La Rosa 1971, 87; the plan La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III suggests a larger size: ca. $9.4 \times 6.9$ m.
the ceiling (partially cracked today) (Figs. 5, 6, 7). All walls are covered with cavities of different sizes, particularly in the lower parts (which could be easily reached?). The west wall includes a large niche that reached from the floor almost to the ceiling and seems to have been made to house something special, such as a statue or statue group. The bottom of the south wall and the northern west wall have man-made recesses under the small niches, probably destined for housing something (couches, chests, benches?). The transition to the façade stretch 3 was worked as a large recessed field with an arched top that includes a small arched niche.

- Stretch 3 is a smooth stretch of rock that includes some holes / 'niches,' roughly in a horizontal line at the same level (Figs. 3, 6). Under these holes is the opening to another rock cut room or recess (c. 3 × 1.5 m, 4.5 m²), which is almost entirely hidden behind debris and was as low as that of room 1.62

- The seven lower steps of the staircase (4) are made of well-cut blocks, sitting on a rubble foundation that is built against the rock (Fig. 3). The upper steps are carved out of the rock.

- The cistern (5) has an arched opening right next to the steps of the staircase (Figs. 3, 8); it is round, widening from top to the bottom that is not visible, though, because the cistern is partially filled with debris; waterproof red plaster covers the visible parts of the interior. Above the arched opening are the remains of a wall made out of roughly cut blocks (at least two layers). A channel was cut into the rock, leading from the arched opening with a slight decline to the east, above the rock cut steps of the staircase; after a short stretch (four rock cut steps) it joins a vertical rock cut channel that comes from the terrace above rooms 6 and 7 and ends in another horizontal rock cut channel, at the level of the lowest rock cut step of the staircase. This channel follows the staircase until it breaks off, where part of room 6 was destroyed.

- Area 6 maybe have been the “vestibule” or “prothyron” described by P. Orsi,63 but its design and accessibility currently cannot be reconstructed (Fig. 3). Since the façade of room 7 seems to be fully preserved, room 6 cannot have served as a vestibule to this room.

- Room 7 was described as a rectangular room with a
size of ca. $6.15 \times 4.65$ m ($28.6$ m$^2$) (Figs. 3, 9, 10).\textsuperscript{64}

Since there are several cuttings in the worked rock above the northern part of its opening, the room can never have been fully rectangular. The opening is significantly lower than that of room 2, and it may have included above its southern part or between room 7 and 6 the inscription. In the interior, room 7 shows several cuttings in the south wall, among them at floor level a large well-made niche in the southwest corner that may have housed something; a similar large niche is visible in the center of the north (or northwest) wall. Large parts of the walls and ceiling are covered with a whitish plaster. The room is filled with debris, among them several large blocks, and its entrance is partially blocked with a (modern) rubble wall.

\textsuperscript{64} Orsi 1897, 81: $6 \times 4.65$ m; La Rosa 1971, 87: $6.15 \times 4.45$ m; the inscription would have been carved above the entrance to this room.
The entrance of room 8 is lower than that of room 7 and today largely blocked by debris (Fig. 9); it may have had a size of about $3.75 \times 4.7$ m ($17.6$ m$^2$).

Finally, the well smoothed rock façade above rooms 7 and 8 includes several rock cut features (Figs. 9, 11): 1. a large rectangular niche just at the intersection of the rooms that shows each two grooves in its upper side walls; 2. a half-round channel that ran from the south down to the north, leading through the large niche; its precise provenance is unknown, but it seems to come from the terrace above 6, where some source such as a reservoir may have been located that also fed the channel system next to the staircase; its destination is also unknown because it just disappears in the debris at the northern end of room 8. Above the channel, the rock façade of room 8 shows further cuttings for some unknown function; remains of a wall with roughly cut blocks are visible on top of the rock façade of rooms 7 and 8.

In sum, the remains are much more complex than hitherto known, incorporating built features and the rock that was exploited in its natural configuration, but also clearly worked in all visible parts (rooms 2 and 7, façade). It cannot be determined whether the group of rooms 1–8 with their highly irregular façade and varying orientation ever functioned as a clearly defined ensemble. There was obviously some larger built feature on top of features 6–8 that was most likely connected with the cistern and the channel systems, suggesting some coherent planning and function.

Two key problems remain to be discussed: The first key problem is dating: apart from the inscription that may have been seen in situ (but not further documented) by T. Fazello in 1558, thus before the big earthquake, no safe evidence for dating survives. The overall well preserved rock walls provide no further evidence of inscriptions or at least graffiti which may seem astonishing. Problems of chronology regard particularly the numerous cuttings in the rooms and the façade, which, in theory, could have been made any time in antiquity or later. For example, the detached inscription shows two round holes right in the center of the second line and a larger rectangular cutting at the upper right edge, which

---

65 A groove in the south wall of the niche suggests that a half-circular open channel made of wood, metal or terracotta bridged the niche between the rock cut parts. The water features are mentioned briefly by La Rosa 1971, 88 n. 175: “Sulla parete di roccia nella quale si aprono i cameroni, resti di canaletta di scolo intagliate.”

66 Some cuttings and features are visible above rooms 2–3, from the topmost step of the staircase; but this area is too heavily overgrown for further evaluation.

67 Ferruti 2004, 192.
all must post-date the carving (and major use?) of the inscription. While some of the holes or the plaster in the caves could even have been made by shepherds and peasants after the earthquake of 1693, when the city was otherwise largely abandoned, this seems less likely for the more sophisticated system of channels and the large rectangular niche. Even the impressive terrace wall system, which is still partially visible today, cannot be safely dated because the wall technique of the few preserved layers is hardly conclusive.

The second key problem is function: what were the wide open rooms with remarkably different heights of their openings used for? Were they appropriate for any administrative function, athletic training (in the nude) and intellectual education, or rather for other activities such as cult, assemblies, and dining? The water system is not visibly connected with any feature that may have served as a loutron, and the niche crossed by a channel rather suggests some cultic or decorative function, for example as a nymphaion. Finally, the completely irregular rock façade could not have been linked with built features on the wide terrace, such as a colonnade or palaistra right in front of the rock cut rooms: features in front of the caves could not have been easily roofed (or at all) and would have taken all light from the caves.

Thus, for now the example in Noto does not allow for closer assessing a Hieronian or later standard gymnasium type – if this complex ever was a clearly defined gymnasion-complex at all.

5 Akrai

Akrai also belongs to the cities that were certainly part of Hieron’s kingdom after 263 BC. A very fragmentary inscription mentioning two gymnasiarchs was found in 1814 in an unknown context and dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC, based on the lettering. The preserved fragments may have belonged to the records of gymnasiarchs.

[Ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείοῦ? τοῦ δεῖνα] 72

68 See the photo of the detached inscription in Orsi 1897, 82.
69 La Rosa 1971, 88, assumed that the arched opening of the cistern was “verosimilmente posteriore”, without giving any evidence or argument, however; it seems clearly linked with the channel system next to the staircase.
70 This requires further examination and explanation: rooms 1, 3, and 8 could only have been realistically accessible if the level of the terrain in front of them was significantly lower than today; consequently, the opening of room 2 would have been remarkably high.
71 Cf. the nearby caves with numerous niches, inscriptions and reliefs that were identified as a Heroon: La Rosa 1971, pl. XIV, 3–4.
72 The ensemble recently excavated in Cava d’Ispica shows many similarities with the complex of caves in Noto, and full publication of the first may provide further insights for evaluating the second. The two largest caves in Cava d’Ispica include rock cut benches along three walls, however, which are clearly visible on the published plan and photo; Sammito and Rizzone 2014, fig. 8 pl. IX.
The fully preserved rock cut cavities are remarkably long; of the cavities
77
In 2003, I received generous permission from G. Voza to study this room
76
Chowaniec 2014 with further literature.
75
layer of ashlars is preserved. Wilson 2013, 96 n. 48, assumes brick rib-
tion of which cavities in the rock
74
While the theater and bouleuterion of Akrai are com-
monly dated to the 3rd century BC, thus testifying to a
certain wealth and building boom under Hieron II, no
gymnasion was ever identified. Furthermore, the post-
Hieronian period of Akrai has received little attention
until recently. Since 2009, a Polish project focuses on
investigating the Roman to Byzantine periods of Akrai,
employing various non-invasive methods and excava-
tion. The project does not include the complex of in-
terest here, however, notably the so-called agora.

The area to the west of the theater and bouleuterion
was presumably excavated in the 1980s to early 2000s,
but never published beyond a rudimentary sketch. Because
of its location, west of the bouleuterion, south of the
major east-west artery of the city, the area is
commonly identified as an agora. The most remark-
able excavated feature is a round room with a diam-
ter of 10.2 m that is half cut into the rock, half built
(Figs. 12, 13, 14, 15). This room can be identified as a laconicum, a round
sweat bath, based on the following criteria: a very narrow
entrance door; a small triangular shaped anteroom with
benches; waterproof pavement and stucco; some revo-
olutionary roofing system of which cavities in the rock
cut walls as well as built walls and some terracotta frag-
ments preserved in situ in one of the cavities survive; and
typological comparisons, most notably with a similar
room in the palaistra of Solunto (Pl. 4).

Currently, 42 safely identified round sweat baths
are known from the entire Mediterranean, which were
built in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC and not yet pro-
vided with sophisticated floor- or wall heating. While
these bathing facilities were included in a remarkably
broad variety of contexts, among them public baths,
houses, clubhouses, gymnasia, and porticus-complexes,
none was ever attached to a safely identified agora. The
largest examples, with diameters of 5.9 to 9.95 m80 were
only found in gymnasia or palaistrai. Thus, the round
room of Akrai, with 10.2 m the largest of the entire list,
most likely belonged to a palaistra or gymnasium.

There are other features that support – or at least
do not contradict – this identification. The plan pub-
ished by G. Voza81 and Google Earth allow for identi-
fying some features of the excavated area. The lacon-
icum may have been situated in the southwest corner of a
building that was prominently located on or close to the
main east-west artery of the city. This street had been pro-
vided with a pavement and sidewalks in the 1st century
BC.82 The building may have included a central peristyle
courtyard with a cistern and rooms in the south and west
(Figs. 14, 15). A line of well-worked blocks is visible in
the southern part of the building, to the east of the round
room. This may have been the stylobate of a stoa, sug-
gested also by the pillars set up here (in modern times;
Fig. 15). Some rock cut rooms with fairly regular, rectan-
gular layouts opened onto this colonnade in the south.
Just north of the stylobate, a fairly large rock cut pool
may have served as a cistern; another, smaller equivalent
is visible further west, close to the entrance of the lacon-
icum (Figs. 14, 15). Rock cut steps in the western part of
the area, to the north of the round room, may have be-
longed to another stoa without or with small rooms. A
well-made niche with a molded socle in the northeastern
outer corner of the round room may have been a small
shrine or have housed an honorary monument. The rock
cut rooms remind of the situation in Neaion, but they are
much more regularly organized here and combined
with the conclusive laconicum.

While the size and plan of this complex currently
cannot be determined, the size of the laconicum suggests
that this was an ambitiously large ensemble. An area or

75 Chowaniec 2014 with further literature.
76 Voza 1999, 129–139.
77 In 2003, I received generous permission from G. Voza to study this room on site, which is most gratefully acknowledged here.
78 The fully preserved rock cut cavities are remarkably long; of the cavities cut into ashlars blocks only the lowest part survives, because only one layer of ashlars is preserved. Wilson 2013, 96 n. 48, assumes brick rib-
bing. Guards on site confirm that the entire roof was found collapsed
onto to the floor, but the evidence was never published. It must remain open whether the room was covered with the traditional conical dome or already with a half dome, which would have been revolutionary.
80 Trümper 2008, 421–426 tab. 3: diameters of round rooms in the gym-
nasia of Assos (8.43 m), Eretria (9.95 m), Solunto (6.7 m), and Thera (5.92 m).
81 Voza 1999, 131 fig. 101.
82 Voza 1999, 129–139.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site – Gymnasion (or parts of it)</th>
<th>Area in m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrigento, Paradromis / Xystos and pool</td>
<td>at least 4368 (excavated area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrai Insula/Area</td>
<td>c. 4480–4760 (hypothetically calculated size of insula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphipolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Palaistra</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Paradromis</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total</td>
<td>6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos (“Gymnasion”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Palaistra</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Stadion</td>
<td>8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total</td>
<td>11 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Palaistra</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Loutron</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Paradromis</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total</td>
<td>6950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretria, Upper Gymnasion (double palaistra)</td>
<td>2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletus, Hellenistic Gymnasion</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neaion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Rock-cut rooms</td>
<td>c. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Terrace in front of rooms (28 × 80)</td>
<td>c. 2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Palaistra</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Paradromis</td>
<td>20 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total</td>
<td>24 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Upper Terrace</td>
<td>6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Kellerstadium Area</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Middle Terrace</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Lower Terrace</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total</td>
<td>20 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solunto, Gymnasion (Palaistra)</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, Area of Altar (Porticus triplex with courtyard)</td>
<td>7117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, Quadriporticus of Roman Gymnasion</td>
<td>c. 5016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taormina, ‘Library’ peristyle courtyard with rooms on 2 terraces</td>
<td>c. 705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tab. 2 Gymnasia/palaistrai, comparison of sizes (sizes of non-Sicilian examples according to von den Hoff 2009; Ackermann and Reber in this volume).*
insula’ of about 80–85 NS × 56 EW (4480–4760 m²) is bordered by streets in the north and west, and probably also east, and by a steep cliff in the south (Fig. 12). The palaistra may not have occupied the entire 4480–4760 m², but have been bordered by shops in the north or even included a race track (in the east). It is quite clear, however, that there is not sufficient space for an additional appropriately sized agora.

A comparison with other sufficiently preserved gymnasia/palaistrai shows that an area of 4480–4760 m² would have been generously sized for a palaistra only, whereas it would have been small for a palaistra with race track. Furthermore, even the north-south extension of the area is not sufficiently long for a standard race track (Tab. 2).

Comparison with other agorai is much more difficult because comparable parameters are much harder to define. A scale to scale comparison of several Sicilian

---

83 This is suggested by the sketch in Voza 1999, 131 fig. 101: the street ran to the west of the bouleuterion, which is located on a higher level than the laconicum and surrounding features.

84 What should be included into calculations: the open courtyard, stoai, adjacent ‘appropriate’ buildings such as bouleuteria that may also be located on different terraces and not immediately on the agora?
sites demonstrates, however, that the area in Akrai would have been small for an agora compared to the overall size of the city.\footnote{Morgantina: city 78 ha; agora (square with stoai and adjacent buildings) c. 10,000 m\(^2\); Solunto: city 18 ha, agora (square with stoa) c. 2,312 m\(^2\); Akrai: city 36 ha, ‘agora’ terrain 4,480–4,760 m\(^2\); furthermore, no elements of an independent monumental stoa seem to have been found in Akrai, similar to several stoai of the agora of Morgantina and the Pi-shaped stoa of the agora in Solunto.}

In sum, it is argued here that the so-called agora of Akrai was a palaistra or even gymnasion and that the real agora should be located somewhere else, for example in the vast area to the north of the theater and main road. The crucial question of the date remains to be discussed. Currently, only typological criteria can be cited, notably the inclusion of a round sweat room, which has no safely dated parallels before the 2nd century BC. This would agree with the date of the above-mentioned inscription and the construction date of the gymnasion in Solunto, which is the closest typological comparison in Sicily.
6 Conclusion

The balance of gymnasia in eastern Sicily is disillusioning (Tab. 1). While literary and epigraphic sources testify to the existence of gymnasia from the 4th century BC onwards, not a single building survives that can safely be identified as a palaistra or gymnasion and is sufficiently preserved for assessing the typology, design, and function of this building type in eastern Sicily.

- The complexes in Syracuse are either sufficiently preserved, but not safely identifiable as a palaistra/gymnasion (peristyle courtyard next to Hieron’s altar) or not fully preserved and thus not safely identifiable (Quadriporticus of the Roman Gymnasium).

- Morgantina provides no reasonably identifiable evidence at all.

- The presumable palaistra in Megara Hyblaia is fairly well preserved, but cannot be securely recognized as a palaistra.

- It is not certain that the often cited structures in Neaiton were ever used as a clearly defined and confined palaistra/gymnasion complex. Without the inscription, the site certainly would never have been identified as a potential venue of gymnasion activities as it lacks any well-known standard features that might suggest such a function. If the caves and possible adjacent structures served for athletic training and intellectual instruction, the ‘gymnasion’ may have been a site with little elaborated features and maybe even without access control.

- Akrai was recognized here as the site with the most securely identifiable gymnasion, although no gymnasion had been identified in literature so far. Since the complex has not been completely excavated, it cannot serve to reconstruct the possible typology of gymnasia in eastern Sicily. It may have been similar, however, to the only fully known and safely identifiable palaistra of entire Sicily, notably the one in Solunto (Pl. 4), but it was certainly significantly larger.86

- None of the examples discussed here is fully published, including architecture and finds and providing a safely established chronology. In fact, dating remains a crucial problem for all examples, certainly regarding the archaeological remains and often also the inscriptions. This concerns not only the date of

86 For the palaistra of Solunto, which is commonly called ‘ginnas- sio’/gymnasion, see Cutroni Tusa 1994, 77–79; Missretta 2015; Sposito 2014, 212–219.
construction, but also the later history and point of abandonment of the complexes. Therefore, archaeology currently does not allow for assessing the development and significance of the gymnasion as an institution and building type in eastern Sicily. The many uncertainties regarding the examples discussed here render a comparative synthetic assessment of key features rather pointless. The urban context cannot be evaluated because central characteristics of the respective cities, such as the location of the agora, are unknown. Two well-known examples suggest, however, that there were no obligatory standards for the location of palaistra/gymnasia in Sicilian cities: the example in Solunto is located right next to the agora, whereas the one in Agrigento was built a significant distance away from the safely identified (upper) agora. While location certainly mattered, local conditions and particularly the availability of space will have determined the placing of gymnasia, and not ideological concepts such as a specific intraurban or suburban location or a compellingly close combination of agora and gymnasion.

Examining an easily assessable and commonly standard feature of gymnasia such as bathing facilities, only two of the examples discussed here provide conclusive evidence, notably the complex next to Hieron’s altar and the building in Akrai. The aforementioned safely identified examples, the gymnasion in Agrigento and the palaistra in Solunto, both included bathing facilities, suggesting that this was common in Sicilian athletic facilities. The lack of bathing facilities in the Quadruporicus of Syracuse and the complexes of Megara Hyblaia and Neaiton may go back to the insufficient state of excavation, preservation, and publication, but may also indicate that these were not (standard?) athletic facilities.

A stronger common denominator is the courtyard with stoai or even peristyle courtyard, included in the complexes of Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia, and Akrai, but this element is far too generic and common in many different Hellenistic building types and contexts to serve as a conclusive criterion for identifying palaistra.

Textual sources are only little more illuminating for reconstructing the appearance of gymnasia in eastern Sicily. When Plutarch mentions stoai and palaistra for the Timoleonteion in Syracuse that served as a gymnasion for the neoi, he lists elements known from Greek gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean. Plutarch is a late source, however, and his remarks cannot easily be understood. He suggests that an agora was transformed into a gymnasion, by first building Timoleon’s tomb in the agora, then surrounding the agora with stoai, and finally building palaistra within or next to the agora. This is an intriguing, yet unparalleled genesis and description of a gymnasion, which does not allow reconstructing the design of this specific gymnasion, let alone of others in and outside the city.

The gymnasia that Hieron built on his ship and elsewhere are not described in any detail. The extensive financial accounts from Tauromenion confirm that numerous agones were held and oil was used in the local gymnasion, but otherwise do not mention any expenses for the construction and maintenance of structures in the gymnasion.

Coming back to the initial question: Prag’s optimistic assumption currently cannot be corroborated by the archaeological record for the Hellenistic or even Roman period of eastern Sicily, either because gymnasia did not exist in great numbers, were not yet found, or were not recognized because they did not include designs and features common of Greek equivalents in the eastern Mediterranean; they may have been sites, equipped at best with temporary or makeshift features, rather than elaborate built complexes. If the complexes in Akrai and Syracuse were only built in the 2nd and 1st century BC and served for gymnasion activities, they would confirm Campagna’s argument.

Hieron’s building and cultural politics regarding gymnasia in Syracuse and in his realm cannot be assessed.

---

87 For example, from the examples listed in table 1, the location of the agora is only safely known in Megara Hyblaia, Morgantina, Solunto, and possibly Tauromenion, but not in Akrai, Neaiton, and Syracuse.
88 Assuming with Wilson 2012, 246–247, that the so-called lower agora is a modern fiction. For the gymnasion in Agrigento, see Fiorentini 2009.
90 As well as those in Tauromenion.
91 Emme 2013, and B. Emme in this volume.
92 Plut. Tim. 39, see above n. 11. It remains open whether this is one of several agonai in Syracuse, and whether this would have been the main or a secondary agora.
93 To name just some problems: did the stoai around the former agora serve as trace tracks; why did the complex include two or more palaistra, although Plutarch mentions only the neoi as users, and where exactly were these palaistra located in relation to the agora with stoai?
94 Athen. V 226c, 227d.
95 Cordiano 1997, 72–82.
from the archaeological record; even the structures in Neaiton should be evaluated much more cautiously than is commonly done based on a single problematic inscription. Research on gymnasia outside of Hieron’s realm, most notably in Agrigento and Solunto,96 has already shown that the gymnasium was an important institution in the Late Hellenistic period when it was included in urban building programs as a clearly defined, built feature, prestigious and in even monumental. Providing more reliable dates and information for the complexes discussed here, particularly the example in Akrai, could substantiate this picture and significantly contribute to the ongoing reevaluation of cities in Roman Sicily.

Pl. 1 Syracuse, plan of the city.
Pl. 2  Morgantina, Contrada Agnese Quarter, plan.
Pl. 3 Megara Hyblaia, ‘palaistra’, stone plan (1) and reconstructed plan (2).
Pl. 4 Solunto, Gymnasion, schematic plan.
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Greek Gymnasia for Non-Greek People. Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence in Pre-Roman Italy

Summary

Literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources testify to the presence of Greek gymnasia in pre-Roman Italy. This paper investigates the political and cultural reasons that led to the adoption of a Greek lifestyle in 'non Greek' contexts, most notably the embracing of the gymnasial ideology. Examining several case studies in two different cultural contexts, namely the Brettian city of Petelia and the Samnite cities of Abella, Pompeii, and Cuma, it is comparatively assessed how the elite of these cities negotiated Greek gymnasial ideology. It is argued that strategies ranged from fully embracing the gymnasium as both an institution and building type to selective emulation of only certain features.
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The concept of Hellenization, usually referring to the spread of Greek culture and its adoption by non-Greek people, has been often used incorrectly. As Mario Lombardo has recently pointed out, scholars usually have adopted the notion to describe people as a passive object of an external process (we often read that people have been Hellenized), in contrast with the original meaning of the verb ‘ellenizein’. In fact, this verb is intransitive and means firstly ‘to speak Greek’, but in a wider sense to adopt and show Greek practices or cultural elements, as the consequence of a selective reception.¹

Among the most typical features of Hellenic culture, athleticism penetrates the early Etruscan andItalic society. While there are no literary testimonies about the existence of athletic competitions in pre-Roman Italy, a rich series of figurative monuments, the majority from funerary contexts, demonstrates the execution of games during the burial ceremonies of prominent people.² The ideology and the values connected to athleticism were adopted by the Italic aristocracies already during the 6th and 5th century BC, as shown by an extraordinary discovery, notably the tomb of the so-called Warrior of Lanuvium (Fig. 1).³

The tomb, dug into tuff stone, revealed a peperino sarcophagus including a rich panoply and a complete gymnastic set: three alabastra (one is missing today), two iron strigils, a leather pouch for sand and a bronze discus finely engraved. The association of these different categories of objects implies a complex ideology based on the Italic military tradition, which is at the same time, however, strongly influenced by Greek cultural models.

Athleticism and sport practice exercised a deep influence on the imagination of the Etruscan and Italic peoples for a long time. Therefore, during the Hellenistic period the number of products for body care increased significantly. For example, the diffusion of strigils reached high levels in funerary contexts.⁴ Often realized in terracotta, they were used for their symbolic meaning rather than their practical function. Similarly, figurative decorations of candelabra, mirrors and fine pottery were inspired by athletic competitions and life in the palaestra.⁵

In conclusion, in ancient Italy the adoption of the Greek gymnasium was one of the most common tools for becoming Greek, in addition to the adoption of the language, the social behaviors and the material culture. In many cases, this phenomenon can also include the appropriation of the typical Greek institution connected with the paideia, such as the Gymnasium. The modalities and the aims, both political and cultural, that justified this choice varied and must be evaluated individually, as they depend on the contexts.

This paper examines several case studies in two different cultural contexts, notably the Brettian city of Petelia and the Samnite cities of Abella, Pompeii, and Cuma. It will be comparatively assessed how the elite of these cities adopted the concept of the Greek Gymnasium, whether they fully embraced the gymnasium as both an institution and building type, or selectively emulated only certain features.⁶

---

¹ Lombardo 2006.
² For an overview on the topic, see Thuillier 1985; Thuillier 1995; Guzzo 2006. In addition, see the papers gathered in Thuillier 1993.
³ On the tomb see Zevi 1993 with further bibliography.
⁴ See Thuillier 1989. For the presence of strigils in graves as a sign of Hellenization in Campania see Johannowsky 1976, 169.
⁵ See, for example, the materials gathered in Bianco 2002; Bruschetti 2002.
1 A gymnasium of the Brettii: Petelia

In pre-Roman Italy, the testimonies of gymnasia in non-Greek contexts are few, and they deserve special attention. The most ancient example was identified in the Brettian center of Petelia, the modern Strongoli on the Ionian coast of Calabria, near Croton. Since the 18th century a Greek inscription has been known, dated to the 3rd/2nd century BC, that records the construction of a stoa pertaining to the local gymnasia under the gymnasiarchy of the brothers Minatos Krittios Matilas and Markos Krittios, both sons of Minatos. The works were funded by koina chremata, public money. The binomial shape of the onomastic formula, typical of theItalic tradition, reveals the Oscan origin of the two brothers. The presence of the gymnasiarchy, strongly linked to the ephebeia, shows that the education of the youths at Petelia followed the model of the Greek paideia.

At the time of the inscription, theItalic aristocracy of Petelia desired to present their city as a Greek polis. Greek identity was created through a foundation myth that linked the origins of the city to the Greek hero Philoctetes. Additionally, the use of Greek in public and private inscriptions provides important evidence.

The Osco-Greek bilingualism of the Bruttii is known also thanks to a gloss by Festus. The author explains the expression bilingues Bruttaces, ascribed to Ennius, and says that the Bruttian people used to speak both Oscan and Greek. Another element that testifies the cultural interactions between Greeks and Bruttii in Petelia is the inclusion of the city in the lists of the theodorokoi of Epidaurus (ca. 350 BC), of Kos (242 BC) and Delphi (198–194 BC).

In spite of this deep Hellenization, the Bruttii were perceived as barbarians by Greek people. According to Livy, during the Second Punic War, the Carthagian general Hannon suggested to the Crotonians to repopulate their destroyed city with a Bruttian colony; the Crotonians, however, refused and answered that they would prefer to die, rather than mix with the Bruttii.

2 The Gymnasia of the Samnites

2.1 Abella

Another case study, in a different geographic and cultural context, is Abella, the modern Avella. This Oscan center, located between Hirpinian Samnium and Campania, also provided a gymnasium in the 2nd century BC, as proven by an inscribed base found in 1984 near the Forum. The inscription mentions Mauius Vestirikius, a local magistrate already known from other inscriptions (i.e. the Cippus Abellanus), as sponsor of some urban ornaments. He offered several objects that belong to a homogeneous group: segunu perissty (translated as statues in the peristyle), batrum tuvffud (a tuff base), and bravus (probably corresponding to Latin brutus). Mario Torelli convincingly argued that bravus was a stone Telamon, the support of a table (trapeza) used in award ceremonies.

All the objects listed in the inscription fit well with the equipment of a gymnasium. Scholars agree in translating the Oscan term perissty with the Greek peristylon; this grecism has been used to refer to a Greek-type building, such as a gymnasium or palaestra.

2.2 Pompeii

A different example comes from Oscan Pompeii, where we have a gymnasium with its decoration. This building, the so-called Samnite Palaestra, is located in the Quarter courtyard and surrounding rooms).
of the Theaters and is strongly linked with the Sanctuary of Athena at the Foro Triangolare.\textsuperscript{21} The building consists of a central rectangular courtyard, surrounded by porticoes on three sides only (Pl. 1).

Based on archaeological excavations and architectural features, the building has been dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC (Pl. 2. 1).\textsuperscript{22}

The asymmetric plan results from modifications carried out after the earthquake of AD 62. At this point, the fourth side of the peristyle was removed, reducing the size of the building by a quarter (Pl. 2. 2).

In this last phase, three small rooms opened on the west side: in the northern room, the traces of a staircase prove the existence of a second floor. Thanks to the new drawings by the architect Luigi Tricarico, it is possible to distinguish two different phases.\textsuperscript{23} Originally, there was a single room opened on the peristyle. This room looks like an exedra and can be identified with the ephebeum that, according to Vitruvius (Vitr. 11.2), was the largest and most important room of the palaestra,\textsuperscript{24} intended for meetings and the education of the youth. The current shape of this exedra, subdivided by an L-shape wall, is the result of a Neronian intervention.\textsuperscript{25}

Evidence of sculptural decoration was discovered in the peristyle: a tuff base with a small altar and a staircase, one of the best-preserved copies of the so-called Doryphoros of Polykleitos;\textsuperscript{26} a marble basin with a support, which has now disappeared. It might also be that a couple of herms in Cipollino marble, walled up in the Sacrarium of the adjacent Iseum, belonged to the sculptural decoration of the building.\textsuperscript{27} According to excavation diaries, several inscriptions, most of them lost, were found in the building,\textsuperscript{28} among them the famous Oscan inscription Vetter 11.\textsuperscript{29} This inscription records the will of Vibius Adiranus, who funded the local vereiia. With his bequest, the quaestor (kvaistur) Vibius Vinicius, with the cooperation of the Town Council (kumbennieis), constructed this public building (tribium ekak).

This inscription provides a key element to explaining the word vereiia. The term appears only in Oscan epigraphic evidence and, therefore, the vereiia seems to have been an entirely Italic institution. Recently, it has been argued that the vereiia was the Italic equivalent of the Greek ephebeia and of the Latin iuventus.\textsuperscript{30} Ephebeia and iuventus were known as institutions presiding over the rites of passages between childhood and adulthood. Previously, this interpretation was neglected in the scholarly debate and, for a long time, scholars preferred the idea that the vereiia was the Samnite cavalry, as suggested by A. La Regina.\textsuperscript{31}

2.3 Cuma

New evidence to support this hypothesis comes from Cuma, a city of Greek origin but conquered by the Samnites in 421 BC. It is interesting to observe that, after the conquest of the city, the Samnites adopted some Hellenic traditions, such as the education system that followed the model of the Greek paideia. Since the 4th century BC, the transformation of the funerary practices reveals that the Cuman society adopted funeral customs with a reference to the Greek gymnasion.\textsuperscript{32} In the composition of the funeral sets, the strigil appeared for the first time in association with balsamaria and unguentaria.\textsuperscript{33} In the 3rd century BC, the weapons disappeared and strigils continued to be used, often with suspension rings, symbol of athletic and military training of the dead.\textsuperscript{34}

This social importance of athletic training is also reflected in the construction of a stadium recently dis-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} For new considerations about the cults in this sanctuary, see with different positions Osanna 2015; Avagliano 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{22} For the chronology of the building see Carandini, Carafa, and D’Alessio 2001, 122, 127; Carafa 2005, 31–35.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Tricarico 2013.
\item \textsuperscript{24} In Vitruvius, this word refers to the whole gymnasium. Instead, in Greek period palaestra was only a part of the building, including the peristyle with the rooms for athletic training. For the debate on this topic, see Petteno 1999.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Carafa 2005, 31–35.
\item \textsuperscript{26} For a reinterpretation of this sculpture with a shield and a sword, respectively carried on the left and right hand, see Franciosi 2004.
\item \textsuperscript{27} As suggested in Pesando 2000, 168.
\item \textsuperscript{28} On the inscriptions found in the building, see Avagliano 2013, 73–75.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Vetter 1953, 49–50 n. 11; Morandi 1982, 123–124 n. 27; Poccetti 1982.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Camodeca 2012, 243–244; Avagliano 2013, 94–101.
\item \textsuperscript{31} La Regina 1981.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Greco 2015, 354.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Valenza Mele 1990, 26–27.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Valenza Mele 1990, 26–27.
\end{itemize}
covered near the Cuman city walls (3rd/2nd century BC). Between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st BC, on one of the bleachers of the building a tribunal composed by two platforms was constructed, probably meant to host the panel of judges and award ceremony of the athletes. On the superior platform a base with an inscription was placed, probably supporting a bronze tripod, which has disappeared today. The inscription (second half of the 2nd century BC) mentions Mauis Calovius, whose title m.tr. inim m.x is generally read as meddix vereias, the ‘magistrate of the vereia’, and ‘meddix decem’ a member of a collegium of ten people, whose functions are not clear. He dedicated a statue (segnum) to a God, whose name is only partially preserved. According to Giuseppe Camodeca, it is possible to make out Pid-, probably for the Latin God Fidius.

Another location connected to the vereia is that of the Central Baths of Cuma, where an inscribed labrum of Pentelic marble dedicated by a meddix vereias was discovered in 1975. The presence of this kind of furniture in thermal space is relevant. It is not possible to clarify whether the labrum that dates to between the end of the 3rd and the 2nd century BC belonged to the original decoration of the baths, which were built at the beginning of the 2nd century BC. In any case, the labrum was included in the baths, when the building was renovated in the Augustan age. In this period, at least, the Central Baths might have also been frequented by members of the vereia. It is perhaps of interest to recall that also at Pompeii a connection between the Republican Baths and the Samnite Palaestra, headquarters of the vereia, has been hypothesized, due to the proximity of the buildings.

Cuma is the city with the richest epigraphic corpus of the vereia. In addition to the cases already discussed, we must mention: firstly, the cocciopesto floor of the Forum temple (later the Capitolium) containing an inscription with the name of the meddix vereias Minius Heius, son of Paccius, belonging to the gens Heia (like the person who donated the labrum); secondly, an inscribed base with the dedication of a statue to Jupiter Flagius on behalf of the local vereia (pro vereiadi), by an unknown meddix vereias.

The wide range of interventions reveals that this institution, directed by the local aristocracy, played an important role in civic life between the 3rd and the 2nd century BC. In this period Cuma was already integrated into the Roman political system, raised to the status of civitas sine suffragio in 334 BC (Livy VIII 14.11). Therefore, Rome could have played a role in the revival of vereia. This hypothesis is based on the cases of Petelia, Naples, Elea-Velia and many centers in Sicily, where gymnasial institutions were revived under Roman rule. In the case of Elea-Velia, for example, Cornelius Gemellius of the tribe Romilia was gymnasiarch on three occasions, as recorded in a Latin inscription that dates to the 1st century BC. In the Roman period gymnasial institutions seems to have been used as instruments to reinforce the loyalty ofItalic allies. In this perspective the buildings linked with Vereia (the Oscan equivalent of ephebeia), both at Pompeii and Cuma, acquired a special interest, still in Roman period. At Pompeii, in spite of the construction of the Great Palaestra, a new modern building for the local iuventus, the old Samnite Palaestra was totally refurbished in the Augustan period. At a certain point, the Central Baths of Cuma, recently renovated, included a labrum funded by a member of vereia.

35 Giglio 2015, on the chronology see in particular 82–83.
36 Giglio 2015.
37 Camodeca 2012. According to the scholar, the text is: ma(lis) kalavis úfisal(eis) m(eddis) v(ereias) inim m(eddis) x ekik segnum pid[-][—]d[-] + ú[dunúm] dedens. Translation: Mauis Calovius, son of Offelius, meddix of the vereia, dedens. Translation: (onomastic formula lost) meddix of the vereias ínim m(eddís) x ekik se[–]únúm iúveí flagiúí pr. vereiiad duneís.
38 On this problem see more recently Camodeca 2012, 241–242 with previous debate.
39 Camodeca 2012, 241; see also Giglio 2015, 70. According to Camodeca, probably the Latin P stands for Latin E.
40 Sgobo 1977, 256–257 pl. X-XI; Volpicella 2006–2007, 213–214 fig. 15. The inscription reads as follows: ma. heíis de(kkieís) m(eddís) v(ereias) inim m(eddis) x ekik fliteam emmens. Translation: Ma(mercus) Heius, son of Decius, meddix of the vereia and decemvir, bought this labrum.
41 For the phases of the building, see Volpicella 2006–2007.
42 See also Gasparri 2008, 302.
44 Sgobo 1977, 249 pl. IX; Poccetti 1981, 96–97, n. 133. The inscription says: min(is) heíis pak(seis) m(eddis) v(ereias) inim m(eddis) x ekik pavmentúm úpsannúm dedens. Translation: Minius Heius, son of Paccius, and the meddix of the vereia and decemvir, commissioned the construction of this floor. Based on recent excavations (see Petacco and Rescigno 2007, 82–81, 99), this floor has been dated to the first half of 2nd century BC.
45 Poccetti 1981, 95–96 n. 132. The text says: — 8/10 — mr. m(eddis) v(ereias) inim m(eddis) x ekik se[–]únim iúveí flagiúí pr. vereiiad duneís dedens. Translation: (onomastic formula lost) meddix of the vereia and decemvir gave this statue as a gift to Jupiter Flagius on behalf of the vereia. Scholars agree that the inscription date to the 2nd century BC.
46 Ampolo 2008, 27. For Sicilian cases, see Prag 2007, 87–96.
47 Greco 2011–2013, 358.
3 Conclusion

In conclusion, although in pre-Roman Italy only few gymnasia can be identified in non-Greek contexts, these are very significant. The spread of the gymnasia institution took place within a specific time span (3rd–2nd century BC), characterized by a global process of Hellenization in the Western Mediterranean. It is not surprising that the phenomenon is parallel to the success of an aristocratic ideology that recognized the value of athletics as a status symbol. However, the approach to this foreign model took different forms. On the one hand, there is Petelia, for a long time in the Crotonian orbit that fully absorbed the gymnasia institution. On the other hand, there is the Samnite world, where, despite a certain degree of Hellenization, the traditional institution of *vereia* was maintained and the adoption of Greek elements was limited to the types of building and their sculptural decoration.
Pl. 1 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, plan.
Pl. 2 1 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, axonometric reconstruction of building in the Samnite period; 2 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, axonometric reconstruction of the building after AD 62.
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Gymnasium, Palaestra, Campus and Bathing in Late Hellenistic Pompeii: A Reassessment of the Urban Context of the Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36)

Summary

The Foro Triangolare area is commonly identified as the site of an athletic-military complex of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii. While the denomination (gymnasium, campus, palaestra of the vereiia) and extension of this complex are debated, the Republican Baths are unanimously interpreted as an integral conceptual and functional part of it. This paper critically re-assesses this assumption, based on recent research in the Republican Baths (Topoi C-6-8 project, 2015–2017). It is argued that the highly fashionable Republican Baths with their separate sections for men and women were not conceived at public initiative for exclusive use by Samnite male and female youths, but instead were built in the 2nd century BC by a private person as a profitable business investment for a broad paying clientele.
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The area of the Foro Triangolare in Pompeii in the Pre-Roman period, thus before 82 BC, is often identified as a complex of complementary buildings that were closely connected with athletic and military activities. Therefore, the complex would have served as a predecessor of the Great Palaestra in Pompeii, built in the Augustan period. Samnite youths, assembled in the vereia, would have trained in the Foro Triangolare complex, whereas the Roman equivalent, the iuventus, later would have frequented the Great Palaestra. While not all scholars agree upon the extension of the athletic-military compound, a maximum list of buildings that have been assigned to it includes: the Foro Triangolare with a three-sided covered race-track (porticus) and a single open-air race-track in the east; the Quadriporticus behind the Great Theater, serving as a gymnasion for older youths; the Palaestra Sannitica used as training site for young boys or the vereia in general; a building adjacent to the Foro Triangolare, either the lot VIII 6,5 or the Casa di Giuseppe II (VIII 2, 38–39), identified as the Domus Publica where military census and levy actions, especially of equestrians, took place and a selected group of soldiers stayed; and the Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36), a typical public Roman-style bath building with separate sections for men and women (Pl. 1).1

The whole complex or some of its individual elements have variously been referred to as palaestra, gymnasion, and campus, and comparisons have been drawn with palaestrae and gymasia in the Greek Hellenistic world as well as with campi in the western Mediterranean (Italy and Roman provinces).

All of these structures of the Pompeian complex have, at some point, been dated to the 2nd century BC, even if the construction date of crucial features is not unanimously agreed upon. The contemporaneity or the exact chronological sequence of these structures cannot be determined, however. While the buildings do not form a coherent architectural ensemble and are even separated by streets and located at different levels, functional coherence is still assumed, suggesting some kind of urban master plan that transformed a formerly sparsely built area into a densely built athletic-military complex.2 The complex would have developed at the margins of the walled city, but in close vicinity of an important Archaic cult site, notably the sanctuary of Minerva (and possibly Hercules).3

Even if the precise identity and importance of the main users of this complex, the Pompeian vereia, remain debated, most recently it has been defined as a public institution with military vocation that was headed by a magistrate and that was equivalent to the Attic ephebeia and the Latin iuventus.4 In the Samnite period, members of the vereia would have been granted sole use of at least three of the buildings, namely the Domus Publica, the Palaestra Sannitica, and the Republican Baths.5 It is commonly not discussed, however, how access to and circulation in the other spaces of the complex could be controlled, whether any of them could have been closed off, at least temporarily, for exclusive use by training athletes.6

The question of users arises particularly for the Republican Baths that include two separate sections, one of them commonly assigned to women, which seems to be at odds with the concept of a male-dominated urban area. Noticing this alleged contradiction, F. Pesando has argued that the Samnites provided athletic training and subsequent bathing for both aristocratic boys and girls. While nothing is concretely known about the cultural practices and habits of the population in Late Hellenistic Pompeii, the Samnites in general would have had a particular cultural affinity to Spartans, sharing with them certain progressive concepts of social behavior and of the role of women.7 This is quite critical though with

---

1 The discussion was most recently summarized by De Waele 2001, 328–332; Borlenghi 2011, 217–219; and Avagliano 2013 with full bibliography; for military use of the complex see especially Pesando 1997; Pesando 2000; Pesando 2002–2003, 239–245; Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010, 149–154, esp. 153; Coarelli 2001, 102; Carafa 2011, 98 n. 36; Avagliano 2013, 84 n. 87.
2 This central question is only explicitly discussed by Pesando 2002–2003, 240 n. 47, who assumes public initiative at least for the buildings with military connotation. The only buildings predating the 2nd century BC are the Doric Temple, dated to 6th century BC, and possibly the Great Theater, whose origins are sometimes dated to the Samnite era, although it would have been completely rebuilt in the 2nd century BC.
3 Avagliano 2016; Avagliano 2017 strongly argued against a veneration of Hercules in the Foro Triangolare.
4 Avagliano 2013, 94–101, esp. 101 with detailed discussion; slightly different e.g. Coarelli 2002, 81: politisch-militärische Adelsorganisation (equites Campani).
5 Most emphatically argued by Pesando 2000; Pesando 2002–2003; but followed e.g. by Avagliano 2013, 82.
6 The propylon of the Foro Triangolare could be closed with two doors, but the area was also accessible from the east, via the Great Theater and the Quadriporticus; De Waele 2001, 318 fig. 413.
7 This is only discussed in Pesando 2002–2003, 241–242; it is not mentioned any further by Borlenghi 2011, 217–219, and Avagliano 2007; Avagliano 2013.
view to the supposed military character of the whole complex, and one wonders why spatial segregation only would have been implemented in the baths, but not in any other facility ascribed to the complex.

The Republican Baths are particularly critical to the theory of an athletic-military complex. While attribution of some of its elements has recently been challenged, the central trio of Domus Publica, Palaestra Sannitica, and Republican Baths is firmly maintained as conclusive evidence of the existence of a socially exclusive vereia in Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii. It is the aim of this paper to reassess the urban context and significance of the Republican Baths, as well as the theory of a coherent athletic-military complex or of the gymnasium-campus. The argument is based upon recent research of this little known bath building that investigates the history, development, function, and urban context of the lot VIII 5, 36. In the following, each of the structures assigned to the athletic-military complex is briefly discussed, providing an assessment of recent research and remaining problems and questions. Focus is on the Pre-Roman, Late Hellenistic period when the complex was presumably designed, whereas the development in later periods is only mentioned when relevant for the argumentation. Furthermore, buildings, which are located in this quarter, but have no immediate connection to or function with the athletic-military complex must be omitted. The conclusion will show that the Republican Baths cannot substantiate the theory of an athletic-military complex and should be taken from the list of safe proofs.

1 Foro Triangolare

The use of the three-sided porticus as a covered race-track – either only of its eastern branch or of all three sides, turning twice somewhat awkwardly around the corner – cannot not be proven nor refuted. The most conclusive evidence seems to be a low north-south oriented wall that runs parallel to the eastern porticus and delineates an open-air corridor of about 7 m width (Fig. 1).

While this wall has been identified as a temenos boundary, there are no corresponding walls on the other three sides of the open square around the Doric temple, which would efficiently close off the entire sacred area. The wall comes very close to the temple, especially its south-east corner, and the open race-track would have impeded accessibility to the temple from the east, but it includes at least one opening right next to the south-east corner of the temple. With view to the location and orientation of the temple, the wall and adjacent eastern portico seem like a compromise, severely limiting the temple and structures in front of it (tholos, altars), while clearly regulating any kind of movement that occurred in the area around the temple.

The potential use of the Foro Triangolare for athletic training crucially depends upon the dating of its various structures. Based on the material, typology, and style of the Doric tufa colonnade and on the notion of a monumentalizing program for the entire quarter, the porticoes traditionally have been dated to the 2nd century BC. Excavations in the eastern portico and the northwestern corner of the portico yielded findings that provoked the reconstruction of a significantly different scenario. From about 135 BC to AD 62, the area would only have been bordered by the low wall in the east and by a series of small rooms (tabernae) in the north that opened to the temenos in the south. The porticoes and Ionic propylon would only have been erected after AD 62 when the area was definitely no longer used for any athletic purposes. A compromise between the two different dates – 2nd century BC versus post AD 62 – was briefly discussed, dating the tabernae to about 130–100 BC and a first portico, of which no trace survives except for its later reused architectural elements, to about 100 BC. This was, however, obviously quickly abandoned in favor of the late date of the portico.
Since the soundings have never been fully published, including all of the conclusive data, no informed decision can be made at this point.  

In general, the traditional dating of the porticoes in the (late) 2nd century BC seems more reasonable; even if not necessarily contemporaneous, Palaestra and porticoes seem to belong to the same concept because otherwise the orientation of the west wall of the Palaestra would be hard to explain: it is not parallel with or perpendicular to the other external walls of the Palaestra and of the adjacent Iseum, but instead follows the orientation of the east portico of the Foro Triangolare. If an Oscan inscription that records the dedication of a porticus (or pastas?) by the meddix publicus V. Popidius V. (f.) referred to the three-sided portico or entrance portico of the Foro Triangolare, as tentatively proposed by Pesando, this would confirm construction of these structures before 80 BC. The inscribed limestone block of this entrance were heavily restored after the Second World War, the entrance is commonly assigned to the original building; see Tricarico 2013, 55 n. 8. Ongoing excavations by the Soprintendenza under direction of Massimo Osanna, which among others concern the western porticus of the Foro Triangolare, may clarify the debate on the chronology of the Foro and its porticoes.

In the sections of the walls of the Palaestra, Tricarico 2013, pls. III, IV, IX, X, several colors are differentiated and linked with US numbers, but a legend explaining the meaning of these colors is missing; while all four walls include red at the bottom of the visible wall, no chronological conclusions can be drawn from this: the currently visible east wall certainly goes back to a later remodeling. That at least the west wall was completely rebuilt down to the foundation, as argued based on recent excavations in Carafa 2005, can also not be deduced from Tricarico 2013; see, however, Hoffmann 1993, 83–87, who, based on an assessment of the standing walls, argued for a major remodeling of the north, west, and south walls of the Palaestra Sannitica in the Augustan or Tiberian period.
was found out of context, however, and its shape does not allow for safely reconstructing its placement in either portico. In sum, construction of the porticoes of the Foro Triangolare in the Imperial period, which must still be comprehensively substantiated, would seriously challenge the notion of a large athletic-military complex in this quarter. A Late Hellenistic date of the porticoes would make it possible, but by no means prove that the Samnite youths trained here.

2 Palaestra Sannitica (VIII 7, 29)

While there is some debate regarding the function of the Palaestra Sannitica, most scholars agree that this building was used for military-athletic training by the Samnite youths, the vereia (Fig. 2).

Construction of the building is generally dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC, and recently stratigraphic and epigraphic evidence has been cited to substantiate and further refine this date. As argued above, the design of the external walls of this building suggests that it was conceived and possibly built in close connection with the porticoes of the Foro Triangolare.

Three major reasons have been cited to support the identification of the building as a palaestra:

- A marble statue of the Doryphoros whose original location cannot be safely reconstructed and whose date is debated in scholarship, ranging from the 2nd century BC to the early Imperial period. With view to the material, marble from Luni, and style, A. Avagliano has recently favored a date in the Tiberian period.

- A stone statue that was set up on a well-preserved base, which was combined with a staircase and an altar. This statue, which obviously received special ceremonies and honors (crowning, sacrifice), is not preserved. While the ensemble is made of tufa, it is not original to the building because the staircase is set on top of a drainage channel.

- An honorary statue of Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus, of which only the base was found. While this person lived in the early 1st century AD and seems to have financed major urban remodeling processes and been honored for this, the statue in the Palaestra Sannitica was set up again (reposuit), probably after damages in AD 62.

In sum, none of the known statues can safely be assigned to the original building and serve to determine the (original) function of the building. A Doryphoros statue set up in a later (Tiberian?) period could only be cited as evidence for an athletic use of the original building, assuming that the function of the building did not change, e.g. after 80 BC or in the Augustan period.

The second reason is a famous Oscan dedicatory building inscription that was found in the building in 1797. This inscription is written on a limestone slab (0.41 × 0.76 × 0.035 m) and documents that

Vibius Adiranus, son of Vibius, gave in his will money to the Pompeian vereia; with this money, Vibius Vinicius, son of Maras, Pompeian quaestor, dedicated the construction of this building (presumably the Palaestra Sannitica, note of author) by decision of the senate.

---

16 Pesando 2002–2003, 259 n. 45; Vetter 1953, 50–51 no. 13; Rix 2002, 104 Po 5; Crawford 2011b, 651–652 Pompei 9. This is a slab framed with cyma reversa moldings on all four sides, 0.59 m long, 0.245 m high, 0.065 m thick, which does not fit well into the architrave or frieze of a portico.

17 Carafa 2005, 25, 31, argues that the Palaestra Sannitica was built before the above-mentioned tabernae, which, in turn, were built between 130 and ca. 100 BC; Carafa 2011, 95–98, assigns the Palaestra to the phase of 130–100 BC. A trench excavated in the north portico of the Palaestra Sannitica showed that the northern external wall was built on a battuto of 130–100 BC. Di Maio, Giugliano, and Rispoli 2008. Crawford 2011b, 657, and McDonald 2012, 12, argue that the famous vereia inscription (see below) was original to the building and carved only after 123 BC because the formula would reflect Roman legislation of the period of C. Gracchus and later; thus, 123 BC would be a terminus post quem for the construction of the Palaestra.

18 Avagliano 2013, 72.

19 CIL X, 851; Pesando 2000, 171. For the statues in detail Avagliano 2013, who convincingly argues that the copy of the Doryphoros could not have been set up on the preserved ensemble of base, staircase, and altar. Cf. also R. Henzel and M. Trümper in this volume. Pesando 2000, 168, suggests that two herms dedicated by Decidianus Rufus may have been set up in the Palaestra Sannitica in the Augustan period. Since these were not found in this building, but in the adjacent Temple of Isis, they will not be taken into account here.
and the same man approved it.\textsuperscript{20}

The precise find spot of this inscription, which was either found inserted into a wall or just placed at the foot of or close to a wall, can no longer safely be determined. Thus, it is debated whether this inscription really belonged to this building, was included in this building in a visible and meaningful way, or whether it was simply stored or reused as convenient building material here. There is also no agreement when this inscription was carved. While the text and dedication as such are always attributed to the 2nd century BC, some argue that the preserved slab is a later copy of the lost Samnite original, whereas others identify it as a genuine inscription of the late 2nd century BC.\textsuperscript{21} Ironically, those who favor an early date, challenge the common belief that the inscription refers to the dedication of its very find spot, the Palaestra Sannitica.\textsuperscript{22} While an early date of the inscription seems to be compatible with the material as well as epigraphic and linguistic criteria, and is, indeed, much more attractive from a cultural and historical point of view, the secondary random reuse of this inscription in this building is an unlikely lectio difficilior.\textsuperscript{23} The convex rounded moldings at the top edge of the inscribed slab, which M. H. Crawford identified as remains of two

\textsuperscript{20} v(ibeis) aadirans v(ibeis) eitiuvam paam / vereiiai pumpaiana tristaa-
/ mentud deded eñak eitiuvad / v(ibeis) vëníkkis m(airbeis) kwaistur
pum-p / aiains triiibüm eak küümbei / niëis tanginud ëpsannam / deded
ïsïlum prufatted. Text according to Crawford 2011b, 656–658 Pompei
24; translation McDonald 2012, 3; see also Vetter 1953, 49 no. 11 who
lists travertine as material; Rix 2002, 104 Po 3; Avagliano 2013, 74 n. 29.
\textsuperscript{21} The argument is summarized in McDonald 2012, and Avagliano 2013,
74.
\textsuperscript{22} Crawford 2011b, 657; McDonald 2012.
\textsuperscript{23} Expertise and interest of epigraphers versus archaeologists seem to clash
here. That the inscription did not necessarily belong to this building and
was only reused here as a mere convenient building block or at best as
a meaningless decorative feature, as suggested by McDonald 2012, 5–6,
seems somewhat far-fetched. This argumentation is based on the assess-
ment of this building in rather general Anglophone literature (Richard-
son 1988; Laurence 1994; Beard 2008); none of the many recent Italian
publications that deal specifically with this building and quarter is re-
ferred to.
Avagliano 2007, 154-155 n. 73–74, argues that the material of this in-
scription, travertine, would be unusual for a 2nd century BC date. Craw-
ford 2011b, 656 lists limestone for this inscription as well as for several
other Oscan inscriptions that are safely dated to the 2nd century BC (and
whose material Vetter 1953 commonly identifies as travertine); see, e.g.,
Crawford 2011b, 628–629 Pompei 8; 631 Pompei 9; 634 Pompei 11; 635
Pompei 12; 637 Pompei 15; 644 Pompei 17; 645 Pompei 18; 647 Pompei
19; 648 Pompei 20; there is even a sundial of marble with an Oscan in-
scription, found in the Stabian Baths and commonly dated to the second
half of the 2nd century BC; Crawford 2011b, 650 Pompei 21.
lions’ paws, may indicate that the inscription was originally set up in some spectacular, unusual way and with some additional decorative elements above it (such as a lion carved in relief?), but the shallow thickness of the slab (3.5 cm) suggests that it was always attached to a wall or a base. Thus, it may serve to date the construction of the building and testify to continuous, if again probably modified use and importance of the building from the late 2nd century BC to AD 79. The only reference to a possible function of the building is the mentioning of the vereia, however, that obviously ceased to be important after 80 BC.

The third reason for identifying this building as a palaestra is the plan, which, most recently, was reconstructed with a rectangular peristyle courtyard and just three rooms on its western side: a central exedra, flanked by two small rooms, whose north-south extension correlates with that of the northern and southern porticoes. Since one of the side rooms presumably served as a secondary entrance, this would have left two rooms of ca. 14 and 28 m² for activities performed in the building.

In order to support the palaestra-theory, Avagliano recently compared the plan of the Palaestra Sannitica with that of other palaestrae in the eastern Mediterranean, notably the so-called Hellenistic Gymnasium in Miletus (2nd century BC), the Palaestra of the Lake in Delos (3rd century BC), and the so-called Gymnasium of the Academy in Athens (probably late Antique period). Apart from the fact that all of these buildings are much larger and, above all, have more rooms than the Palaestra Sannitica, the reconstruction and function of the examples in Miletus and Athens have recently been challenged. Arguments cited to deconstruct the palaestra-theory are the long rectangular plans of the peristyle courtyards, the shape and (reduced) number of rooms, and particularly the lack of bathing facilities.

If the Republican Baths served as a substitute for the lacking bathing facilities, as unanimously argued, both buildings must have been conceived and built together or the Republican Baths must have been older. Both scenarios cannot be proven, as will be shown below. Even if the Republican Baths may, at some point, have been used by those who frequented the Palaestra Sannitica, nothing suggests any exclusive connection between the two buildings. That athletes would have had to cross a major thoroughfare, moving from the Palaestra to the baths, seems like a makeshift solution, at best. Furthermore, the baths probably provided a small colonnaded courtyard for light training, suggesting that they functioned independently and (also) served a clientele that had not trained in the Palaestra Sannitica. Finally, and most crucially, the combination of an independent athletic facility for training youths with a public bath that provided heated relaxing bathing forms is without comparison in the Mediterranean world of 2nd and early 1st century BC. The combination of military-athletic exercise and bathing in warm water was considered taboo and decadent for a long time in the Greek world, because it would have rendered young men effeminate, and it did not become popular before the late 1st century BC or even only 1st century AD. This notion and plan, Tricarico 2013, 215 pl. II, does not show any remains of a staircase.

24 Crawford 2011b, 656–657.
25 Vetter 1953, 49 no. 11; recent assessment of the exterior walls of the Palaestra shows that the east wall was much more heavily restored in modern times than the other three walls and might have housed the inscription when the Palaestra was excavated; Tricarico 2013, pls. III–XI. For the remodeling of the Palaestra, see below.
26 De Waele 2001, 316–317 pls. 40–41; Tricarico 2013, 220–221, fig. XIII, provides only an axonometric reconstruction, but no reconstructed plan. Peristyle courtyard: 17.55 × 32.35 m; northwestern room: 3.16 × 4.74 m; central exedra: 8.95 × 3.16 m. Old plans, e.g. Coarelli 2001, 103 fig. 10 (after Mazois), show a staircase with two flights in the northwestern corner room, but no trace of this survives today, and the most recent state
27 For Miletus, Emme 2013, 59–63; with critical remarks, however, in Trumper 2015. For the gymnasium of the Academy, Caruso in this volume; the Palaestra of the Lake in Delos is now even identified as the Gymnasium known from inscriptions of the 3rd century BC (Bruneau et al. 2005, 242 n. 76) but its reconstructed original plan is provided with a loutron and at least five rooms on three sides of the peristyle courtyard; Delorme 1960, pl. XV fig. 28.
28 Trumper 2015. The fluted support of a labrum, made of Pentelic marble and decorated with an Oscan dedicatory inscription of a meddix of the vereia, was found in or close to the Central Baths in Cumae that...
struct separation is confirmed by research on campi in the western Mediterranean, especially Italy: campi mentioned in inscriptions and identified (more or less safely) in the archaeological record were never combined with a Roman-type bath and warm bathing facilities, but only with cold water piscinae.\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, it would be very strange, if the Palaestra Sannitica, as a Palaestra, and the Republican Baths had ever been linked intentionally and conceptually. At least, such a concept could not be traced back to the influence of Greek-Hellenistic gymnasia or of Roman campi, but it would have to be identified as an idiosyncrasy of Samnite Pompeii.

Alternatively, one could hypothesize that the Palaestra Sannitica in its original phase included simple washing facilities, such as a labrum set up in the courtyard that could be filled with water from a nearby well or cistern, e.g. in the Foro Triangolare. A labrum was apparently found next to the main entrance when the Palaestra Sannitica was excavated.\textsuperscript{31}

In sum, the Palaestra Sannitica did not conform to standards of safely identified Greek palaestrae in the eastern and western Mediterranean, because of its size and plan, but above all because of the possible lack of bathing facilities. Its use as a meeting place of the Samnite vereiia and perhaps rather simple and spatially restricted exercise facility still seems most probable, as substantiated by the Oscan dedicatory inscription that was seldom vereiia and perhaps rather simple and spatially restricted exercise facility still seems most probable, as substantiated by the Oscan dedicatory inscription that was most likely displayed in this building from the very beginning. Accessibility to and thus use of the building could be fully controlled and restricted. The location of entrances clearly suggests, however, that the building was meant to be used in connection with the – more or less contemporaneously built – porticoes of the Foro Triangolare.\textsuperscript{32} While the integration of the Foro Triangolare may have compromised the concept of exclusive controlled use, and the members of the vereiia may have had to mix with a larger crowd, it may have provided additional benefits, namely more space for exercise (or strolling), water supply, and cultic facilities.

3 Quadruporticus (VIII 7, 16)

In AD 79, this building included a large peristyle courtyard with rooms on all four sides and was accessible via a staircase from the Foro Triangolare and a long corridor and Ionic entrance colonnade from the Via Stabiana in the east. Its construction is commonly dated to the 2nd century BC (Pl. 2).

Until recently, the original building was reconstructed as a simple quadruporticus without any rooms, except for an exedra in the south, and identified either as a porticus post scenam for use in relation with the Great Theater or as a gymnasium for use in connection with the Foro Triangolare and Palaestra Sannitica complex. After the earthquake of AD 62 the building would have been substantially remodeled, adding rooms on all sides for use as gladiatorial barracks.\textsuperscript{33}

Recent research challenges the common reconstruction of the first building and, with this, the identification of its original function.\textsuperscript{34} While five building phases have been identified between the period of about 130 BC to AD 79 and the complex was substantially rebuilt in the last three phases (ca. AD 10–79), remains of the first phase walls clearly suggest that the building included rooms on at least three sides from the very beginning: stretches of the back walls of the original complex were identified on all four sides. Even if the width of the porticoes may have been changed over the some 200 years of use,\textsuperscript{35} the position of the stylobate seems to have been

\begin{itemize}
\item were probably constructed in the late Republican period; this support was not found in situ, in its original position, however, and thus its precise use in the baths cannot be safely determined; Volpichella 2006–2007, 213–214 fig. 15; Crawford 2011a, 493–494 Cumae 3; cf. Avagliano – Montalbano in this volume. Crawford dates the inscription to presumably before 180 BC and assumes that the labrum had been "placed in a gymnasion, when it was first built at the end of the third century BC, and re-deployed in the reconstruction of the first century AD (see Volpichella), perhaps without the inscription attracting attention." Volpichella 2006–2007 does not mention a gymnasion, however, and none has so far been identified in Cumae. He argues, instead, that Oscan could have been used long after 180 BC when addressing the general public that was not fully Latinized and may have frequented the baths; he does not make any specific connection between the vereiia and the baths.
\item Borlenghi 2011, passim: e.g. Corfinum; Forum Vibii Caburum; Herculeum, Palaestra (?); Pompeii, Great Palaestra; Saequinum; Trea; Verona; etc. Piscinae that can safely be linked with a campus are only attested from the Augustan period onwards. Avagliano 2013, 72: the labrum and its base were transported to the Museo Borbonico and obviously can no longer be safely identified (and dated).
\item Otherwise, the builders would hardly have sacrificed one of only three rooms for an entrance.
\item Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 63–64; summary of literature Avagliano 2013, 79–80 n. 68–70. Poehler and Ellis 2011; Poehler and Ellis 2012; Poehler and Ellis 2013; Poehler and Ellis 2014.
\item This seems to be the case particularly on the west side; Poehler and Ellis 2011.
\end{itemize}
maintained in all phases. The distance between the stylobate and the original back walls requires either two-aisled porticoes with an internal row of columns (of which no traces survived anywhere) or porticoes with back rooms. While E. Poehler and S. Ellis reconstructed a double-aisled colonnade in the north, whose northern aisle would have been substituted by a series of rooms in the fifth phase after AD 62, it remains unclear whether this configuration belongs to the original phase of the building or, for example, to a remodeling after 80 BC, when the Odeum was built. At least the course of the eastern back wall of the complex is highly irregular, however, and this wall did not run parallel to the stylobate, which rules out the solution of a two-aisled portico.

The original rooms may have been small and low, but they still require explanation. Any higher number of such rooms on several sides is not typical of a palaestra/gymnasium or a porticus post scaenam. The original entrance situation of the complex, particularly before the construction of the Odeum after 80 BC, cannot be reconstructed and it must remain open whether access could ever be fully controlled, which would be required for a gymnasium. The building included a latrine in its two final phases, but no bathing facilities have been identified for any of the phases.

In sum, recent research confirmed that the building belongs to the large urban development program of this quarter after 130 BC. While the final publication of recent research that also includes a hypothetical reconstruction of the original plan must be awaited for a comprehensive assessment, some preliminary conclusions can be drawn. Use of the original complex as a palaestra seems highly unlikely because of the plan, possibly rather open accessibility, and lacking bathing facilities. Even if this complex may have been used as an ambulatory by visitors of the theater, the presence of a series of rooms suggests additional purposes and functions, for example use for storage, production, and sale of goods, or for dining and accommodation. As a monumental multifunctional complex, located between sanctuaries and entertainment facilities, the Quadriporticus may have drawn crowds all through the day and year for multiple reasons and activities.

4 Domus Publica

The existence of a domus publica in Pompeii is commonly deduced from an Oscan inscription (Vetter 27), which was painted on a pilaster between the houses VIII, 5,19 and 20 at the Via dell’Abbondanza and whose interpretation is debated. It belongs to the group of eítuns inscriptions that were found throughout the city and related to the siege by the troops of Cornelius Sulla around 91–89 BC. The inscription Vetter 27 stands out for its formula and mention of a public building (domus publica). Currently, three different interpretations of this inscription and its relevance for an assessment of the archaeological record can be distinguished that are central to the argument of this paper.

1. F. Pesando: The domus publica is identified as a location where military census and levy actions, especially of equestrians, took place and a selected group of soldiers stayed; the (completely preserved) inscription would have served as a signpost, pointing to this building, which would have been located in the lot VIII 6, 5 (Pl. 1). The building of this lot would have been decorated with a unique terracotta frieze, dated to the 3rd century BC and showing an equestrian battle. After the foundation of the Roman colony in 80 BC, the domus publica, whose hypothetical plan is not discussed, would

36 Poehler and Ellis 2012, 11 fig. 19; this double-aisled porticus would have connected the Ionic entrance colonnade in the east and the staircase to the Foro Triangolare in the west. The reconstructed plan, fig. 19, shows series of rooms on all other sides.

37 Poehler and Ellis 2011, 5.

38 Poehler and Ellis 2011, 5.

39 The various thresholds of the eastern entrance corridor from the Via Stabiana to the Quadriporticus and the steps of the Ionic propylon show cuttings for doors or grilles, but it currently cannot be safely determined whether these go back to the first phase or one of the remodeling phases of the building. Since the staircase between the Quadriporticus and the Foro Triangolare has been substantially restored, the question of doors at the foot or top of the staircase can also not be determined.

40 So far, only phase plans, marking the remains assigned to different phases, have been published, e.g. Poehler and Ellis 2013, 11 fig. 16.

41 As a porticus post scaenam, it would be the earliest currently known example of this building type; Ramallo Asensio 2000, 90–92.

42 Vetter 1953, 56 no. 27; Rix 2002, 106 Po 38; Crawford 2011b, 624–625 Pompeii 6. The eítuns inscriptions commonly include the formula anter ... ini (between ... and), and mention the name of a commander at the end. In contrast, Vetter 27 includes words interpreted as ampt ... ampt (by ... by), and the name of the commander was either never mentioned (Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010, 150) or is not preserved (Avagliano 2013, 94). Text and translation according to Crawford 2011b, 624–625: eisuk amvíannd / eítuns ampt(ér) tribud / tür(tikud) ampt(ér) t men-erv(a). The eítuns from this quarter, by the domus publica, by (the Temple) of Minerva.
have been systematically destroyed and dismantled as an unwelcome symbol of the former Samnite city and its public institutions. The terrain would have been transformed into a garden, which public authorities used as a dump site after the earthquake of AD 62.  
In this reading, the domus publica constituted a central part of the Samnite military-athletic complex that was visually, conceptually and spatially intimately connected with the Republican Baths and the Palaestra Sannitica.

2. A. Avagliano: The eítuns of this and other inscriptions would point to a subdivision of the city into architectural units or quarters shortly before the Sullan occupation and to a subdivision of the Samnite army into units. The eítuns inscriptions would not have served as signposts for armed troops that strayed vacantly in the city, looking for instructions where to go for the defense of the city, but would have indicated the limits of the urban area to be defended; they would have signaled the militants who were well familiar with the layout of the city to which stretch of the walls they had to go and which commander they were assigned to.  
The specific inscription Vetter 27, where reference to the commander would not have been preserved, would not have pointed to a clearly defined area, but to a specific building that must have played a significant role in the defense of the city. Since this public building must have been located next to the Temple of Minerva, this could only have been the Casa di Giuseppe II (VIII 2, 38–39) that was built in the 2nd century BC and occupied a prominent spot for the protection of the southern side of the city (Pl. 1). But the precise design of the house in this period as well as the function of the public building (domus publica) are not specified.

According to this interpretation, the Palaestra Sannitica and the Republican Baths still functioned as a conceptual unit, used by the vereia (a public institution of military vocation, similar to the Attic ephebeia), whereas the domus publica is identified as a separate building for a different group and function.

3. P. Carafa: The inscription is also interpreted as a reference to an urban area where a military unit was enlisted or that was defended by a single unit, but the sanctuary of Minerva and the domus/villa publica are identified as the limits of the area to be defended that therefore could not have been situated close to one another. It is not discussed in more detail, where the domus publica would have been located, whether it could be identified at all, and what its precise function would have been.

This reading does not require any connection between the Palaestra Sannitica, the Republican Baths, and the domus publica.

Focusing on the identification and significance of the domus publica, all three interpretations entail problems. The last reading seems least problematic, but the difference in the formula between the inscription Vetter 27 and the other eítuns inscriptions is simply ignored.

Recent research challenges the second reading, because the Casa di Giuseppe II was built over a square building from around 300 BC, supposedly with an impressive Tuscan atrium and with all of its three stories at the end of the 2nd century BC.  
This design of a luxurious three-story house is hard to reconcile with the idea of a domus publica shortly before 89 BC and the defense of a city wall, which must already have been overbuilt at this point. Avagliano also does not discuss when, why, and how the Casa di Giuseppe II would have been transformed into a private house.

The first and most intriguing and holistic interpretation depends crucially upon the identification of lot VIII 6, 5, which has already been convincingly refuted by Avagliano. She argues that the lot was most likely occupied by two houses from the 2nd century BC to 62 AD when the terrain was transformed into a garden after irreparable earthquake damage.

There is no conclusive evidence that the terracotta frieze with the equestrian battle scene was ever found and displayed in the lot VIII 6, 5, and according to R. Känel, its date must be significantly lowered from the 3rd century BC to

---

44 Some scholars even identified the vereia pompeiana as Samnite cavalry or equites campani; consequently, the same group would have frequented the Palaestra Sannitica and the domus publica; Avagliano 2013, 94, n. 129.
45 Avagliano 2013, 82–94, esp. 91, based on previous interpretations by A. Prosdocimi and R. Antonini.
46 Avagliano 2013, 94.
47 Carafa 2011, 98.
48 While this is a philological discourse, which cannot be discussed in detail here, recent special publications commonly take the difference in formulas as meaningful; e.g. Crawford 2011b, 624–625 Pompei 6; also Avagliano 2013, 84.
49 Carafa 2005, 19.
50 Avagliano 2013, 83–88, who critically assesses the results of recent excavations in this lot, published by Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010.
51 Avagliano 2013, 87 n. 103.
52 Date proposed by D’Agostino 1982, and followed by Pesando 1997.
ca. 100 BC. Since one fragment was found in recent excavations under a pavement in the atrium of the Casa di Giuseppe II and other fragments were found to the south of this house, the frieze may originally have decorated this house, maybe the walls of its Tuscan atrium. Since friezes with similar topics have been found in other private houses, this may have been a fitting decoration for an ambitious private house with layout on three terraced stories, even if the frieze currently has no exact parallels in Pompeii.

In sum, there is currently no conclusive evidence for safely reconstructing the location, layout, and function of the public building mentioned in the eituins inscription Vetter 27. Even if it seems most likely that the eituins inscriptions referred to a clearly defined urban area and military unit, it has yet to be determined what the eituins of Vetter 27 would have done by a public building by the Temple of Minerva. The archaeological evidence of VIII 6, 5 and the Casa di Giuseppe II yields no convincing proof for an identification as domus publica. Finally, and most importantly here, the notion of a conceptual and spatial connection between the Palaestra Sannitica, the Republican Baths, and the domus publica rests on highly tenuous grounds and should be viewed with great caution, if not best be abandoned.

5 Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36)

The Republican Baths play a key role in the minimalist as well maximalist readings of the Foro Triangolare complex (Pl. 3).

While the building was correctly identified by its excavator A. Maiuri as a Roman-style bath building with separate sections for men and women, he vaguely dated construction to 100 to 70 BC. Maiuri recognized that the baths were deliberately razed and that the lot was transformed into a peristyyle garden for the adjacent Casa della Calce (VIII 5, 28). He dated this transformation to the Augustan period and argued that the baths must have been built and managed by the very owners of the Casa della Calce who had conceived them as a profitable investment in a period of urban need.

Pesando argued for a construction date in the 2nd century BC, which would make a clear connection of the baths with other Samnite buildings in the Foro Triangolare complex possible. He also proposed the most rigorous reading, assigning exclusive use of the baths to the Samnite male and female youths, and voting for public initiative and ownership; after 80 BC no more investments would have been made in this political-social symbol of Samnite identity, until the baths were finally abandoned in the late 1st century BC. A hoard including 96 coins that was found in a settling basin of the drain in the sidewalk just to the east of the men’s apodyterium (Pl. 3 room 2, basin q4) would confirm rapid decline of the baths after 80 BC. This hoard contained Ebusan, Pseudo-Ebusan, and Pseudo-Massaliot, Roman Republican, and Greek coins that were circulating in Pompeii in the early 80s BC. Following Pesando’s intriguing interpretation, the baths were unanimously identified as a substitute for missing bathing facilities in the Palaestra Sannitica, by both minimalists and maximalists.

The above-mentioned new research project (Topoi C-6-8) aims at comprehensively reassessing the development, function, and urban significance of this building. Construction of the baths in the 2nd century BC could be confirmed by stratigraphic finds, but a more precise date in the 2nd century that would allow for assessing the potential role of this building in the urban development of the Foro Triangolare complex currently cannot be provided. While stratigraphy did not yet yield a precise date for the structural and functional transformation of this lot, an abandonment of the baths in the second half of the 1st century BC seems most likely. Pesando’s ideas regarding development, func-

53 Oral reference; R. Känel proposes a highly intriguing interpretation: the frieze could have been related to the campaigns of Marius, and would have been deliberately destroyed and spread by the Sullan faction. I am very much indebted to R. Känel for discussion of this frieze and generous sharing of his expertise and ideas.
54 Pesando 1997, 59 n. 38; Avagliano 2013, 87 n. 103.
55 Esp. in Fregellae: Coarelli 1994; Känel 2010, 287.
56 Maiuri 1950, esp. 130.
57 Most importantly Pesando 2002-2003, but see also Pesando 1997; Pesando 2000; Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010.
58 He was not the first, however, to link the baths to the Foro Triangolare complex; see a summary of earlier research in De Waele 2001, 531-532.
59 See remarks before n. 1. Final evaluation of this project is under way and will be published in a monograph. This is not the place to discuss results in due detail, outlining all of the evidence and arguments.
60 After preliminary reading of the pottery, finds made under the pavements of the house structures can only be vaguely dated to the 1st century BC or at best to the second half of the 1st century BC; the strongest indicator for a more precise date is the stucco decoration of a room that the owner of the Casa della Calce installed in his newly enlarged house, over the former vicolo between the house and the baths (Fig. 5, to the
Development: During its period of use, key features of the building were significantly remodeled, among them certainly the heating technology and water management and possibly also the bathing program. While stratigraphy does not allow for safely dating these changes to before or after 80 BC, they nonetheless testify to continuous maintenance and improvements. Identifiable remodeling measures include the following:

- The laconicum of the men’s section (Pl. 3 room 6) was probably built or at least significantly remodeled in a later period. This may have entailed secondary construction or remodeling of a small (colonnaded?) courtyard to the south of the laconicum (Pl. 3 room 16) that was accessible from the men’s bathing section and may have served for relaxing sojourns or light exercise. In a final phase, dated by stratigraphy to around 50 BC, the laconicum was fortified with buttresses along its eastern side. The laconicum was a highly fashionable bathing form in the 2nd/1st century BC in the entire Mediterranean, commonly conceived for use by men. Such a Greek-connoted sweat bath was added in the Stabian Baths in a second phase, at the initiative of two duoviri of the young Roman colony shortly after 80 BC. Consequently, the bathing program of the Republican Baths was trendy, either already in the original design or as a result of a modernizing renovation (before or after 80 BC).

- The heating system, which was highly innovative, if experimental in the original design, was changed and improved several times. Among others, the original number of six fires under six arched openings was reduced and the firing chambers were rendered more efficient (Fig. 3).

- The water management was at least once significantly remodeled and improved. The baths incorporated a preexisting deep well that was made of large Sarno limestone blocks and used as an open well from which water was drawn by hand (Pl. 3 room 14; Figs. 4–5). When the well was first used in the baths, some changes were made, using opus incertum walls with lava. While the design and functioning of the well in this phase can no longer be reconstructed, it was most likely connected with a reservoir over the vaulted room to its north (Pl. 3 room 13a/b). In a later phase during the period of

---

61 CIL X 829.
62 In this case, the Republican Baths could even have served as a model for the remodeling of the Stabian Baths after 80 BC.
63 Water was most likely already lifted with some sophisticated mechanism such as a tread wheel/bucket chain system, but no traces of this survive.
the baths, the well was significantly modified: enlarged in the east and vaulted in its ‘old’ western part (Figs. 4–5). This served to install a more sophisticated water-lifting device, with a bucket chain in the new open eastern part and some lifting mechanism on top of the vaulted part. Presumably, the reservoir over room 13 was also changed. While the north and south walls of the ‘old’ western part of the well are heavily encrusted with thick layers of calcareous concretions (Figs. 4–5), the new eastern part lacks any traces of similar concretions. Maiuri concluded from this phenomenon that the well was remodeled only shortly before the abandonment of the baths and never used in its refined form. Such a costly late renovation would clearly challenge Pesando’s notion of a decline after 82 BC, but the development and chronology of the water supply system is not yet fully known and awaits final assessment.

Several features were redecorated or repaired: for example, the supports of the labra in both caldaria were fortified and redecorated; the opus signinum revetment in the men’s immersion pool was renewed at least once; the stucco decoration of the women’s tepidarium wasembellished, using a yellow socle with polychrome dots imitating marble—this decoration is now commonly assigned to the (late) First Style (Fig. 6).

The walls of the domestic peristyle garden were set onto the quasi-cleaned pavements of the bathing rooms. This suggests that the baths had not been abandoned for a longer period and used as a dump, but that the transformation between baths and house occurred swiftly and immediately after the abandonment of baths (Fig. 7).

The coin hoard cannot safely determine the end of the use period of the baths: the settling basin, in which it was found, was obviously deep enough so that the hoard did not get flushed away; the hoard may have somewhat hindered the settling process, but it did not necessarily block the entire drain.

While the reasons for the abandonment of the baths cannot be safely determined, the archaeological record and urban context provide some clues. The baths were certainly never connected to the public aqueduct which became standard for all publicly accessible baths in the early Imperial period. The heating technology and water management of the Republican Baths may have been innovative at the time of construction, but were most likely less advanced and sophisticated than those in the original Stabian Baths, built at the end of the 2nd century BC. In the late 1st century BC, the technology of the Republican Baths was surely outdated and comprehensive modernization in order to meet contemporary standards would certainly have been very costly. Therefore, dwindling profitability of the Republic Baths may have caused their abandonment. In contrast, a kind of political-social stigmatization of the baths after 82 BC, as suggested by Pesando, is difficult to accept: the Alaestra Sannitica, which was presumably much more strongly imbued with Samnite political-military ideology than a standard bathing facility such as the Republican Baths, was significantly remodeled and embellished in the Augustan period, when the Sannite vereia certainly had no longer any function and social significance.

**Function:** As argued above, exclusive use of the baths by specific groups cannot be derived from the archaeological record, namely from criteria such as design,

64 Maiuri 1950, 128–129. – The water management of the Republican Baths is currently being investigated by Thomas Heide.

65 Maiuri 1950, 126, does not describe the drainage system in detail, but his field director A. D’Avino provides more detailed information in his unpublished excavation report, 1950, 173: measures of the settling basin: 0.65 × 0.65 m, 0.9 m deep; the settling basin was found in a depth of 0.1–0.15 m below the walking level and was entirely reveted with opus signinum; the drain (0.3 m wide, 0.3 m high) was covered with Sarno limestone slabs; both the drain and the settling basin were partially filled with sediments, which would testify to long use of the drainage system, but did not obstruct it; the coins were found in the sediment layer of the settling basin. Today, the sidewalk is covered with modern cement so that the drain and settling basins can no longer be studied.

Baths built in the late 2nd or early 1st century BC, such as the Stabian Baths and the Forum Baths, were later connected to the aqueduct; baths newly built from the early Imperial period onwards were supplied by the aqueduct from the beginning, among them the Suburban Baths, the Sarno Baths, the Palaestra Baths, the Baths in the Praedia of Julia Felix, and the Central Baths. For the abandonment of the baths and the reuse of lot VIII 5, 36, see now: Monika Trümper. “Baths to House: Transformation of the Republican Baths in Pompeii.” In Umgebaut. Umbau-, Umnutzungs- und Umwertungsprozesse in der antiken Architektur, Ed. by K. Piesker. Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung 13. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2018. Forthcoming.
Fig. 4  Pompeii, Republican Baths, deep well.

Fig. 5  Pompeii, Republican Baths, deep well.
accessibility and urban-spatial context. The design and bathing program of the baths can be identified as standard for publicly accessible baths of the late Republican period in the entire western Mediterranean, and the baths are not at all typical of bathing facilities in any safely identified contemporary athletic complexes in the eastern and western Mediterranean. The location of the Republican Baths was certainly carefully chosen with view to maximum profit. Situated at a major crossing of a quarter that was significantly developed in the second half of the 2nd century BC, the Republican Baths were visible, conveniently accessible, and thus would easily have attracted clients.

If the coin hoard mentioned above can be identified as a purse that a customer of the baths accidentally dropped when changing in the men’s apodyterium it may suggest that visitors had to pay for entry to the baths. This is a common practice in publicly accessible baths, but seems somewhat unnecessary and strange for supposed exclusive use of the facility by a privileged group such as the Samnite youths.

Admittedly, this scenario, proposed by Maiuri 1950, 127, and Stannard 2005, 122, is somewhat strange: the drain in the apodyterium that evacuates into the settling basin where the hoard was found is a wide, very shallow open channel, like a slight depression in the pavement; this channel was certainly not flushed continuously, but only temporarily, when the immersion pool in the men’s caldarium was emptied or bathers splashed lots of water out of the labrum.

Fig. 6 Pompeii, Republican Baths, women’s tepidarium, renewed stucco decoration.

Fig. 7 Pompeii, Republican Baths, men’s tepidarium, walls of house set on clean pavements of baths.
Ownership: Without conclusive inscriptions, it is difficult to safely determine the ownership of baths. In general, the 2nd and 1st centuries BC were a period of transition, when baths built by public initiative and managed by public authorities became more common. Before this period, publicly accessible baths were usually built and managed by private persons as business investments. The continuous existence of privately owned and publicly accessible baths in the Roman Imperial period is well attested for Pompeii and beyond.

The Republican Baths provide few clues for determining their ownership. While the deep well may have been built at public initiative and expense some time before the 2nd century BC, the surrounding structures that predate the baths do not speak for any coherent building program or public use. These include several hydraulic installations, spread over the entire lot, and features that suggest industrial use. A similar situation was recently identified in the nearby lot I 1, 1–2 on the eastern side of the Via Stabiana: a large well, made of Sarno limestone blocks, dated to the 2nd century BC and interpreted as a public well was surrounded by or even incorporated into structures used for industrial activity.

The central question is whether and when the wells identified as public enterprises could be incorporated and continuously used in private buildings, or, to put it more bluntly, whether the ‘public well’ of the Republican Baths necessarily provides safe evidence for public ownership of the baths. The well in lot I 1, 1–2 was presumably continuously accessible as a public well immediately next to private workshops and was only privatized and included into retail space in the early 1st century AD. The deep well in IX 2, 1–29 seems to have been used as a publicly accessible well at least until AD 62, and was even embellished with an arched superstructure. The deep well of the Stabian Baths was only built together with and specifically for the baths in the late 2nd century BC. One of the largest deep wells with a sophisticated water-lifting device was incorporated into the Casa della Regina d’Inghilterra (VII 14, 5), but it is unclear when exactly this happened, whether the well was ever used within the context of the house and for how long. The massive walls of this well were never dismantled, razed, or modified, as in the case of many other public deep wells, but instead left standing at a significant height above the floor level of surrounding rooms; this suggests that the well was used, at least for some time, for the purpose of the house and its various industrial facilities. Generally, the integration of large rectangular deep wells in buildings of the 2nd and 1st centuries BC (before the aqueduct was built) seems to point to public initiative, but the topic certainly deserves closer investigation which cannot be provided here.

The transformation of private into public space is well attested in Pompeii in various periods: for example, houses and tabernae under the eastern side of the Forum were replaced by public buildings in the Augustan

68 This is at least suggested by the few available textual sources (literary texts and papyri); Fagan 1999; Trümper 2013.
69 In Pompeii: Baths in the Praedia of Julia Felix (rented out as balneum venereum et nongentum, CIL IV, 1356); Baths of Crassus Frugi (CIL X, 1065) and most likely also the Sarno Baths and the Palaestra Baths. For the phenomenon in general, see Fagan 1999.
70 Schmölder-Veit 2009, 117 fig. 12, differentiates between private and public deep wells: the public examples were larger (ca. 2 × 2 m) and mostly rectangular, whereas the private ones were always round and smaller, with diameters of one meter or less. The date of the deep well in the Republican Baths cannot be securely determined archaeologically. This holds true for most deep wells in Pompeii, see Schmölder-Veit 2009, 116 n. 22; for recent lists of deep wells in public and private contexts (both incomplete though) see Schmölder-Veit 2009, 118–119; Dessales 2013, 217. Recently excavated deep wells include: a) IX 2.1,129, 1.98 × 1.98 m, which was made of Sarno limestone blocks, but could not be safely dated; Pender 2008; b) I.1.1–10, 1.54 × 1.08 m, which was also made of Sarno limestone blocks (with grooves from ropes on the upper face) and dated to the 2nd century BC; Ellis et al. 2011, 3–4. I owe these references to Domenico Esposito.
71 A channel in rooms 26, 27, 28 (Fig. 5), running from west to east; a basin in the laconicum that was cut by a well (Fig. 5 room 34); a small bell-shaped cistern and adjacent well under the pavement of the men’s apodyterium (Fig. 5 room 25).
72 Ellis et al. 2011, 3–5.
73 Ellis et al. 2011, 5.
74 Pender 2008.
75 The Stabian Baths were also re-investigated within the frame of the Topoi C-6-8 project, and their construction date could be significantly revised: they were not built in the 3rd century BC and did not include an Archaic deep well, as proposed in the influential monograph by Eschbach 1979, but were only built together with the well in the late 2nd c century BC; for preliminary results, see Trümper 2017. Size, location, development, and above all two inscriptions suggest that the Stabian Baths were built at public initiative in the late 2nd century BC and remained public property until AD 79: 1) Oscan dedicatory inscription by the quaestor Mr. Atinius on a sundial that was found in the Stabian Baths and is commonly dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC; Vetter 1953, 50 no. 12, Rix 2002, 104 Po 4; Crawford 2011, 652–651 Pompei 21; 2) Latin dedicatory inscription by two duoviri of the Roman colony who initiated construction of a laconicum and districtrium as well as repair of the palaestra and porticus, commonly dated to shortly after 86 BC; CIL X, 829.
76 Schmölder-Veit 2009, 118–119 no. 15; other wells, such as no. 19, obviously went out of use when they were included in private tabernae.
period at the latest; a house next to the (publicly owned) Stabian Baths was razed and its terrain was included in the baths sometime between AD 41 and 79;\textsuperscript{77} the (most likely publicly owned) Central Baths were built over demolished houses after AD 62. In contrast, transformation of public buildings into private space is more difficult to imagine, particularly during a heyday of urban development, as is commonly reconstructed for the Augustan period. This is again a phenomenon, which requires more comprehensive assessment, particularly for the Augustan period.

The Republican Baths were, probably from the beginning, closely interlocked with the western adjacent Casa delle Pareti Rosse (VIII 5, 37). While the original western limit of the Republican Baths currently cannot be securely reconstructed, it possibly did not run straight, but deviated twice, serving at least partially as a partition wall between the house and the baths. This phenomenon can also be observed for the original Stabian Baths, whose layout had to respect a more or less contemporaneously built rectangular house in the southwest corner of the lot; in this case, however, the baths and the house were subdivided by a double wall that clearly marked private vs. public property (Pl. 4).

No evidence of a similar duplication of boundary walls was found in the Republican Baths.

After outlining the available criteria, it must remain open which one is really conclusive for determining public vs. private ownership, the inclusion of a presumably public deep well in the 2nd century BC (public ownership?), the transformation into a private house in the late 1st century BC (private ownership?), or the lack of a clear double boundary wall (private ownership?). Even if publicly owned, however, nothing indicates exclusive use and function, and the existence of a separate section for women most strongly speaks for use by a broad, paying clientele.

In sum, the Republican Baths were built with innovative features and technology in the 2nd century BC, then remodeled and partially modernized before they were abandoned in the second half of the 1st century BC, presumably when they were no longer fashionable or profitable. While the location of the Republican Baths at a major crossing and in a quarter that saw significant urban development in 2nd century BC was certainly chosen carefully with view to attracting visitors,\textsuperscript{78} no intimate conceptual and spatial connection with any other buildings in the area can safely be identified. In contrast to the Republican Baths, two other publicly accessible baths that were most likely publicly owned and certainly built before the Augustan period, were both continuously used and modernized at public expense until AD 79.\textsuperscript{79} Therefore, the integration of a presumably public well notwithstanding, the Republican Baths are best understood as a private initiative and business investment.

6 Conclusion

The socio-political structure of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii is largely unknown, and it must remain open who would have embraced either the Greek gymnasium or the Roman campus as an institution and building type, and why. While the Greek gymnasium and palaestra as building types were developed in the 4th century BC, the campus is mentioned in Late Republican inscriptions from Latin colonies in Italy, whereas a clearly recognizable building type with porticoes and piscina seems to have developed only from the Augustan period onwards.\textsuperscript{80}

It must be emphasized that, despite rich epigraphic evidence, Pompeii’s inscriptions do not include any reference to a gymnasium or campus and related offices, institutions, and groups (such as the gymnasiarchy, ephebeia). The term iuvenalis was used in Pompeian election notices to refer to a young man, but a collegium iuventutis is not mentioned in any inscription and the interpretation of a graffito by Geganius Romulus, aedilis iuvenalium is debated.\textsuperscript{81} A palaestra and porticus were

\textsuperscript{77} Trümper 2017.

\textsuperscript{78} The existence of a deep well that could serve as major water supply of the baths was certainly an added bonus.

\textsuperscript{79} The Stabian Baths, Trümper 2017; and the barely studied Forum Baths, which were certainly constructed after 86 BC by two duoviri of the early colony, as recorded by two identical inscriptions; see CIL X, 819 and Fagan 1999, 250–251 no. 62; another inscription on the labrum in the men’s caldarium records that two duoviri let this labrum made with public money, in the year AD 3 or 4; CIL X, 817; Fagan 1999, 252 no. 68.

\textsuperscript{80} Delorme 1960; Borlenghi 2011.

\textsuperscript{81} A. E. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley 2004, 114, with reference to CIL IV, 5748; Borlenghi 2011, 225; that the graffito CIL IV, 5321, refers to ludi iuvenalium, Geganius Romulus acting as a curator lusus iuvenum, is not unanimously accepted.
The development of the Sanctuary of Isis is debated, which cannot be
likely at all to have served for athletic-military training and related activities; 2 = possibly served for athletic-military training and related activities; 3 = likely served for athletic-military training and related activities; 4 = certainly served for athletic-military and related activities.

1: Quadriporticus, Republican Baths, lot VIII 6, 5 and Casa di Giuseppe II as domus publica
2: Foro Triangolare with portico(es) and open-air race-track, if built in the 2nd century BC
3: Palaestra Sannitica, particularly (or solely?) if connected with porticoes/race-track of the Foro Triangolare

According to this scheme, only the Great Palaestra would be rated 4, securely (if not solely) used as a sports facility in the Roman colony, but not before the Augustan period.

Construction of the Great Theater, Quadriporticus, Palaestra Sannitica, Republican Baths and possibly also the porticoes of Foro Triangolare in the second half of the 2nd century clearly testifies to the existence of some urban development program and the importance of this area. An embellishing remodeling occurred in the Augustan period, including again the Great Theater, the Quadriporticus, the Palaestra Sannitica, and the Foro Triangolare that was decorated with honorary monuments and furniture, but – and this is crucial – excluding the Republican Baths that were even destroyed. While it is commonly assumed, that the athletic-military function of the Foro Triangolare complex declined or ceased in the Augustan period one wonders why it would have been renovated and what it would have been used for in this period.

This regards, first and foremost, the Palaestra Sannitica, which would not only have lost its bathing facility, but also gained serious competition from the newly built Great Palaestra. While the building was newly decorated with statues (herms, Doryphoros?), it also lost a substantial part of its peristyle courtyard to the adjacent Iseum at some point during its history. Pesando argued that a certain Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus, the second most important man in Augustan Pompeii, would have initiated a comprehensive renovation program in the Foro Triangolare area that included setting up a series of herms found in various locations and the dedication of something by decree of the decurions, which could possibly be recognized as renovation of the Palaestra Sannitica. In recognition of his generosity, M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus would have received an honorary statue in the Palaestra Sannitica, which would have been

---

82 CIL X, 829.
83 For gymnasia in Sicily, see Trümper in this volume.
84 1 = not likely at all to have served for athletic-military training and related activities; 2 = possibly served for athletic-military training and related activities; 3 = likely served for athletic-military training and related activities; 4 = certainly served for athletic-military and related activities.
85 The development of the Sanctuary of Isis is debated, which cannot be discussed in detail here; see the recent overview in Gasparini 2011 with earlier bibliography.
86 Pesando 2000, 164 fig. 5: Foro Triangolare, Odeum, cemetery of Porta Stabia, and two in the sacrarium of the Iseum, which had most likely originally been set up in the Palaestra Sannitica and were reused after AD 62 in the Iseum.
87 CIL X, 952.
been set up again (reposuit) in this building by a relative after the earthquake in AD 62. According to this intriguing narrative, the Palaestra Sannitica would have served as a kind of memorial of the good old Samnite days (and institutions such as the vereia) that was nostalgically kept in the Augustan period, when Pompeii otherwise was comprehensively modernized after the model of Augustan Rome, and even after AD 62, when Samnite days were long past. Athletic-military training can hardly have played any role here anymore, however, and it remains completely open who would have frequented this building for which purposes and activities.

The inhabitants of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii adopted many building types known in the western Mediterranean at this time, among them the theater (Great Theater), the temple with porticoes (Temple of Apollo. Temple of Venus), the multifunctional porticus-complex (Quadriporticus), the basilica, the publicly accessible bath (Stabian Baths, Republican Baths), the atrium house, and the atrium peristyle house. However, a clearly recognizable standard Greek palaestra or gymnasium or a Roman campus were not among them. The Palaestra Sannitica as a sports facility, used with or without the Foro Triangolare, was a modest substandard solution in comparison to Greek palaestrae and Roman campi; because of lacking parallels, it cannot be identified as a typical Samnite concept, however. In contrast, the Republican Baths were, like the nearby Stabian Baths, a highly fashionable, fully functioning publicly accessible bath complex that is hard to see in a conceptual unit with the Palaestra Sannitica. If the size of the original Palaestra Sannitica is compared with that of the contemporary Quadriporticus and the palaestra of the original Stabian Baths, let alone with that of the later Great Palaestra (Pl. 5), it is obvious that the activities of the Samnite vereia, from a spatial point of view, did not play such a significant role in Late Hellenistic Pompeii.

88 CIL X, 851: the original Augustan dedication is not known.
Pl. 1. Pompeii, Area of the Foro Triangolare; buildings identified as part of the athletic-military complex: 1 Foro Triangolare (porticoes, race-track?); 2 Palaestra Sannitica; 3 Quadriporticus; 4 Lot VIII 6, 5 (domus publica?); 6 Casa di Giuseppe II (domus publica?); 6 Republican Baths.
Pompeii, Quadriporticus, phase plan.
Pl. 3  Pompeii, Republican Baths, reconstructed plan.
Pompeii, Stabian Baths, reconstructed plan of the original building.
Pl. 5  Pompeii, Palaestra Sannitica, Stabian Baths, Great Palaestra: scale to scale comparison.
Bibliography

Avagliano 2007

Avagliano 2013

Avagliano 2017

Beard 2008

Borlenghi 2011

Coarelli 1994

Coarelli 2001

Coarelli 2002

Coarelli 2004

Crawford 2011a

Crawford 2011b

D'Agostino 1982

De Waele 2001

Delorme 1962

Dessales 2013
Di Maio, Giugliano, and Rispoli 2008

Ellis et al. 2011

Emme 2013

Eschebach 1979

Fagan 1999

Gasparini 2011

Hoffmann 1993

Jashemski 1993

Känel 2010

Laurence 1994

Maiuri 1950

McDonald 2012

Pender 2008

Pesando 1997

Pesando 2000

Pesando 2002–2003

Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006

Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010

Poehler and Ellis 2011

Poehler and Ellis 2012

Poehler and Ellis 2013

Poehler and Ellis 2014

Ramallo Asensio 2000

Richardson 1988
Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS:  1 M. Trümper after De Waele 2001, 8 pl.  3.  2 M. Trümper after De Waele 2001, 317 pl. 41 and Tricarico 2013, 213 pl. II.  3 C. Rummel.  4-5 C. Brünenberg.  6 D. Esposito.  7 M. Trümper.  PLATES:  1 M. Trümper after Pesando 2000, 164 fig. 5.  2 Poehler and Ellis 2013, 11 fig. 16.  3 C. Brünenberg.  4 C. Brünenberg.  5 M. Trümper after Fig. 3, Pl. 4, and Jashemski 1993, 91 plan 29.

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Dr. phil. (Munich 1995), Habilitation (Heidelberg 2005), is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.
Crowded or Empty Spaces? The Statuary Decoration of the ‘Palaestrae’ in Pompeii and Herculaneum

Summary

While the sculptural decoration of palaestrae and gymasia in the eastern Mediterranean has received significant research attention, the topic has not been studied comprehensively for equivalent structures in the west. This paper investigates the sculptural decoration of the Samnite Palaestra and the Large Palaestra in Pompeii as well as the Palaestra at Herculaneum. It assesses the existence and character of sculptural programs and the much-debated question of whether the sculptures were appropriate for an athletic setting or are even adequate to confirm the contested identification as palaestrae of these buildings. The sculptural decoration of all three buildings is shown to have differed significantly from that of their eastern counterparts. This suggests that the appellation of these ‘palaestrae’ may merit a reconsideration.
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The inhabitants (of Alabanda, note of authors) were shrewd enough in politics, but they had the reputation of being stupid because of one not very great fault, inconsistency. In the gymnasium, the statues were all of politicians; in the public assembly, they were of quoit-throwers or runners or javelin-throwers. Thus the unsuitable disposition of the statues added a blemish to the city in public estimation.¹

This section of Vitruvius is frequently used by archaeologists as evidence of what was perceived as appropriate decoration for specific functional spaces in antiquity. Cicero also referred to such concepts of decoration when he commissioned a group of statues for the garden gymnasium at his villa in Tusculum.² Both quotations have often been interpreted as sufficient to reconstruct the appropriate decoration for gymnasia or, conversely, to identify a building based on its sculptural decoration.

Whereas the sculptural decoration in palaestrae and gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean has received increased attention in recent decades,³ comparable studies for the western Mediterranean are lacking. The aim of this article is to focus for the first time on the sculptural decoration in western palaestrae and gymnasia. The situation in the west is a great deal more difficult than that of the east, because the identification of these buildings is considerably more problematic and often controversial. There are three different names in the literature for the buildings used for athletic-military training and intellectual instruction: palaestra, gymnasium, and campus. But the same building is often referred to with two different terms. Furthermore, so far only the campus type has received comprehensive study.⁴ This paper will discuss three examples of buildings that are referred to in the literature as palaestrae: the Samnite Palaestra built in Pompeii in the second century BCE, the Large Palaestra (Palaestra Grande) built in Pompeii in the Augustan era, and the Palaestra at Herculaneum erected in the late Augustan-Tiberian period.⁵ Three questions will be examined: 1. whether there was any statuesque decoration at all, and how it should be characterized; 2. what role the sculptural decoration played in the identification of the buildings, i.e., whether, following Vitruvius and Cicero, a seemingly appropriate sculptural decoration is sufficient evidence for identifying a building as an athletic facility; and 3. the significance of sculptural decoration in the determination of the possible function of the buildings: whether it is possible to convincingly prove that the sculptures were suitable for certain functions. The concluding comparison of the three facilities is intended to show whether standards or striking differences in their sculptural decoration can be demonstrated and how these can be explained.

From a methodological point of view, the sculptures would need to be analyzed in context with other elements of interior decoration (wall painting, stucco, floors, furniture), but space does not allow for such analysis here. Instead, the focus will be limited to the decoration in general, in order to at least roughly situate the sculptures within that decorative ensemble. The following considerations are based solely on a critical reading of published literature.

1. The Samnite Palaestra in Pompeii

The Samnite Palaestra is located in Regio VIII of Pompeii, between the Temple of Isis, the theater, and the Foro Triangolare (Pl. 1).⁶ Originally constructed in the second century BCE, the building’s current condition goes back to the imperial period (Pl. 2). The structure consists of a rectangular courtyard measuring 8 × 19 m, bounded on three sides by a portico with 5 × 8 Doric columns made of tufa; in the west, several rooms open onto the peristyle courtyard. The palaestra was accessible through a main entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside to the north, and a narrower access with three steps

¹ Vitru. 7.5.6: Alabandis satis acutos ad omnes res civiles haberi, sed propter non magnum vitium indecentiae insipientes eos esse iudicatis, quod in gymnasio eorum quae sunt statuae omnes sunt causas agentes, foro discos tenentes aut currentes seu pila ludentes. Ita indecens inter locorum gymnasio eorum quae sunt statuae omnes sunt causas agentes, foro disnon magnum vitium indecentiae insipientes eos esse iudicatos, quod in gustan era, and the Palaestra at Herculaneum erected in the late Augustan-Tiberian period.³ Three questions will be examined: 1. whether there was any statuesque decoration at all, and how it should be characterized; 2. what role the sculptural decoration played in the identification of the buildings, i.e., whether, following Vitruvius and Cicero, a seemingly appropriate sculptural decoration is sufficient evidence for identifying a building as an athletic facility; and 3. the significance of sculptural decoration in the determination of the possible function of the buildings: whether it is possible to convincingly prove that the sculptures were suitable for certain functions. The concluding comparison of the three facilities is intended to show whether standards or striking differences in their sculptural decoration can be demonstrated and how these can be explained.

From a methodological point of view, the sculptures would need to be analyzed in context with other elements of interior decoration (wall painting, stucco, floors, furniture), but space does not allow for such analysis here. Instead, the focus will be limited to the decoration in general, in order to at least roughly situate the sculptures within that decorative ensemble. The following considerations are based solely on a critical reading of published literature.

1. The Samnite Palaestra in Pompeii

The Samnite Palaestra is located in Regio VIII of Pompeii, between the Temple of Isis, the theater, and the Foro Triangolare (Pl. 1).⁶ Originally constructed in the second century BCE, the building’s current condition goes back to the imperial period (Pl. 2). The structure consists of a rectangular courtyard measuring 8 × 19 m, bounded on three sides by a portico with 5 × 8 Doric columns made of tufa; in the west, several rooms open onto the peristyle courtyard. The palaestra was accessible through a main entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside to the north, and a narrower access with three steps

¹ Vitru. 7.5.6: Alabandis satis acutos ad omnes res civiles haberi, sed propter non magnum vitium indecentiae insipientes eos esse iudicatis, quod in gymnasio eorum quae sunt statuae omnes sunt causas agentes, foro discos tenentes aut currentes seu pila ludentes. Ita indecens inter locorum gymnasio eorum quae sunt statuae omnes sunt causas agentes, foro disnon magnum vitium indecentiae insipientes eos esse iudicatos, quod in gustan era, and the Palaestra at Herculaneum erected in the late Augustan-Tiberian period.³ Three questions will be examined: 1. whether there was any statuesque decoration at all, and how it should be characterized; 2. what role the sculptural decoration played in the identification of the buildings, i.e., whether, following Vitruvius and Cicero, a seemingly appropriate sculptural decoration is sufficient evidence for identifying a building as an athletic facility; and 3. the significance of sculptural decoration in the determination of the possible function of the buildings: whether it is possible to convincingly prove that the sculptures were suitable for certain functions. The concluding comparison of the three facilities is intended to show whether standards or striking differences in their sculptural decoration can be demonstrated and how these can be explained.

From a methodological point of view, the sculptures would need to be analyzed in context with other elements of interior decoration (wall painting, stucco, floors, furniture), but space does not allow for such analysis here. Instead, the focus will be limited to the decoration in general, in order to at least roughly situate the sculptures within that decorative ensemble. The following considerations are based solely on a critical reading of published literature.

1. The Samnite Palaestra in Pompeii

The Samnite Palaestra is located in Regio VIII of Pompeii, between the Temple of Isis, the theater, and the Foro Triangolare (Pl. 1).⁶ Originally constructed in the second century BCE, the building’s current condition goes back to the imperial period (Pl. 2). The structure consists of a rectangular courtyard measuring 8 × 19 m, bounded on three sides by a portico with 5 × 8 Doric columns made of tufa; in the west, several rooms open onto the peristyle courtyard. The palaestra was accessible through a main entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside to the north, and a narrower access with three steps
down from the Foro Triangolare to the west. Studies and excavations of the structure have recently confirmed that the Samnite Palaestra was renovated several times and reduced in size, especially in the east, in favor of the Temple of Isis. The time at which this massive intervention occurred is still under debate.7

The following arguments have been invoked to support the identification of the building as a palaestra:

1. The floor plan, with its peristyle courtyard and adjoining rooms, is reminiscent of Greek palaestrae.8

2. An Oscan inscription was found inside the structure, documenting the donation of a building for the Pompeian Vereita, a pre-Roman equivalent to the iuvventus. This inscription is usually applied to the building, even if its exact find location, dating, and significance for the structure are disputed.9

3. A marble statue was found in the courtyard next to a statue base; it was identified as a copy of the Polylectic Doryphoros and apparently was part of the decoration of the building in 79 AD.10 There was also an altar located in front of the base, and a staircase behind the base, with its last step higher than the base (Fig. 1).11

This ensemble was interpreted as proof and provision for the cultic worship of the statue, which would have been crowned from the staircase and given sacrifices at the altar. Given this context, the Doryphoros was interpreted as the ideal image of an athlete.

4. In addition, the Samnite Palaestra was interpreted as part of a gymnasium or campus complex that would have been built in the second century BCE (Pl. 1). This complex is usually thought to have included the Foro Triangolare, the Terme Repubblicane, the Quadriporticus of the theater and a domus publica.12

The key question is what role to assign the statuary decoration in the discussion of the function of the structure, alongside the arguments from architecture and urban planning, as well as whether and especially when the statues were important during the approximately two-hundred-year history of the building’s use.

Of particular importance for this question is the statue of Doryphoros, which has often been cited as decisive proof of the building’s designation and has as a result been ascribed to the initial decoration. But there are several problems:

- The stylistic dating of the statue made of Lunen- sian marble is disputed. The dating to the Augustan-Tiberian period is the most convincing, for material and stylistic reasons.13

- The statue’s inclusion into the ensemble consisting of the base, staircase, and altar has also been frequently challenged. This is due to the discrepancy in shape and size between the cavity on top of the base, which measures 57 × 53 cm, and the plinth of the statue, which measures 55 × 66 cm.14 H. Weinstock’s proposal to explain this difference by restoring the rear part of the base has received a mixed response in the literature and is not unanimously accepted.15

- Furthermore, the staircase of the ensemble is on top of the drain channel that conducted rainwater from the shed roof of the southern portico. Even if the water could flow under the stairs, this ensemble will hardly have been part of the initial decoration of the palaestra. It is certain, however, that the ensemble was set up before the palaestra was reduced in size: it was prominently built in the axis of the entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside, which opened onto the exact center of the original peristyle courtyard. In addition, the ensemble of the base, staircase, and altar is predominantly and convincingly dated to pre-Augustan times because of the tufa used and the profiles.

---

7 On the research discussion, cf. M. Trümper in this volume, note 83.
8 Avagliano 2013 for older literature.
10 Naples, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 6011. Found on 13 April, 3 and 17 August 1797. H. 2 m.
11 H. of base: 1.42 m; h. of steps: 1.87 m; h. of altar: 1.10 m. Cf. Weinstock 1997.
12 For detail and criticism see M. Trümper in this volume.
13 E.g., in Zanker 1974, 8; Zanker 1979, 298–299; and recently again in Avagliano 2013, 70–72 with older literature. Since the extensive refurbishments in the area of the Foro Triangolare and in the Samnite Palaestra are usually dated to the Augustan era, the Doryphoros is most likely to have been erected in this context, i.e., in the Augustan era; it will therefore be assumed to date to this period in what follows.
14 The first to doubt they went together was Mau 1900, 184; cf also Della Corte 1924, 48; Hartwick 1993; La Rocca, M. De Vos, and A. De Vos 1994, 166.
15 Proposal in Weinstock 1997, esp. fig. 73, 2; accepted by, e.g., Coarelli 2001, 103; Pesando 2000, 155–157; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 61; Borlenghi 2011, 218; dismissed with detailed reasoning by Avagliano 2007, 137–144.
Several options are conceivable in view of these complex findings:

1. The tufa base was already inside the palaestra in the pre-Augustan era and originally supported another statue, one that cannot be identified and in any case was no longer inside the building by 79 CE. This statue was replaced in the Augustan era by the Doryphoros figure.

2. The base was not from the palaestra originally, but was brought there to be reused for the installation of the Doryphoros.

3. The Doryphoros was never installed on this base. A different marble statue stood on the base, one that by 79 CE was no longer in the building.

Serious objections can be raised to all these options: The first and second options do not explain the discrepancy between the base and statue plinth. Another argument against the second solution is that in the early imperial era, one would hardly have installed a high-quality marble statue on a secondhand tufa base. The third option seems plausible at first, especially since the statue shows no signs of weathering, which one would expect if the statue had been exposed to the elements for seventy to a hundred years. The state of preservation of the statue thus suggests that it was installed in the shelter of one of the porticoes or in one of the western rooms. But it remains unclear why of all the statues, the one that was to be reconstructed on the tufa base and clearly had the most prominent position and significance in the building was the statue that by 79 CE was no longer in the palaestra. It may have been a presumably monumental, over-life-size marble statue depicting a hero, god, or emperor entitled to cultic honors. A monumental marble statue would have been possible in pre-Augustan Pompeii, if rather rare, and correspondingly valuable.

Avagliano 2007, 144, asserts that there are two holes on the back of the statue to attach it to a wall.
For the Doryphoros, then, it must be clarified where and how it was installed from the Augustan period until 79 CE. Even though the statue stands securely on the plinth and the plinth is smoothly worked, at least at the front, it is hardly likely that the statue was installed directly on the ground, especially since neither the porticoes nor the rooms in the west have permanent floors. But a suitable base – preferably reconstructed as an inscribed base made of or revetted with marble – has not been found. These conspicuously missing finds, which make option three problematic, have not been systematically addressed in the literature. Similarly problematic lacunas concern other parts of the building, so the problem will be summarized further below for all findings.

Finally, for the Doryphoros, it should be pointed out that this statue once again gained crucial significance for the identification of the building as a palaestra after another Doryphoros replica was found in the gymnasium at Messene. This replica was identified as a representation of Theseus based on the description by Pausanias. Others have interpreted the Doryphoros as Achilles, or as a generic statue of an ideal athlete. A recent proposal suggested putting a sword and shield in his hands. Even though no other Doryphoros statues have been found in palaestrae or gymnasia to date, the two replicas in Pompeii and Messene are considered to be typical and appropriate decoration for such facilities. All the same, the findings in Pompeii show that the Doryphoros cannot be claimed to determine the function of the original building. Its “late” installation, however, could reveal much about the seldom discussed function of the building in the post-Samnite period, i.e., in Roman Pompeii.

The excavation reports suggest that another base with a statue was installed in the Samnite Palaestra during the Augustan period. Only the inscribed marble revetment slab of a base was found, honoring Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus. But today it no longer stands in the place where it was found. The offices and honors listed on this and other bases discovered in Pompeii attest that Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus was one of the most important local elites in the Augustan period. The inscription explicitly states that the statue was reinstalled (reposuit), which F. Pesando has tied to repairs done after the earthquake of 62 CE: Marcus Decidianus Pilonius Rufus may have restored the palaestra and the statue of Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus after the earthquake, while Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus could have financed the reconstruction of the palaestra in the Augustan period. This would testify to the palaestra’s uninterrupted significance for the Pompeian elite until 79 CE, which would also be reflected in the carefully maintained sculptural decoration. Since the top of the base is not preserved, the decision cannot be made as to whether the statue of Decidianus Rufus was made out of marble or of bronze, as was much more customary for honorific statues in Pompeii. The exact location where the statue was erected cannot be reconstructed either, since conclusive remains, such as a mausory foundation or core, have not been preserved or documented. The limited space in the Samnite Palaestra offers few possibilities. A marble statue would have been better off reconstructed in one of the porticoes or the rooms; a bronze statue could have stood in the open courtyard without a problem.

In summary, at least two, if not three statues can be reconstructed for the Samnite Palaestra, each of which comes with its own significant problems: 1. a marble statue connected with the tufa ensemble of a base, altar, and set of stairs that was presumably installed in the Sam-

19 Franciosi 2013, esp. 24 fig. 27b.
21 CE, e.g., Yegül 1993, 382: “A slightly over–life–size marble copy of Doryphoros by Polyclitus found inside the palaestra (it might or might not have been set on the base) underlines the agonistic character of the building.”
25 Pesando 2000, 170, explicitly mentions that the inscribed marble panel belonged to a “base di statua in cementizio” whose exact find location in the palaestra is not mentioned in the excavation diary of F. La Vega.
26 The tufa ensemble preserved in situ, however, shows that marble statues were also installed in the open air.
27 Pesando 2000, 168, suspects that two herms, donated by Decidianus Rufus in the Augustan era, were additionally installed in the palaestra. They were supposed to have been reused in neighboring Iseion after 62 CE as framing for a niche. It would be striking in this case, however, had the sculptures associated with Decidianus suffered a different fate after 62 CE: whereas his honorific statue was specifically repaired and reinstalled in the Samnite Palaestra after 62 CE, his sanctified herms were removed from the palaestra.
nitive period, but as an addition to the original building; 2. the statue of Doryphoros, probably dedicated in Augustan times, which was positioned in an unknown location or perhaps on the already existing tufa base; 3. the statue honoring Decidianus Rufus, which was consecrated by unknown benefactors in a similarly unknown location, perhaps in the Augustan period, and reinstalled by Marcus Decidius Pilonius Rufus after 62 CE. Because components of all three statue installations were found, and the statue of Decidianus Rufus should still have been standing after 62 CE, all three were probably intended to be seen simultaneously; this would mean that the Samnite Palaestra, which was relatively small from the start and was subsequently made even smaller, had a comparatively rich sculptural decoration, beginning in the Augustan period.

On the other hand, the state of preservation at the time of the excavation must be discussed much more critically than has occurred in the literature: Why has the marble statue from the tufa ensemble not been found, or the marble or bronze statue of Decidianus Rufus, or the masonry core of its statue base and the (masonry and marble-clad or even solid marble) base of the Doryphoros? The missing marble or bronze elements could be explained by looting right after the eruption of Vesuvius, even if there is no concrete evidence of this practice in the case of the Samnite Palaestra. In any case, the marble Doryphoros statue and the marble inscription for Decidianus Rufus would have evaded the grasp of the treasure hunters. Looting is not a conclusive explanation for the fact that no masonry core for a statue base has been found, however, since such masonry base cores have survived at the Forum, the site of intensive post-79 pillaging.  

This begs the question of whether the Samnite Palaestra was even fully decorated, fit for use, or being used in 79 CE, and whether all the sculpture components found here really belonged to the building; perhaps they were only stored there, for reasons unknown. This primarily concerns the strangely isolated marble inscription to Decidianus Rufus, but would also theoretically apply to the Doryphoros statue. The statue-less tufa ensemble would suggest that the building had lost its original significance (and function?) around 79 CE.

Given this background, the statuary decoration of the Samnite Palaestra is to be evaluated with great caution and cannot be claimed to identify the function of this building with any certainty. The prominently placed, carefully planned, and – until 79 CE – well-preserved tufa ensemble proves only that a statue was erected here and was the object of cult worship, at least for a time. This statue could have been the only "decorative" element in the palaestra, which provides no evidence of any permanent floors and wall paintings, and only little other furniture.  

2 The Large Palaestra in Pompeii

The Large Palaestra is located directly alongside Pompeii’s amphitheater (Pl. 3). The 141.75 × 107.4 m complex, presumably built in the Augustan period, consists of a peristyle courtyard with a surface area of 127 × 100 m, framed on three sides by a raised portico of brick columns with composite capitals of tufa. In the center of the open space is a rectangular swimming pool (34.55 × 22.25 m) with a depth of 1 to 2.60 m.  

Trees were planted in double rows in front of the porticoes. The entire complex was surrounded by a crenellated wall. While the accessibility of the complex has not been fully clarified, at least three openings identified as main entrances led to the amphitheater and there were smaller entrances on the north and west sides. The vast peristyle courtyard was only partially framed by rooms, on two sides: a latrine to the south that was added later, and a centrally placed exedra to the west with a secondary room. This exedra includes a base in situ, placed at the center, which should be interpreted as the base of a statue because of its dimensions and location (Fig. 2). Only the masonry core of the base and the molded marble revetment at the foot of the base have yet been extensively studied or published.

29 Avagliano 2013, 72 note 25 mentions a labrum that was found near the main entrance.
30 Maiuri 1939, 165–238; Delorme 1960, 436–439; Zanker 1995, 123–125; La Rocca, M. De Vos, and A. De Vos 1994, 266–268; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 74–76; Borlenghi 2011, 45–47, 220–226. Maiuri 1939, 165–238, provides a detailed excavation report, but the building has not been fully clarified, at least three openings identified as main entrances led to the amphitheater and there were smaller entrances on the north and west sides. The vast peristyle courtyard was only partially framed by rooms, on two sides: a latrine to the south that was added later, and a centrally placed exedra to the west with a secondary room. This exedra includes a base in situ, placed at the center, which should be interpreted as the base of a statue because of its dimensions and location (Fig. 2). Only the masonry core of the base and the molded marble revetment at the foot of the base have yet been extensively studied or published.

31 The Augustan dating is based on the dating of walls (material and technology) and tree roots; Jashemski 1979, 160–161; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 75; Borlenghi 2011, 224.
32 The number of access points varies according to the plans published; cf. Trümper 2008, 85 note 369; Borlenghi 2011, 220, describes ten entrances for the last use phase after 62 CE.
survived.33 Since the marble revetment of the base’s corpus (which may have held an inscription) and the cover plate are missing, the number and nature of the statues that may have been installed here can no longer be determined. A colossal statue or a group of three statues could easily have been erected on the base, however.34

The floor plan, with its large peristyle courtyard and swimming pool, is usually cited as a criterion for identifying the building as a facility for athletic activities, as are some of the abundantly preserved graffiti.35 Although “Large Palaestra” (Palestra grande) has become established as its name, the building has been identified as a campus for training the Augustan iuventus, a “luogo destinato alla formazione fisica e intellettuale del cittadino-soldato.”36 But its intra-urban location and abundant and varied graffiti have given A. Borlenghi reason to assume that the complex was conceived from the beginning as a multifunctional structure, intended not only for iuvenes training and recreation, but as a public place for the entire population, “d’incontro deputato al divertimento e allo svago.”37

Against this background, the interesting and as-yet-undiscussed question arises once again of whether the hybrid concept – campus and luxurious portico-complex at the same time – is manifested in the statuary decoration, or whether the statuary decoration can confirm such a concept and perception of the building. Whereas the sculptural decoration of campi apparently remained largely limited to cult statues in exedrae or apses,38 the portico-complexes (especially in Rome) were characterized by lavish decoration including sculptures, paintings, and other objects.39

Only one finding indicates that statues were installed in the Large Palaestra: the aforementioned exedra, with the large base at its rear. Even with the evidence that elements of the building’s decoration were renewed before 62 CE, and that repairs and additions took place after 62 CE, the exedra can be unequivocally identified as part of the original layout.40 The intercolumnium in front of the exedra in the western portico was widened as well as decorated with pilasters and half-columns, its own staircase to the courtyard, and possibly even a gable.

33 Maiuri 1939, 174 does not specify dimensions for the surviving base, nor are these found in any later publication; according to the plan in Maiuri 1939, pl. IX, the base is 3.15 m wide and 1.30 m deep at the molded foot.
34 Cf. the dimensions of statue bases that are sure to have supported colossal statues, in Ruck 2007, 27–50 table 6–7.
37 Borlenghi 2011, 226; on the graffiti see also Langner 2001, 23, 117–118. The graffiti attest to amphitheater visitors, soldiers, slaves, teachers, doctors, hairdressers, and passersby.
38 Borlenghi 2011, passim, mentions only a few statues for the campi in the western Mediterranean; his synthesis devotes an individual chapter only to cultic sites and consecrations, Borlenghi 2011, 170–173.
39 These include the Portico of Pompey, the Porticus Liviae, the Porticus Metelli/Octaviae, and the Templum Pacis in Rome; Maucaulay-Lewis 2011; cf. also the Agora of the Italians in Delos; Trümper 2008. The Eu-machia Building in Pompeii, in which few statues were set up, and the Basilica or Augusteum in Herculaneum, in which lavish sculptural decoration was found, are often compared to the rich portico-complexes in Rome; Allroggen-Bedel 2008; Trümper 2009, 49–55.
40 Borlenghi 2011, 224.
obviously to emphasize the exedra in the back.\textsuperscript{41} Borlenghi reconstructs a cult statue on the statue base and interprets the exedra as a cultic center of the complex and of the \textit{iuvenes}, who would have worshipped Flora or another deity here.\textsuperscript{42} Others, by contrast, have reconstructed the statue of an emperor on the base, such as Augustus, who particularly favored the \textit{iuvenes}.\textsuperscript{43} The lack of other statues is conspicuous and requires an explanation. It is known that the complex was damaged in the earthquake of 62 CE and that renovations were still underway in 79 CE.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, the discovery of the statue base suggests that this building was at least partially robbed of some of its precious materials (marble, metal) after the eruption of the volcano.\textsuperscript{45} But neither of these phenomena can fully or satisfactorily explain the lack of decorative sculpture. If honorific statues\textsuperscript{46} or statues of athletes, heroes, or gods had been set up here, some remains from the bases would at least have been found in or in front of the porticoes, in the intercolumniations, or out in the courtyard. As has already been explained above and has also been confirmed by the example in the exedra of the Large Palaestra, bases with masonry cores would not all have been destroyed in the earthquake and then systematically removed, nor would they have been overlooked in excavations or consistently destroyed. As a result, the lack of statuary decoration may illuminate how the complex was conceived, suggesting that it was primarily intended as a pragmatic-functional structure for athletic training. In the local context, the complex apparently had neither the function and prestige of public squares and structures such as the forum and theater (\textit{loci amoeni}), where honorific statues were concentrated, nor the function and ambience of richly decorated public and private complexes with porticoes and peristyles (\textit{loci celeberrimi}), which were populated with “decorative” statues or even works of art.

The other decorations in the Large Palaestra confirm this as well: the porticoes and scarce rooms have only dirt floors; moreover, the porticoes were decorated with simple Third Style paintings, which date to the eras of Caligula or Claudius, and thus were not part of the original building. Repairs began after 62 CE, when ruined columns were mended and revetted with stucco. Some elements were highlighted architecturally, such as the entrance portals, the exedrae, and the crenelated perimeter wall. Thus, there was investment in decoration but the expense was largely limited to a pragmatic minimum. This demonstrates once again that while the structure was impressively monumental, it was conceived as a simply decorated functional building, rather than a luxurious portico-complex. This austere conceptualization does not seem to have changed during the building’s seventy to ninety years of use.

3 The Palaestra at Herculaneum

This palaestra is located east of Cardo V, at Insula Occidentalis II.\textsuperscript{47} Although the eastern part of the complex has never been completely revealed, the various tunnel excavations have allowed the basic features of its layout to be reconstructed. The complex occupied an entire insula and extended over several terraces, following the south-to-north gradient of the topography. At the center of the palaestra is a peristyle courtyard measuring 118 x 80 m (9500 m\textsuperscript{2}), framed on three sides by Corinthian columned halls and by a cryptoportico to the north (Pl. 4). The open courtyard held two large

\textsuperscript{41} Borlenghi 2011, 220.
\textsuperscript{42} Borlenghi 2011, 224.
\textsuperscript{43} Zanker 1995, 124; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 76.
\textsuperscript{44} Borlenghi 2011, 224.
\textsuperscript{45} Maiuri 1939, 174 interpreted this finding as evidence that the exedra had not yet been completely restored after 62 CE with its stucco decoration and base. This is unlikely, at least with regard to the base, because the foot of the base would hardly have been installed prior to the stucco decoration, while the rest of the base’s marble revetment would have been added only later. It is likewise highly improbable that only the foot of the base had been installed when Vesuvius erupted.
\textsuperscript{46} Pesando 2000, 166–167 and Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 76, propose that the fragment of the inscription CIL X, 552, which documents the dedication of a public building by the duovir Marcus Lucertius Decidianus Rufus, could have referred to the Large Palaestra; Borlenghi 2011, 222, mentions two inscribed marble fragments found in the latrine and possibly installed in the Augustan era above the middle entrance in the east wall; they also commemorate a donation to the Pompeians by two men: [– – –]us C(ai) [filius] M(arcus) Ge[minius] M(arci) [filius] / p(ublice) p(om)peiianis; Della Corte 1939, 303–304 no. 398 fig. 20; Della Corte 1947, 561. One could have expected that honorific statues were installed in the building for men such as these, especially since Decidianus Rufus received numerous statues in Pompeii; cf. Pesando 2000, 163–174 fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{47} Maiuri 1958, 116, 142–143; Yegül 1993; Devijver and Wontghem 1984; Pagano 1996, 243–248; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 382–384; for detailed descriptions that also take the newest research into account see Borlenghi 2011, 192–207; Esposito 2014, 47–54; Esposito 2015. Because the rooms are not uniformly designated (with numbers or letters) in the literature, the plan in pl. 4 in this paper provides letters for the rooms that are relevant for the discussion, for ease of understanding.
basins: a cross-shaped basin, placed in the center (Pl. 4: G: 5.8 × 5.5 m and 5.8 × 3.15 m, 1-1.2 m deep, with stairs in the northwest corner), and a long rectangular basin, located in front of the cryptoportico (Pl. 4: H: 30 × 3 m, 2.35 m deep). Traces of plantings were also found in the courtyard. Only one small semicircular exedra (Pl. 4: D, I) presumably opened onto the south portico; the east and especially the better-known west portico, by contrast, were lined with numerous, sometimes two-storied rooms, including rooms with clear architectural emphasis (often referred to as aula or aulae, pl. 4: D, E, K). The western aula extended over two levels and was built on the same axis as the cross-shaped basin. It had a raised apse to the west and was flanked by two symmetrical rooms (Pl. 4: J-M). The rooms to the west of this three-room group opened onto the Cardo as tabernae. The northern cryptoportico (Pl. 4: F) supported an open portico that was connected to other rooms, including a large aula with a vestibule that opened onto Cardo V (Pl. 4: N-O). The peristyle courtyard, by contrast, was accessible through at least two monumental entrances in the southwest of Cardo V and in the northeast (probably from Cardo VI) (Pl. 4: A, N).

Based on the construction technique and especially the stamps on the bricks, the complex insula was interpreted as a uniformly planned and executed construction project begun in the late Augustan period and completed by 35 CE at the latest. Although it has been proved that the complex was altered after the earthquake in 62 CE, there is disagreement about the stages and exact extent of the reconstruction measures taken, which will probably not be clarified until the building has been comprehensively studied and published. The main evidence for construction measures after 62 CE is a marble inscription that was found in the southwestern entrance area at Cardo V (Pl. 4: A–B). It dates back to 76 CE and documents that the emperor Vespasian had the Temple of Mater Deum restored after it had been destroyed in an earthquake. There is dispute over whether this inscription belonged to the palaestra, however, and where exactly it was installed, even though this information is key to understanding the function and designation of the complex.

Another imperial inscription, also found in the southwestern vestibule, memorializes two persons (magni stipites) for restoring the sanctuary (aedem) of an unknown deity. The exact date of the inscription and its connection to the building complex are also unknown, as is its function; nevertheless, this inscription has been used to determine the function of the palaestra.

Given the floor plan’s similarities with that of the Large Palaestra in Pompeii – and especially because of the peristyle courtyard with basins – the complex was initially identified as a palaestra or campus of the colony. Even researchers who acknowledged substantial architectural differences between the two complexes in Pompeii and Herculaneum adhered to the interpretation of the site as a place for athletic training. Only recently has a radically new interpretation been proposed, one which is principally based on Vespasian’s dedication inscription and on the sculptural decoration: that the complex served as a sanctuary for Near Eastern gods, who were worshipped here in various sacella; Cybele/Mater Deum, Dea Syria/Atargatis, and Isis are

48 Maiuri 1938, 136; Jashemski 1979, 162.
49 The rooms on the east side are not listed on the plan Maiuri 1938, 114 fig. 91 (here pl. 4); for these see Pagano 1996, 258 fig. 13; Borlenghi 2011, 192 fig. 86; Esposito 2015, 214 fig. 8.
50 Borlenghi 2011, 192–207, labels this part as the upper terrace, and the peristyle courtyard section as the lower terrace. For critical remarks on the plan and function of the upper terrace see Esposito 2015 with older literature.
51 For dating see Borlenghi 2011, 202; Pagano 1996, 243 reconstructs only one renovation after 62 CE; Montesi 2010 posits two phases, one immediately after 62 CE and one in 72-73 CE. Despite extensive recent research, the building has to be fully published.
53 Arguments against linking the inscription and the building include

Maiuri 1938, 192 note 59; Pagano 1996, 245–246; Horster 2001, 282. Suggested explanations for the find location included displacement by the pyroclastic flows, as well as the inscription being stored in the vestibule. On the pyroclastic flows see Guadagni 1995.
54 AE 1980, 248: Haec op[era et ?] / aede[m...]/ peq(unia) s[ua...]/ D(ecimus) Clau[dius...]/ Sex(tus) Spur[ius.../.....]. On the various additions and interpretations see Borlenghi 2011, 198, 205, who notes that the inscription could possibly be dated to the Augustan period and would then have referred to the repair of a late republican sanctuary that had been here before the construction of the palaestra. But this does not explain why this inscription was located in the vestibule of the palaestra in 75 CE (perhaps reused as a spoil in the construction of the palaestra?).
55 For a summary of the research discussion see Borlenghi 2011, 203–204; Esposito 2015, 224–226.
56 Karl Weber proposed the interpretation as a sanctuary (“Palacio della Vénère ó Vespasiano ó Madre de los Deos”) in 1757; cf. Ruggiero 1885, 231–232, but Maiuri rejected it after the complex had been comprehensively uncovered; Maiuri 1958, 118.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Object Designation</th>
<th>Find location (refer-ences to rooms fromfig. 6)</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statue Hermes</td>
<td>Richelieu type with portrait head 1.76 m Flavian Marble</td>
<td>Pagano 1996, 247, 260 fig. 16; Borlenghi 2011, 198, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Statue + base Aphrodite Fréjus type</td>
<td>Courtyard, northeast corner 1.76 m; base:1.15 x 0.55 x 0.455m</td>
<td>Mid-1st cent. CE Marble</td>
<td>Pagano 1996, 247, 260 fig. 17; Borlenghi 2011, 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Base ?</td>
<td>Portico, southeast corner (D/E) ? Opus vittatum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Base + inscription</td>
<td>Isis or Hygieia? Portico, southwest corner (C/D)</td>
<td>Statue: 0.60 m; base:0.55 x 0.45 m</td>
<td>Marble, opus vittatum</td>
<td>Ruggiero 1885, 39; Pagano 1996, 247–248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sculpture Serpent (hydra?)</td>
<td>Center of cross-shaped basin (G)</td>
<td>2.42 m First half of 1st cent. CE Bronze</td>
<td>Guidobaldi 2005, Pappalardo 2005, Borlenghi 2011, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fragment Hand with object</td>
<td>Between basin and aula</td>
<td>26 cm long, 8 cm diameter</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Marble Pagano 1996, 248; Borlenghi 2011, 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statue Atoum</td>
<td>South of rectangular basin; from upper level? 0.90 m</td>
<td>Ptolemaic (Borlenghi), 18th Dynasty (Botti, Tran Tam Tinh)</td>
<td>Basalt Botti 1963, Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 51–52, fig. 1–2; Pagano 2000, 85–86 no. 17; Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.82; Borlenghi 2011, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Statuette Isis</td>
<td>Entrance area (B)</td>
<td>0.095 m 150–100 BCE Bronze</td>
<td>Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 61–62 no. 7, Gasparini 2006, 127 no. II.86, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Statuette Harpokrates</td>
<td>Entrance area (B)</td>
<td>0.08 m 1st cent. CE Bronze</td>
<td>Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 69–70 no. 25, Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.86, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Statuette Bes</td>
<td>Northwest corner 0.195 m 2nd cent. BCE (Tran Tam Tinh), Claudian-Neronian (Pagano)</td>
<td>0.195 m 2nd cent. BCE (Tran Tam Tinh), Claudian-Neronian (Pagano)</td>
<td>Bronze Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 76 no. 46, Pagano 2000, 105–106, Gasparini 2006, 127 no. II.85, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Statuette Aphrodite</td>
<td>Entrance area (B)</td>
<td>0.175 m ? Bronze</td>
<td>Accademia ercolanesi 1771, 52–53, pl. 14–15, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Statuette Hermes</td>
<td>Entrance area (B)</td>
<td>0.11 m ? Bronze</td>
<td>Accademia ercolanesi 1771, 123–125, pl. 33–34, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Statuette Herakles</td>
<td>Entrance area (B)</td>
<td>0.13 m ? Bronze</td>
<td>Accademia ercolanesi 1771, 83–85, pl. 22–23, Borlenghi 2011, 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
named. Vespasian’s dedication inscription would have been located above the southwestern entrance (Pl. 4: A) and consequently would have been relevant to the entire complex, even though the Mater Deum was worshipped only in the western aula (Pl. 4: K), whereas Isis’s sanctuary has been located on the upper terrace or on the lower terrace, perhaps next to the Mater Deum.

Borlenghi even reconstructed a chronological sequence of the cults: the first to be venerated would have been Cybele, popular under Augustus, along with Dea Syria, who was frequently associated with Cybele and whose worship would have been supported primarily by the northern basin used for fish farming (Pl. 4: H); Vespasian would have reestablished this sanctuary – in deliberate imitation of Augustus – and at the same time associated it with the imperial cult; he also would have introduced the cult of Isis during his reign, a cult that had still been unpopular under Augustus. The monumentality of the complex in the small town of Herculanum, however, suggests that even under Augustus, the imperial cult may have been associated with Cybele’s.

The complex nature of the function of the Palaestra at Herculanum cannot be discussed in detail here. Instead, the focus below will be on the question of what an analysis of the sculptural decoration can contribute to the discourse on how to determine the function of the complex: whether there are clear indications of use as a sanctuary, an athletic facility, or even some other concept. For a better understanding of the discussion to follow, all documented and published sculptural finds have been compiled in a table and their find locations mapped (Tab. 1; Pl. 5).

Statues were installed in three corners of the portico: in the northeast, a statue of the Aphrodite Fréjus type was found next to an opus vittatum base (Tab. 1 no. 2, fig. 7 no. 2; Fig. 3).

In the southeast corner is another base in situ, but neither the inscription nor the statue have survived (Tab. 1 no. 3, Pl. 5 no. 3). There is also a base in the southwest corner which has been connected with a marble inscription fragment (Tab. 1 no. 4; Pl. 5 no. 4): IULIA HYGIA/EX VISU. According to the inscription, Julia Hygia acted as the donor of the statue. It can be gathered from the formulation ex visu that a statue of the gods was being donated. An under-life-size statue, now missing, was discovered in close proximity to the base by Karl Weber in 1757. He described the statue as a female holding a serpent in her hand, meaning that she could have represented Isis or Hygieia.

A statue of the Hermes Richelieu type was found with a Flavian portrait head in the northwest corner of the open courtyard (Tab. 1 no. 1; Pl. 5 no. 1; Fig. 4).

A five-headed bronze serpent winding around a narrow tree trunk had been installed in the center of the cross-shaped basin (Tab. 1 no. 5; Pl. 5 no. 5). This has been identified as the hydra of Lerna and, in the context of the palaestra, considered it to be an incentive for the youths to emulate Herakles. There have also been suggestions of ties to Rome, where Agrippa used a hydra statue to decorate a fountain next to the Basilica Julia, the Lacus Servilius.

In addition, a colossal left hand made of marble, holding an object painted reddish-brown, was found between the cross-shaped basin and the western aula absidata (Tab. 1 no. 6; Pl. 5 no. 6; Figs. 5–6). The hand’s find location and size suggest that it belonged to a statue installed in the western aula (Pl. 4: K). The location, size, and decoration of the aula and the raised apse are unanimously acknowledged in the scholarly literature as evidence that this room had a cultic function. Not only was this room located in the precise axis of the cross-shaped basin, but it was also accentuated by the design

---

57 Borlenghi 2011, 204–207.
58 Cf. the discussion of the decoration in Gasparini 2010; Borlenghi 2011, 198–202 with plan of distribution 199 fig. 90; Esposito 2014, 47–54; Esposito 2015.
59 Naples, National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 5997.
60 CIL X, 929.
61 On ex visu see Noy 2004.
62 “…una estatuita de marmol de mujer bestida con una camisa que le cubre solo el cuerpo, los brazos desnudos y las piernas; es alta de 2 pal. y 4 on. bien conservada, con la mano derecha tiene en la barba y el otro brazo como cruzado debajo del derecho y tiene con la mano izquierda una serpiente y las piernas tiene como cruzadas estando en pie.” Weber cited in Ruggiero 1883, 249; Borlenghi 2011, 220.
63 The matching base was missing, which led Guidobaldi 2005, 145 to suspect that the statue had come from the upper floor.
65 Festus 572 L. Guidobaldi 2005, 145; Borlenghi 2011, 206, argues that the hydra may have had no symbolic function, and therefore a purely decorative one.
66 Magazzino archeologico di Ercolano inv. 1623. Pagano 1996, 248; Borlenghi 2011, 220. No images of the hand have been published until now; the authors are grateful to Domenico Esposito for pointing out that this hand was in the magazine, as well as for his help with the request for publication rights.
of the west portico (its own staircase, a broadened intercolumniation, etc.), like the exedra in the Large Palaestra of Pompeii. The dimensions of the apse (4.1 m wide) suggest that a monumental statue or a group of statues was installed here; Cybele/Mater Deum and the emperor have been proposed as subjects of cult worship. The question is whether the interpretation of the marble hand can be of more assistance with this question. The hand was previously interpreted as part of an acrolith statue and therefore a colossal statue of the gods, which was installed in the apse. The question of whether it is an acrolith statue is of particular interest, since such statues are only expected to be found in a sanctuary. But the hand does not favor the acrolith statue interpretation, since the surviving part extends well beyond the wrist suggesting that a garment had covered the arm up to this point. In addition, the dowel hole at the end of the fragment is formed in the way one would expect a cut above the wrist is rather unusual for acrolith statues; usually the entire arm is attached. See Häger-Weigel 1997. An example of an acrolith statue with the hands preserved to above the wrists is one of the archaic acrolith statues from Morgantina, but the dowel holes are designed differently and the marble hands were probably attached to the wooden frame with wooden dowels; cf. Marconi 2008, 9–10 figs. 3–10.

68 Pagano 1996, 248. A more detailed discussion is needed as to why the hand was not found inside the apse and why only part of the statue was preserved.
69 On acrolith statues and attachments in general see Claridge 1990; Häger-Weigel 1997; Despinis 2004; Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2013, 761–763.
of stone attachments for marble or limestone statues. The surface is smooth and the dowel hole very narrow. A marble arm from Pantelleria with comparable attachment points can be cited as a parallel to the marble hand from Herculaneum. Since this arm of the Pantelleria statue has been interpreted as an intentional addition to a marble statue, an analogous interpretation is also possible for the hand from Herculaneum.

The reddish-brown painted object in the hand merits special attention as well: it is a flat, rectangular object surrounded by three fingers (middle finger to little finger) in such a way that it can only be seen on the palm of the hand under the bent fingers (Fig. 5). The continuation between the extended index finger and the outstretched thumb, by contrast, is easy to see. The object juts out between the index and middle finger in particular, as well as between the thumb and index finger, and the reddish-brown paint has been well preserved in both these parts. Because the hands and fingers of statues survive so rarely and are often substituted with modern additions, it is not easy to find comparisons for this hand position. Numerous conceivable attributes can be excluded, however, such as a lance, a bow, a lightning bolt, a club, a sistrum, a patera, and even a plectrum, which was usually held in the right hand. Two narrow edges of the object have no reddish-brown color: next to the little finger, and on the slanted edge between the thumb and index finger; by contrast, there are traces of color on the straight edge between the thumb and index finger and the straight edge between the index and middle finger. Since the surface of the unpainted edges has been smoothed, however, these edges cannot be reliably identified as broken edges of a partially preserved object without closer study. The partially preserved object may

70 Cf. Häger-Weigel 1997, 46–55; Claridge 1990, esp. 147–151 with pictures; more recent work on acrolith or marble statues is in Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015, 761–763. The closest resemblance is in the surface treatment Claridge 1990, 150 fig. 21a. It should be noted, however, that previous research has dealt primarily with the heads of acrolith statues. Attached limbs, particularly hands, have rarely been addressed because of the state of their preservation.
71 Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015, 738 no. 20 fig. 20a–d, with discussion 761–763.
72 Pagano 1996, 248 refers to this as a “tavoletta colorata” without further explanation or discussion.
be able to be completed as a sword, which a male statue would hold in his left hand. The sword blade would have continued below the little finger and palm; where exactly the pommel of the sword was and how it was held would have yet to be clarified.\footnote{On the holding of swords cf. the discussion and pictures in Spalthoff 2010, pl. 81 fig. 242; Marçadé 2000, fig. 6, 7.} Even if only the complete publication of the hand can clarify the questions raised here, the following must be noted for the question being posed: The hand can be interpreted as part of a colossal marble statue; although the object held by the statue cannot be determined with certainty, typical attributes of some gods (Cybele, Isis, Herakles) can at least be excluded. If the object was a sword, the statue may have depicted an emperor.

A black basalt statue of the sitting Atoum was found south of the northern basin, in the peristyle courtyard, and assigned to the upper terrace (Tab. 1 no. 7; Pl. 5 no. 7).\footnote{Antiquarium Herculanenum inv. 2168/2169. H. 90 cm. Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 51–52 no. 1, fig. 1–2: 18. in dynasties; Pagano 1996, 245: Prolaimai; Gasparini 2010, 234: late 4th/early 3rd cent. BCE..} An inscription in hieroglyphics names the statue as Atoum, god of Heliopolis and Aha. Unusually, there is a hole underneath the left shoulder, which may have been used for transport or as a waterspout. This is uncommon among Egyptian statues and would therefore have come from a Roman redesign.\footnote{The hole is not mentioned in the literature; the use of the statue as a waterspout would make the suspected cultic connotation obsolete.}

In addition to the listed statues, several statuettes were found, which have mainly been used to interpret the complex as a sanctuary of Isis. In the southwestern entrance, a group of statuettes was uncovered whose exact positioning in the large room cannot be reconstructed:

- Isis (Tab. 1 no. 8; fig. 7 no. 8)\footnote{Antiquarium Herculanenum inv. 1411/76699.}
- Harpocrates (Tab. 1 no. 9; Pl. 5 no. 9)\footnote{Antiquarium Herculanenum inv. 1420/76698.}
- Aphrodite (Tab. 1 no. 11; Pl. 5 no. 11)\footnote{Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5133.}
- Hermes (Tab. 1 no. 12; Pl. 5 no. 12)\footnote{Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5227.}
- Herakles (Tab. 1 no. 13; Pl. 5 no. 13)\footnote{Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5270.}

Furthermore, a Bes statuette was found in the west porch (Tab. 1 no. 10; Pl. 5 no. 10).\footnote{Antiquarium Herculanenum inv. 1429/76707.} The objects with Egyptian connotations (Atoum, Bes, Isis, Harpocrates) have been grouped with other compatible objects to substantiate the theory of an Isis sanctuary. Examples include the statue donated by Julia Hygia in the southwestern entrance (Pl. 4: A); a gold amulet from the western entrance area (Pl. 5, no. 14);\footnote{Base: Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 1107; 1st cent. CE; H. 0.082 m; Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 81 no. 54; Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.83, Borlenghi 2011, 202; bulla d’oro: Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 24666; Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 81 no. 54; Gasparini 2006, 122; Borlenghi 2011, 202.} and statuettes found in the tabernae in Cardo V.\footnote{Scultures from rooms that did not connect to the interior of the complex, i.e., the palaestra area, are excluded here; on this see Borlenghi 2011, 199 fig. 90, who also includes these (on p. 226) in the considerations of the function of the building. The bronze base (27 × 19 × 8 cm) would have supported a statuette or a lightweight cult object; Borlenghi 2011, 202.}

What statements can be made about these largely heterogeneous sculptures that would help to identify the function of this building? From a methodological point of view, it would be important to examine several questions much more precisely, which cannot be done here in detail necessary but will be briefly discussed:

- The dating of the sculptures with regard to the question of whether they can be assigned to particular phases of use of the building; whether there were uniform sculpture programs, for example; or how the process of setting up and consecrating sculptures can be reconstructed. The Flavian portrait head, for instance, shows that the mode of decoration was changed and that new or modified sculptures could be installed during the use period of the building.
- The relevance of the find locations, which so far have been variably assessed: When (and why) are finds classified as belonging to the building, as opposed to being considered as secondary deposits or translocations occurring in the Vesuvius eruption? Which finds can justifiably be claimed to have been used for the decoration of the building and can there be used
for its interpretation. Critical discussion is needed on what is missing here and how it can be explained. Attempts must be made to explain why the palaestra decoration has been preserved in so fragmentary a fashion, particularly in view of the fact that considerably more extensive and more completely preserved sculptural decoration has been found in numerous other buildings in Herculaneum.

– The relevance of the find collections: Which criteria – the quality or the quantity of certain sculptures, for example – influence the interpretation? Statuette of Isis and Harpocrates were found in the southwestern entrance area (Pl. 4: B), but so were figures of Hermes, Aphrodite, and Heracles. Although the latter at least numerically outweighed the Egyptian gods, they have been given scant consideration in the literature. Another issue in need of critical interrogation is the installation of five differently sized statuettes measuring 8 to 17 cm. What effect could small objects of this kind have even exerted on visitors within the monumental entrance hall (7.75 × 21.63 m), and should they really be used to determine the function of the entire building complex? Such groups of variously sized statuettes are more typical of shrines or lararia in domestic or commercial contexts, but not in monumental entrances to large public buildings (palaestrae, sanctuaries, and others).

– There is much debate in research about whether sculptures had a “decorative” versus a “cultic-sacred” function and how to identify and prove this. The “Aegyptiaca” are particularly worthy of mention in this context; their importance has long been discussed in the scholarship. Recently it has been argued on a number of occasions that Egyptian motifs and depictions were not chosen for cultic reasons and should not be ascribed to the specific religious interests of those commissioning them. Rather, the introduction and dissemination of such motifs should be interpreted as an exotic fashion or attributed to the practice of collecting luxury objects and works of art. There must be corresponding critical interrogation of how the broadly scattered objects with Egyptian connotations and Egyptianizing elements in the wall paintings of different rooms are to be interpreted for the Palaestra at Herculaneum.

In sum, extreme caution should be used when enlisting the heterogeneous assemblages of sculptural decoration, with their depictions of gods and heroes as well as portrait statues, to determine the function of the building. Such statues permit neither a clear confirmation nor a definitive refutation of the sanctuary thesis. In any case, it should be emphasized that the sculptural decoration here is significantly more extensive than its equivalents in the small Samnite Palaestra and the Large Palaestra in Pompeii.

For this reason, only the plan and typology of the entire installation can be used to identify the complex. These were already decisive for its designation as a palaestra, but received scarce consideration for interpreting it as a sanctuary of Near Eastern gods. Sanctuaries with large porticoes had been well known in the Mediterranean since the Hellenistic period and were also represented in the Vesuvius cities. The corresponding sanc-
turies in Pompeii, however, included a centrally placed temple with an altar, and their landscaped open courtyards were not decorated with large basins. So far, no fixed typology has been established for sanctuaries of Cybele/Mater Deum, and no example has been clearly identified that could serve as a parallel to the Palaestra at Herculaneum. A similar situation applies for the Dea Syria, the worship of whom can hardly be convincingly confirmed by the existence of a basin suited to fish farming; in addition, the basin was found filled with rubbish, and so was probably no longer in use after 62 CE. Since Vespasian had the sanctuary renovated in 76 CE, a basin that was pivotal to the cult would certainly not have been filled with debris. Certain parallels can be invoked with respect to the Isis sanctuaries, which are the best studied among the sanctuaries of Near Eastern deities. The Iseum Campense in Rome is the most salient: its Flavian construction phase has been reconstructed with a large semicircular water basin and a sizeable but paved courtyard; the numerous assigned finds, however, point much more clearly to Egyptian deities than do those in the Palaestra at Herculaneum.

Even though the Palaestra at Herculaneum seems to have been significantly destroyed in the Vesuvius eruption, and furthermore has been neither completely uncovered nor comprehensively published, it is important to emphasize the lack of key elements that one would expect to find in a large sanctuary with several shrines and cults: altars in particular, but also objects such as cult statues, cultic equipment, and votive deposits.

The architectural differences between the Palaestra at Herculaneum and its counterpart in Pompeii have already been widely discussed and need not be repeated here. Only the striking difference in the decoration merits emphasis: the simple decoration in the Large Palaestra in Pompeii remained unchanged during its use period. The Palaestra at Herculaneum, by contrast, at least in its last phase of use, was richly decorated with various floors (opus signinum, opus tessellatum, opus sec-tile), various wall decorations (marble, Third and Fourth Style paintings with figural picture panels) and sculptures. The Palaestra at Herculaneum clearly had more in common here with the luxury portico-complexes in Rome listed above than with the Large Palaestra in Pompeii and campi. Cult worship absolutely played a role in the complexes of Rome. It was practiced in centrally placed temples or exedra-type shrines, or could be limited to evoking a sacral atmosphere through decoration and garden and landscape settings. It is important that these complexes also or even mainly served the population as “primary locations for leisured walking” in an atmosphere of amoenitas. Shady porticoes at various levels, gardens, water basins with various functions (decoration, fish farming, swimming and wading, boating) and luxurious decoration were also typical for villas of the time, such as the nearby Villa dei Papiri, and even for townhouses, such as the Pompeii house of Octavius Quartio/Loreius Tiburtinus (II 5, 2). Perhaps the best example to compare to Vespasian’s generous donation is the Templum Pacis in Rome, which included a prominently placed shrine to Pax but was also or even chiefly conceived as an extravagant complex with gardens and porticoes for the people. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Vespasian chose to restore a complex with a comparable design and designated the entire complex as a Templum Matris Deum. Only the complete publication of the complex can show how much was actually restored or conceptually changed in the Vespasian renovation and whether the late Augustan construction was already planned to be a portico-complex with shrine(s).

At present it cannot be determined with any certainty whether the facility was ever used for athletic training; the sculptures and inscriptions provide no clear indication, at least. Since the cross-shaped basin in the uncovered parts had at least one staircase, apparently it could and would have been well used. The basin depth of 1–1.10 m was no lap pool by today’s standards, but it would have allowed for simple swimming and

93 Pedrucci 2009.
94 Maiuri 1918, 137; Borlenghi 2011, 160, 203, interprets the basin as evidence of the Dea Syria.
95 Kleibl 2009.
96 Kleibl 2009, 200–204.
97 Especially Yegül 1993.
98 Cf. the list of the portico facilities and portico temple facilities of this type in Maucaulay-Lewis 2011 277 Tab. 11. 3.
99 Maucaulay-Lewis 2011, 277 (cit.); 278.
100 This house was even designated a “miniature villa”; Zanker 1995, 150–162; Tcherni 2006; Tcherni 2011; Dickmann 1999 has proven that such “villa” elements were being adapted and integrated into townhouses, in various forms, from as early as the 2nd/1st cent. BCE.
101 On renovations after 62 CE, cf., e.g., Monteix 2010, 226–231 fig. 17.
102 Strikingly little graffiti were found in the building, none of which points to iuvane or athletic activities; Borlenghi 2011, 198.
certainly immersion baths. The question of whether such baths were to be taken as part of athletic, cultic, or leisure activities, however, must remain unanswered. In all cases, clarification is needed on who took these baths and when, as well as the form (naked, clothed), society, and context (e.g., with or without onlookers) in which the bathing could have or should have occurred, and whether other equipment and spaces were also required (e.g., changing rooms).

4 Analysis

A comparative analysis of the questions posed at the beginning of this paper yields the following picture: A statue can certainly be demonstrated to have been present in the Samnite Palaestra, and as many as three statues may have been there after 79 CE. The Large Palaestra only has evidence of one base for a statue or group of statues. Only in the Palaestra at Herculaneum did the finds of bases, large sculptures, and statuettes illustrate a relatively broad spectrum of numbers, formats, and representations, which presumably would only increase if the building were to be completely uncovered.

The two facilities in Pompeii were definitely not as lavishly decorated with sculptures and other objects as reconstructed for gymnasium in the east, based on archaeological and epigraphic finds. With their austere functional decoration, the Pompeian buildings offered rather “empty” spaces that were eminently suitable for the vereitia and iuvenes activities that are attested in inscriptions. Their “spartan” decoration is not necessarily attributable to cultural conventions and customs in Samnite-Hellenistic Pompei or the Roman colonia of Pompeii, as a comparison with safely identified facilities in Solunt and Agrigent proves. From a typological standpoint, the completely excavated “gymnasium” of Solunt (the structure is more of a palaestra) and the only partially uncovered gymnasium of Agrigent exhibit significantly more commonalities with Greek gymnasia in the east than the Pompeian facilities, but no evidence of sculptural decoration has yet been found in either. Thorough investigations in the future will be needed to determine whether austerity was typical in athletic facility decoration throughout the western Mediterranean and how to explain this phenomenon. For Pompeii, what is clear is that the floor plans and sculptural decoration in the Large Palaestra show that “campus” would be a better designation for this site. Although the Samnite Palaestra differs from palaestre in the Greek east, this designation still seems to be the most appropriate, since no Oscan terms are known that would be fit to describe vereitia meeting places or training locations.

The Palaestra at Herculaneum appears on the whole to have been more sparingly decorated with sculpture than the eastern gymnasium; it does not exhibit a single “appropriate” sculpture or any “suitable” object that would clearly suggest the context of an athletic facility. Furthermore, the sculptural decoration in the local context in general is modest, to a rather striking degree, and would certainly not be classified as a space “crowded” with statues. Since Vespasian explicitly called attention to the restoration of the facility through his inscription in 76 CE, it must have been in a usable

103 On the criteria for the use of “swimming” pools see Trümper 2017; Trümper per 2018. The basin in the Large Palaestra of Pompei was markedly deeper, up to 2.60 m, but its bottom dropped out only gradually, from the west (1 m) to the east (2.60 m). The pool was accessible via a three-step staircase that extended over the entire west side and was decidedly inimical to the swimming of laps in the longer east-west direction; Maiuri 1939, 188 fig. 14.

104 These questions would also need to be discussed in much greater detail for the Large Palaestra in Pompeii than has been the case in the literature so far.

105 Von den Hoff 2004; von den Hoff 2011; Mathys 2014; Kazakidi 2015; von den Hoff 2015a; von den Hoff 2015b; R. von den Hoff in this volume. Particularly revealing is the inventory of Kallistratos, which lists the inventory of the Delian Gymnasium (or even a part of it) for the year 156/155 BCE, including 41 marble herms, 12 bronze torches, 10 bronze shields, 60 gilded shields as girders of portraits, numerous life-size and under-life-size sculptures, and many other objects; ID 1417, A., l. l. 118–134; Morretti 1996; Morretti 1997.

106 For the Samnite Palaestra: the controversial Oscan inscription Vetter 1953, 49–50, no. 11; the indications in the Large Palaestra include graffiti with the verb ludem, a reference to various magistri (in charge of the ludi iuvenales?) and the names of centurions as well as a painted edictum munerum on the northern outer wall that gives notice of ludi atletici, inter alia; Borlenghi 2011, 225. Cf. M. Trümper in this volume.

107 E.g., donations/statues of/for iuvenes athletes or officials; objects like labra and strigiles; or consecrations of victory like the torches in Delos, etc. Statuettes of Hermes and Herakles (Tab. 1 no. 11–12) are appropriate to the context of a Greek gymnasium, but were also popular far beyond; their find context and their socialization, moreover – in the western vestibule (Plate 4: B) together with statuettes of Aphrodite, Isis, and Harpocrates – does not provide a clear and convincing determination of the function and identification of the building.

108 Cf., e.g., the galleries of statues found in the theater, the Basilica Noniana, the Augusteum (or so-called basilica), and the Villa dei Papiri; Guidobaldi 2008.
state at this point, even if it was not yet completely renovated. The sculptures should therefore be thoroughly representative of the functional concept of the Vespasian complex. The plan of the complex suggests that it was designed as a portico and not as a palaestra or campus. This does not rule out a sacred function, or even a (Vespasian re-)designation as a Templum Matris Deum – following the model of the Templum Pacis in Rome. The sculptural decoration falls short of the usual reconstructions of portico-complexes in Rome, but does not contradict the function or designation proposed above.
Pl. i  Pompeii, "campus complex" at the Foro Triangolare. 1.2. 1 Foro Triangolare (porticoes, racetrack?); 2 Palaestra Sannirica; 3 Quadriporticus; 4 Lot VIII 6, 5 (domus publica?); 5 Casa di Giuseppe II (domus publica?); 6 Republican Baths.
Pl. 2  Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, plan.
Pl. 3 Pompeii, Large Palaestra, plan.
Pl. 4  Herculaneum, Palaestra, plan.
Pl. 5  Herculaneum, Palaestra, plan with find locations of the sculptures, rectangular: bases in situ, round: approximate find location.
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The Emergence and Significance of the Palaestra Type in Greek Architecture

Summary

This paper explores the significance of palaestrae as a characteristic architectural feature of Greek gymnasia. First, the identification of palaestrae from the archaeological evidence is examined. While gymnasia were identified based on the existence of a peristyle courtyard alone in earlier research, I argue that only the combination of peristyle, exedra and loutron is sufficient evidence for the secure identification of a building as a palaestra. Second, the interrelation of gymnasia and general developments of Greek architecture and urban design are discussed. Since gymnasia were a vital part of urban landscapes from the 4th century BC onwards, the architectural shape of palaestrae is closely related to contemporaneous concepts of diversification of urban space, and social exclusiveness.
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The interrelation of gymnasia and Graeco-Roman cityscapes is reciprocal. On the one hand, the development of the institution of the Greek gymnasium took place within the framework of the Greek and Roman city, its physical shape and the political and religious institutions of the polis. On the other hand, gymnasium had an impact on the city as a whole. As architecturally defined spaces, gymnasia were part of the urban landscape from the 4th century BC onwards; as a vital place of interaction, the gymnasium usually formed a crucial part of the social life of the polis. Therefore, in order to arrive at a better understanding of the meaning of gymnasia and their architectural form it is inevitable to consider both, the architectural development of Greek cityscapes in general as well as that of Greek gymnasia in particular. Accordingly, the aim of this paper is twofold: in the first part, I will discuss palaestrae as the most typical architectural feature of Greek gymnasia. In the second part, I will focus on the significance of the peristyle as an architectural type in general.

1 Peristyles and (false) Palaestrae

In terms of architecture, probably the most characteristic feature of many Greek gymnasia was the palaestra. It is commonly accepted that Greek gymnasia usually comprised a number of separate architectural structures. This was the case in Amphipolis, Olympia, Priene, and many other places (Pl. 1). Typical buildings that could be part of a gymnasial compound include facilities for running like xystoi and stadia as well as bathing facilities and sanctuaries.\(^1\) The presence or absence of all these structures within an architectural ensemble seems to differ according to local conditions. However, nearly all gymnasia had a peristyle building that is referred to typologically as palaestra.\(^2\) With regard to their function, palaestrae can be considered the focal unit of each gymnasium. It is usually within the palaestrae where the majority of imagery was set up, where prestigious donations of specific parts of the architecture can be observed, etc. In the terms of Greek epigraphy, one might say that the palaestra usually was the epiphanestatos topos of each gymnasium. In addition, the obvious importance of the palaestrae buildings is further emphasized by the chronological development of many gymnasia. As Christian Wacker pointed out in his study of the palaestra at Olympia, palaestra buildings were usually the earliest architectural structures that were constructed within a gymnasial ensemble.\(^3\) The apparent ubiquity of this building type regularly led scholars to the assumption that, in turn, a building with a peristyle is often likely to be a gymnasium.

The reason for this equation lies in the history of modern archaeology and in the excavation of Olympia in particular. It was as early as 1876 that excavations under the auspices of the German archaeological institute led to the rediscovery of a building that was immediately identified as the palaestra mentioned by Pausanias.\(^4\) Furthermore, the palaestra at Olympia was considered to be in accordance with the description of the ideal Greek gymnasium by Vitruvius.\(^5\) Due to its correspondence with these literary sources, the palaestra at Olympia soon became an important model for the interpretation of other peristyle buildings and was regularly referred to as such. Therefore, the impact of the palaestra at Olympia on the interpretation of allegedly similar buildings especially in the late 19th and early 20th century can hardly be underestimated. This is easily illustrated by looking at a number of comparable structures at other sites, that have originally, though wrongly, been identified as gymnasia mostly with explicit reference to the building in Olympia (Pl. 2).

For instance a major building in the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros was identified as a gymnasium by its excavator Panagiotis Kavvadias in 1900 (Pl. 2).\(^6\) However, further research conducted by August Frickenhaus and successively by Richard Tomlinson proved that this building served as a dining establishment due to the installation of klinai within the major rooms.\(^7\) Similarly, a building in the extramural sanctuary of Hera near Argos was considered a gymnasium by the excavators due to

---

1 For these components see Delorme 1960, 235–260; Wacker 1996, 61–66.
2 For the term palaestra see Delorme 1960, 260–271.
4 Paus. 6.11.2; Adler, Borrmann, and Dörpfeld 1892, 113–121.
5 Vitruv. 5.11.1.
the existence of a peristyle courtyard. It was once again Frickenhaus who could prove that the building was used as a setting for symposia due to the evidence of klinai in the three rooms that open onto the peristyle courtyard. Similarly, a building at Miletus has been identified as a ‘Hellenistic Gymnasium’ by its excavator Theodor Wiegand. This interpretation was based mainly on the alleged similarity to the lower gymnasion at Priene that had been excavated about 10 years earlier by Wiegand, as well. In addition, the excavators considered the adjacent thermae of Capito a later addition to the original gymnasia structure. However, whereas the secondary addition of bathing facilities to pre-existing gymnasia is generally a common phenomenon in Asia minor in the Roman Imperial era, this rule does not apply to the case of Miletus. In this case, no attempt was made to connect the thermae by adding a door to the northern back wall of the Hellenistic building (Pl. 3).

Since washing facilities have not been safely identified in the original structure, it seems very unlikely that this building functioned as a gymnasium at any point of its history. Due to its position at the center of the city as well as its spatial and chronological relationship to the neighboring bouleuterion the alleged Hellenistic gymnasion of Miletus might have housed a political or administrative institution of the city, instead. Yet another example is the case of the gymnasion at Sikyon. This building was originally identified as a gymnasion by its excavator Anastasios K. Orlandos with reference to its ground plan as well as a passage in Pausanias who mentions a gymnasion ‘not far from the Agora’. The building was referred to accordingly until recently. However, a recent reassessment of the archaeological material found in the course of the excavations showed that this interpretation is rather unlikely. Further buildings that have been identified as gymnasia due to the existence of a central courtyard include a building in Ai Khanoum as well as the so-called ‘Asclepieion’ at Paestum. Whereas the identification of the first building has been challenged by Inge Nielsen, who interpreted it as part of the extensive palatial quarters of Ai Khanoum, the example in Paestum is likely to be another example of a lavish dining hall from the early Hellenistic period.

These examples illustrate that the general assumption that a building with a peristyle court must be interpreted as a gymnasium became something like a self-fulfilling prophecy within the archaeology of the early 20th century. Contrarily, the problem of the identification of palaestrae shows that the most conspicuous feature of this building type, i.e. the peristyle, was used for structures with a variety of other functions, as well. This observation leads to two implications. 1.) Since a peristyle courtyard alone is not sufficient evidence for the identification of a palaestra or gymnasium, more specific criteria need to be defined in order to securely identify these buildings from the archaeological evidence. 2.) Since the peristyle as an architectural feature is not restricted to gymnasia, the significance of this architectural type must lie beyond the concrete function of the individual building. Therefore, in order to arrive at a proper understanding of the phenomenon of Greek palaestrae it is inevitable to consider some general developments of Greek architecture and urban planning, especially of the 4th century BC when the peristyle became a widespread phenomenon in Greek cities and sanctuaries.

### 2 Peristyles and (genuine) Palaestrae

The problem of identifying gymnasia or, more precisely, palaestrae from the archaeological record is closely re-
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8 Waldstein 1902, 132: “The original destination of the building is uncertain and conjecture has made it a gymnasium.”
9 Frickenhaus 1917, 121–130; Lepold 2008, 28–33.
11 Miletus: Wiegand 1908, 9. In his brief discussion of the functions of the individual rooms in the gymnasion of Priene Wiegand explicitly refers to Vitruvius as well as to the gymnasia at Delphi and Eretria. The palaestra at Olympia, however, is not mentioned: Wiegand and Schrader 1924, 274–275.
12 Wiegand 1908, 10.
13 For detailed discussion of the building see Emme 2013, 113–118; Trump 2015 196–205.
14 Paus. 2.10.1–7; Orlandos 1934, 122; Wacker 1996, 220–221.
17 Ai Khanoum: Veuve 1987; von Hesberg 1995, 15–16; Paestum: recent works on the building were published by E. Greco, suggesting that the building housed a sanctuary of Asclepius: Greco 1999; for the interpretation as a gymnasion see Maiuri, Aurigemma, and Spinazzola 1986, 56; Lauter 1986, 237.
lated to the problem of the function of these buildings. With regard to the ubiquity of palaestrae within Greek gymnasia it seems striking that the precise function of these buildings is far from being understood completely. Whereas the archaeological evidence of the use of individual rooms is often scarce, literary sources evoke the impression of a variety of different rooms for specific functions such as apodyteria, konisteria, sphairistrae, korykeia etc. However, discussions of these terms among both epigraphists and archaeologists have made it clear that many of them cannot be identified within the archaeological or architectural evidence from any site.\(^{20}\) A promising example is the gymnasia at Delos. In this case, a rather precise description of the building survives in the form of several inventories from the mid-2nd century BC. The most famous among these lists, the so-called inventory of Kallistratos, can be dated to the year 156/155 BC.\(^{21}\) The inventory mentions the names of several rooms of the Delian gymnasia such as an apodyterion, a portico (peristoon), an exedrion, a loutron and an epistasion. These names have been attributed to different parts of the building by different scholars.\(^{22}\) The most likely solution is shown here in Pl. 4.

However, it is crucial to point out that only three parts of the building can be identified with certainty, according to their architectural shape. Obviously, the term peristoon refers to the portico, surrounding the central courtyard. The loutron can be identified with two rooms in the north-western corner of the building.\(^{23}\) Finally, the term exedrion is likely to refer to the room on the northern side of the building regarding its architectural layout and the bench along its rear wall. The identification of the other rooms mentioned in the inscription relies mainly on the assumption that their order in the inventory reflects the progression of the magistrates on their way through the building.

Thus, the case of the Delian gymnasia illustrates that only three components can be identified with certainty from the archaeological evidence alone: beside the peristyle itself, this includes washing facilities (loutra) and exedrae. Whereas a loutron will usually be discernible due to water installations such as basins, pipes, a water-proof floor etc., the main features of an exedra include a broad opening in the form of a colonnade and benches alongside the three remaining walls of the room. Rooms of this kind are found in almost all palaestra buildings where they served as places for lectures, philosophical discussions or similar gatherings. On the contrary, the precise architectural form of other rooms that are usually mentioned in the literary sources such as koinisteria, apodyteria etc., remains unclear. Therefore, it seems reasonable to accept the combination of the above-mentioned three features for the identification of palaestrae buildings from the archaeological evidence. The validity of this approach can easily be tested regarding palaestrae of the 4th and early 3rd century BC that have been identified with certainty (Pl. 5).

Following the works of Jean Delorme, Henner von Hesberg and Christian Wacker, it is commonly accepted that there is hardly any archaeological evidence for Greek gymnasia before the early 4th century BC. Early examples include the gymnasia at Eretria, Amphipolis, and Delphi.\(^{24}\) The Academy and the Lykeion of Athens might be two more candidates, but the current state of publication is too difficult to assess the precise date of these structures and their original layout in any detail.\(^{25}\) As far as I can see, none of these buildings can be dated securely to the first half of the 4th century BC. To this group I would further add the palaestra at Olympia that is usually dated to the early 3rd century BC.\(^{26}\) In the case of the gymnasia at Delos, a secure date based on archaeological criteria has not yet been established. The building or a predecessor on the same site might very well belong to the later 4th or early 3rd century BC, as well.\(^{27}\) Finally, the gymnasia at Samos was presumably constructed at some point in the early 3rd century BC as well, but its design is not well known.\(^{28}\)

Among the buildings mentioned, the gymnasia at

\(^{20}\) For a detailed discussion of these terms see Delorme 1960, 272–316.

\(^{21}\) I. Delos Nr. 1417.

\(^{22}\) Audiat 1930; Audiat 1970; Roux 1980; Salvat 1994; Ferrutti 1998–2000. In contrast, Moretti 1996, Moretti 1997 proposed that the gymnasion mentioned in the inventory should be identified with the *Palaestra du lac*. However, this interpretation seems rather unlikely, regarding the fact that the function of this building is generally far from clear, see Emme 2013, 255–256.

\(^{23}\) Trümper 2008, 251–255.


\(^{26}\) Wacker 1996.

\(^{27}\) For a brief discussion of the problem see von den Hoff 2004, 376–377; Emme 2013, 255–256.

\(^{28}\) Martini 1993.
Amphipolis yields good evidence for the functional conception of late-classical palaestrae. In its original state, the building was equipped with two loutra in the northeastern and northwestern corner, respectively. A long room on the western side of the building has the form of an exedra with five columns of the front and a stone bench on the back wall. Another exedra might have existed in the eastern part of the building. Similarly, the western section of the gymnasium at Eretria comprised an exedra and an adjacent loutron in its northern aisle. Further research on the recently discovered eastern section of the building complex will clarify, in which way both parts were used with regard to their individual functions. Given the state of preservation, the situation of the gymnasium at Delphi is less clear. Obviously, water installations were placed outside the palaestra proper in an open courtyard, including a circular pool and a series of basins along the western wall of the courtyard. A room for lectures or similar gatherings may be identified in the southern part of the palaestra, but the reconstruction of an exedra remains conjectural. Finally, the palaestra at Olympia combined two loutra in the northwestern and northeastern corners of the building with a total number of six exedrae of varying size. In sum, even though the total number of buildings is rather small, the archaeological evidence illustrates that the combination of loutron, exedra and a peristyle courtyard was something like a standard for palaestrae from the middle of the 4th century BC onwards.

While the existence of loutra and exedrae is closely related to the actual functions of these rooms within the gymnasiac context, the reasons for the ubiquity of the peristyle itself are less obvious. The dating of the earliest examples of palaestrae to the middle of the 4th century BC indicates that the architectural scheme of the peristyle was not used for the construction of gymnasiac architecture in the first place. In contrast, earlier examples of peristyle buildings clearly demonstrate that the architectural concept of a courtyard surrounded by porticoes was established already at the end of the 5th century BC within Greek architecture. This is illustrated mainly by the development of Greek dining facilities such as the Pompeion at Athens or a similar building in the Argive Heraion, mentioned above (Pl. 2). The scheme was then adopted for gymnasiac architecture probably around the middle of the 4th century BC. Therefore, in order to arrive at a better understanding of the peristyle motif it is necessary to focus on some general developments of Greek architecture in the 4th century BC.

3 Peristyles and Urban Design

A good example from this period is the layout of Megalopolis in Arcadia (Pl. 6). The city was founded immediately after the defeat of Sparta in the battle of Leuktra in 371 BC. As recent fieldwork by Hans Lauter and Heide Lauter-Bufe has revealed the city center of Megalopolis was organized in an orthogonal shape. A central square can be identified as the agora. The place was surrounded by freestanding porticoes on all four sides, a conception that echoes the idea of the peristyle on a larger scale. In addition, two major building complexes were situated on the western side and in the southeastern corner of the agora. Whereas the first structure served to accommodate the political institutions of the city, the latter complex housed a sanctuary of Zeus. The sanctuary consisted of a temple that was incorporated into the western portico of the complex. The secluded character of the building illustrates how the religious concept of the temenos was transferred into architecture. The building complex on the western edge of the agora is yet more telling for the new conception of urban space in the first half of the 4th century (Pl. 6). The extant remains show that the original complex consisted of four units: a spacious hall in the north, followed by three courtyard sections of different size and structure. According to the excavators, the complex originally housed a number of political and administrative institutions such as the boule, the damiourgeion as well as another sanctu-
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29 See G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume.
30 Emme 2011, 576.
31 See G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume.
32 Sielhorst 2015, 23, 96-100; Dickenson 2017, 30-62.
33 For the complex on the western side of the agora see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011; for the sanctuary of Zeus see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2009.
34 Emme 2013, 35-57.
35 Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011.
ary of Zeus and Hestia that would have been equivalent to a prytaneion in other cities.\textsuperscript{36} Even though the identification of some of these institutions is hypothetical the general notion of defining different spaces for different functions by means of architectural segregation becomes obvious. Accordingly, the peristyle was used for a variety of different tasks, i.e. sacred and administrative functions in this case.

Another example is Miletus.\textsuperscript{37} Here again, the architectural scheme of the peristyle was used for sacred as well as administrative buildings. In addition, a peristyle court was constructed as part of a market building on the southern side of the Lion Harbor at the end of the 4th century BC (Pl. 7). The complex consisted of a central square that was surrounded by rooms of equal size on all four sides as well as two outer porticoes on its northern and eastern sides. Due to its architectural shape and its position, the building is securely identified as a market.\textsuperscript{38} The conception of the structure corresponds to a well-known passage in Aristotle’s Politeia wherein the author claims that “there should also be a traders’ agora, distinct and apart from the other [i.e. the political agora].”\textsuperscript{39}

The new conception of urban space that developed over the course of several decades between the later 5th and the early 4th century BC is interesting in several aspects: On the one hand, literary sources like Aristotle and Plato make it clear that the social and constitutional structure of the polis was supposed to find its physical equivalent in the city’s layout and architectural shape. On the other hand, the conceptual differentiation of space was articulated architecturally by making use of a common architectural scheme, i.e. the portico in general and the peristyle, in particular. It is against this cultural and architectural background that Greek gymasia were constructed from the 4th century BC onwards in the shape known to us. The impact of these ideas on the overall appearance of urban space is hard to envision, because of the poor condition of many of these buildings. The secluded character of peristyle architecture is best illustrated by reconstructions (Pl. 7). Interestingly, from an architectural point of view it was not possible to tell whether a building like this was a bouleuterion, a sanctuary, a dining hall or a gymnasium, respectively.

Furthermore, the context of many buildings indicates that the architectural form of the peristyle often had a connotation of social exclusiveness. This is especially the case with regard to early examples such as dining facilities. In this case, Christina Leybold pointed out that lavish buildings like the Pompeion at Athens or the ‘gymnasium’ at Epidaurus were used by members of a local or international elite\textsuperscript{40}. Similarly, the peristyle was a common feature within (proto-)hellenistic palaces like those of Vergina and Pella and became part of upper-class houses in the early 4th century BC, as well.\textsuperscript{41} It is not surprising, therefore, that the peristyle was adopted for gymnasial architecture. Literary and epigraphic sources clearly state that the gymnasium was a space exclusively frequented by male citizens of the polis and their sons. The social distinction that was inherent to the institution of the Greek gymnasium was marked architecturally by the adoption of a secluded building type.\textsuperscript{42}

In addition, the secluded character of peristyle architecture was further stressed by the construction of propyla.\textsuperscript{43} Usually, propyla were built as secondary additions to the preceding structures like in case of the palaestrae in Amphipolis and Olympia, thus changing the outer appearance of these buildings. On the one hand, a lavish propylon would add significantly to the outer appearance of a building whose façades consisted mainly of blank walls. On the other hand, the monumental entrance would have transformed the act of entering a building into a special situation. However, the addition of propyla was not restricted to palaestrae but can be observed in combination with a variety of peristyle buildings. Therefore, like in case of the peristyle itself, the significance of propyla lies in their general connotation of exclusiveness and nobilitation.

Finally, with regard to the interrelation between the individual building and the surrounding cityscape, it is worth mentioning that the first buildings of the palaestra type can be observed at a time when the institution

\textsuperscript{36} For the interpretation of the individual parts of the building see Lauter-Butzl and Lauter 2011, 105–128.
\textsuperscript{37} Emme 2013, 265–270; Sielhorst 2015, 125–132.
\textsuperscript{38} Gerkan 1922, 20–23; Emme 2013, 139–162; Sielhorst 2015, 126–127.
\textsuperscript{39} Arist. Pol. 1331a–b; see also Plat. Nom. 778 e; compare Sielhorst 2015, 115; Dickenson 2017, 50–57.
\textsuperscript{40} Leybold 2008, 193–201.
\textsuperscript{43} von Hesberg 1995, 18–19; von den Hoff 2009, 154.
of the Greek gymnasium was transferred to places intra muros. It is generally accepted that this change in the placement of gymnasium happened sometime in the early 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{44} This development is echoed in contemporaneous literary sources. For example, Aristotle demands that gymnasium for the presbyteroi should be situated near the agora, i.e. within the city.\textsuperscript{45} Whereas the philosopher’s claim reflects a theoretical ideal a contemporaneous passage from Aeneas Tacticus’ book on poliorcetics illustrates that the placement of gymnasium extra muros was still the rule in the first half of the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{46} The author explicitly states that military commanders should not leave the city in case that an enemy set fire to buildings outside the walls like dockyards or gymnasia. Therefore, another reason for the adoption of the peristyle scheme for gymnasial architecture may have been the shifting of the institution to locations inside the city. It was in an urban surrounding, after all, where the application of excluding architecture was necessary in order to maintain the exclusive character of the social institution.

4 Conclusion

I tried to illustrate that architectural form and practical function are less interdependent than is usually thought. On the one hand, the Greek gymnasium would have fulfilled its basic function as a place of physical training and education very well without a peristyle courtyard. On the other hand, the architectural scheme of the peristyle was applied to a variety of functions other than gymnasium from the late 5th century BC onwards. This observation implies that the peristyle can hardly be reduced to a specific functional meaning. Its significance lies on a more general level: as a excluding architecture, the peristyle made it possible to close off spaces for a variety of specific functions as well as individual social groups. It is obvious that both aspects apply extraordinarily well to the gymnasium. Finally, this interpretation is important for the understanding of the process of adaptation of peristyle architecture in the western Mediterranean as well. With regard to the variety of functions of peristyle buildings in the Greek east there is little reason to assume that every courtyard surrounded by columns was meant to evoke the impression of Greek gymnasial architecture or was even used accordingly.\textsuperscript{47} On the contrary, the adoption of the architectural scheme in Italian architecture reflects a profound understanding of the general significance of the type: to organize urban spaces and to provide secluded units for specific functions and individual groups. This becomes most obvious with regard to the imperial fora in Rome. As Paul Zanker pointed out “the imperial fora were closed, self-contained areas. Each was strictly closed off from the next, even though they were adjacent to one another. […] These separate spatial entities also constituted specific pictorial spaces”.\textsuperscript{48} It seems important to note the difference in the overall conception of these buildings. Whereas the gymnasium of the Greek polis were spaces of social interaction that were constantly shaped and re-shaped by the donation of individual parts and the construction of honorific monuments (Pl. 4) the imperial fora were clearly dominated by the individual person of the emperor including the iconography of statuary and decoration.\textsuperscript{49} Therefore, it seems more likely that Italian buildings like the grande palestra in Pompeji where constructed on the conceptual model of the fora of Caesar and Augustus in Rome rather than on Hellenistic gymnasia. Thus, even though their architectural layout might be comparable, the function and social significance of these buildings could hardly have been more different.

\textsuperscript{44} von Hesberg 1995, 16; Wacker 2004, 149–152. 
\textsuperscript{45} Arist. Pol. 7.11.1–3. 
\textsuperscript{46} Aen. Tact. 25.6. 
\textsuperscript{47} Dickmann 1999, 158. 
\textsuperscript{48} Zanker 1997, 183. 
\textsuperscript{49} Kyrieleis 1976; Zanker 1997; Emme 2013, 240.
Amphipolis, gymnasium. 4th century BC

Delphi, gymnasium. 4th century BC

Olympia, palaestra and gymnasium. 3rd/2nd century BC

Delos, gymnasium. 2nd century BC

Priene, Lower gymnasium. 2nd century BC

Pl. 1 Greek gymnastial compounds, 4th–2nd century BC.
The emergence and significance of the palaestra type in Greek architecture

Pl. 2 Alleged Greek gymnasia.
Pl. 3 Miletus, ‘Hellenistic Gymnasium’ and adjacent thermae. Note the non-existence of a door between both buildings as well as missing water installations in the northern aisle of the ‘gymnasium.’
Pl. 4 Delos, gymnasium. Hypothetical reconstruction of room names according to the Delian inventories of the mid-2nd century BC (author).
Pl. 5 Greek Gymnasia. Exedrae marked red, loutra marked blue.
Pl. 6  Megalopolis, plan of city center at the end of the Hellenistic period.
Pl. 7 Miletus, reconstructed aerial view of city center at the end of the Hellenistic period.
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New Research on the Gymnasium of Eretria

Summary

The Gymnasium at Eretria is one of the best examples of a palaestra from the early Hellenistic period. This paper presents results from fieldwork carried out by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece in 2015 and 2016 that yielded important new insights for the chronology, plan, and function of this complex. The building was constructed around 330–320 BCE as a palaestra with two differently sized courtyards. The courtyards were probably conceived for use by different age groups. The construction period of the palaestra coincided with the introduction of the ephebeia in Eretria. The palaestra was remodeled several times, with a particular focus on improving its bathing facilities, and was finally abandoned around 100 CE when the ephebeia lost its importance.

Keywords: Eretria; gymnasion; palaestra; bathing facilities; ephebeia
Introduction

The Gymnasium of Eretria (Pl. 1) stands alongside the palaestrae of Olympia, Delphi, Delos, Miletus, Priene, and Pergamon as one of the most famous buildings of its kind in the ancient Greek world. Its architectural form is considered to be one of the best examples of an early Hellenistic palaestra and has been a frequent subject of commentary in research. Recent studies, however, have shown that the plan of this gymnasium must be revised and that, as we will demonstrate in the following, such a process results in a significantly different picture of this building.

1.1 Research history of the Gymnasium of Eretria

The existence of a gymnasium in Eretria was attested as early as 1850, when a decree honoring a benefactor of the gymnasium was discovered. In 1885, the Kleonikos statue came to light, a figure that is also known as the “Youth from Eretria” and is now preserved in the National Museum of Athens. Excavations at the gymnasium did not begin until 1895, however, under the guidance of R.B. Richardson, who was then the director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. While the results of this initial work were published only in preliminary reports, they were soon complemented by several more general studies on the ancient gymnasium, especially the work by J. Delorme published in 1960 and the 1972 entry by P. Auberson and K. Schefold in the guide to Eretria. The ruins were cleared of overgrowth over the course of two campaigns during this same period. Elena Mango then studied the gymnasium as part of her dissertation and carried out a series of investigations between 1993 and 1995 that were published in 2003 in Volume XIII of the series Eretria, Ausgrabungen und Forschungen.

1.2 An unexpected discovery

A chance recent discovery, however, has revised our previous knowledge of the Gymnasium of Eretria. A large restoration program carried out by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Euboea under the direction of K. Boukaras provided an opportunity for the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (ESAG) to buy the two plots in the south and east of the gymnasium. A mechanical cleaning of these plots carried out between 2013 and 2014 by the Ephorate revealed not only the foundations of the southern part of the large courtyard A, but also the foundations and walls of a subsequent building in the east that also exhibits a peristyle courtyard (Pls. 1–2).

The excavations carried out by Mango to the east of the loutron B-C-D had already yielded evidence of the existence of a second building in the east of the palaestra, but the extent of her excavations had been greatly limited by the boundaries of the plot at the time. When the rooms K1, L, O, and P were partially revealed by Mango, they were interpreted to be part of a public bathing facility adjacent to the gymnasium. The archaeological investigations carried out by the ESAG in 2015, however, quickly confirmed that the eastern part constituted an architectural and functional unit in tandem with the western part: the Gymnasium of Eretria thus consisted of two adjoining building complexes, which together gave rise to the plan of a large palaestra with two courtyards (A and P). Instead of speaking of two palaestrae, plural, in the following, we prefer to describe the entire ensemble as one palaestra with two courtyards, which when taken together with the running track and other elements comprised the actual gymnasium.
1.3 A new excavation and research program

This new discovery not only required a revision of the layout plan and the reconstruction of the Gymnasium of Eretria, but also a new excavation and research program begun in 2015 under the leadership of Karl Reber, Guy Ackermann, and Rocco Tettamanti. A total of three to four excavation campaigns were planned so as to expose the entire building and obtain material through targeted stratigraphic soundings in order to date the individual construction phases. The results will be presented in a new volume of the series Eretria, Ausgrabungen und Forschungen (Eretria, Excavations and Research) that should round out the volume already published by Mango.\(^1\) In the following remarks, we will focus on four key questions: the construction period of the palaestra, the installations in the bathing rooms, the use of the various complexes, and the date the gymnasium was abandoned.

2 The construction period of the palaestra

The first question is how to date the two parts of the building, with their respective peristyle courtyards (courtyard A in the western part and courtyard P in the eastern part – Pl. 1): Was the palaestra planned from the beginning as an architectural unit with two courtyards, or was the eastern part built onto the older western part as a later expansion?

2.1 Remarks on the plan of the palaestra

At first glance, the overall plan of the palaestra suggests that the two different parts of the building were one unified design. The palaestra was constructed on the lower part of the southern slope of the Acropolis (Pl. 3) and forms a large, rectangular complex with a diagonal north façade that parallels an existing road that ran northwest-southeast (Pl. 1). The two parts of the building are connected by a continuous wall (M47) to the south that served as a southern façade during the first construction phase. Not until a later phase of construction was the building expanded to the south, through the portico A3 in the western part and through rooms W-X-Y-Z in the eastern part.\(^12\) The fact that the northeast corner of courtyard P (at K4 and T) is precisely aligned with the diagonal north façade seems to confirm the contemporaneity of the two parts of the building.

In addition, we can observe that individual rooms or room modules in the two parts of the building have the same dimensions. Courtyard P, for example, with its porticoes P1, P2, P3, and P4, is exactly the same size as the inner courtyard of peristyle A (without the porticoes A5 and A6, which belong to a later construction phase). The standardization of proportions and modules is also indicative that the two parts of the building were simultaneously conceived. Various depth soundings were carried out in the initial excavation campaigns in order to confirm this contemporaneity and narrow down the dating of the construction period.

2.2 Dating the first construction phase of the western part

Mango dated the construction period of the gymnasium to the very end of the fourth century BCE, or around 300 BCE.\(^13\) A new analysis of the material finds attributed to the first construction phase of the western part makes it possible to correct this dating upwards by almost a quarter of a century.\(^14\) The start of construction of the western part thus dates back to the transitional period from the Classical to the Hellenistic epoch, meaning from ca. 330–320 BCE or shortly thereafter.

In the 2015 and 2016 campaigns, a total of eight depth soundings were taken under the ground level of courtyard A in order to study the different phases of construction and gather enough material to date these phases (Pl. 1).\(^15\) The new dating to around 330–320 BCE is confirmed by the material found in these soundings.

---


\(^12\) Rooms U, V1, and V2 of the eastern part were likewise not added until the later Hellenistic period; cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017.

\(^13\) Mango 2003, 49–55, 129, 133.

\(^14\) The four latest ceramic fragments, which according to Mango have a terminus ante quem of the very end of the fourth century, or around 300 BCE, have already been dated to the end of the classical period or the very beginning of the Hellenistic period, according to more recent research.

\(^15\) The different phases of the construction of the courtyard and its porticoes were reexamined: cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Reber 2016, 86–89; Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017; but see Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 133–140.
The soundings also showed that courtyard A, in its first phase, was bounded to the south by wall M47, and therefore was surrounded by only three porticoes (A1, A2, and A4) at that time. Not until a second construction phase, which can be dated to the beginning of the third century BCE, was courtyard A transformed into a veritable peristyle through the addition of the portico A3.

2.3 Dating the first construction phase of the eastern part

Mango suggested dating the initial construction phase of rooms K1, L, and O to the first half of the third century BCE. The walls of the exedrae O and S are constructed from large, polygonal blocks of limestone, the interstices of which were filled with smaller hewn stones (Pl. 2 and Fig. 2). This construction technique is characteristic of the architecture of Eretria in the fourth and early third century. Wall M47 from the first construction phase also continues on for a length of about 32m in the south of the eastern part, which, as already mentioned, is a main argument for the contemporaneous construction of the two parts of the building.

One piece of evidence is perplexing, however: the freshwater conduit of clay pipes (St98) discovered in the American excavations, which runs through a rock channel below the ground of K1, was cut through the north wall of exedra O and therefore must have been built even before the first construction phase (Pl. 1). As Mango had already suspected, this water line could have been connected to the rock channel observed to run below Room N and in the spout north of Room B. If so, the line would have been deliberately routed around the northeast corner of the western part (alongside room B). This would mean that there was a temporal hiatus between the construction of the western part and the creation of the northern rooms (L-O-R-S) of the eastern part. In fact, the ceramic material from the soundings taken under the ground of courtyard P dates only to the early third century BCE (Pl. 2). We may therefore assume that the building was planned from the beginning with the two courtyards A and P, as the wall M47 confirms, but that the construction of courtyard P and the northern rooms of the eastern part did not start until a few decades after the western part had been erected.

2.4 The construction of the palaestra and the institution of the ephebeia in Eretria

The results from the first excavation campaigns have shown that the construction of the Gymnasium should be dated to nearly a generation earlier than previously assumed. The new dating around 330–320 BCE coincides with an important event for Eretria: this is the era in which the city introduced the Athenian-adopted institution of the ephebeia, perhaps as an indirect consequence of the *diagramma* of Polyperchon in 319/318 BCE that restored democracy in Eretria after an intermediate stage of oligarchical rule. Epheboi are mentioned for the first time in Eretria in a contract between Chairephanes and the city of Eretria, which dates chronologically to shortly after this event. According to A.S. Chankowski, the introduction of this institution should not be dated before 340–330 BCE, since epheboi are not mentioned in the Artemisia Decree that was written in this era and governed the festivities to honor Artemis at Amarynthos. The introduction of the ephebeia by the Eretrians, which probably occurred around 319/318 BCE, was undoubtedly the precondition for building the gymnasium.

16 Mango 2003, 64–66.
17 It should be noted that the walls of the north wing of the building have no foundations of conglomerate blocks, since the limestone plinths rest directly on the natural rock.
18 Mango 2003, 71–72 (W1).
19 Chankowski 2010, 144–158, esp. 157–158; cf. also Chankowski 1993, first dating hypothesized between 340/330 and 319/318 BCE. On the consequences of the *diagramma* of Polyperchon for the city of Eretria cf. also Knoepfler 2001a, 183–184. Mango assumes that Chankowski sets the date of the introduction of the ephebeia in Eretria too high, especially since she considers construction of the Gymnasium to have only occurred very late in the fourth century; Mango 2003, 133 note 794; cf. also Chankowski 2010, 468.
20 IG XII 9, 191, l. 44–47.
21 IG XII 9, 189. – On the dating of the decree IG XII 9, 191, cf. Knoepfler 2001b, 61–67. – On the non-mention of epheboi in the Artemisia Decree of 340–332 BCE (IG XII 9, 189) is not a strong enough argument for a later introduction of the ephebeia; Fröhlich 2013, 524.
new research on the gymnasium of Eretria

Fig. 1 Aerial view of the exedra Q1 in the western part of the gymnasium.

Fig. 2 Aerial view of the exedra Ω in the eastern part of the gymnasium.
3 The bathing rooms of the gymnasium

3.1 The exedrae Q1 and O

Excavation of the two bathing rooms Q1 in the west and O in the north wing of the eastern part was completed in 2015. Both rooms are closely comparable with each other in terms of architecture and interior installations (Figs. 1–2.). Both are wide exedrae that are open to the porticoes in the corresponding courtyards (Q1 - A2 and O - P1). The stylobate evidence indicates that room O may be reconstructed as a distyle exedra in antis; the number of columns for exedra Q1, on the other hand, is not certain.

The floors of the two exedrae are decorated with mosaics. Q1 has alternating rectangular fields with white and black stone fragments (Fig. 1). The black field in the middle has a white palmette in the center, which is composed of marble fragments. The floor in O consists of light-colored limestone fragments and a dark center image made out of gravel. The central ornament shows a rosette (Fig. 2). The polychromy and the use of fired clay shards for the middle rosette suggest a dating in the later Hellenistic period.

The exedra were surrounded on three sides by benches, but only the negatives of their supports are visible in the floor. These benches were interrupted in the middle of the back wall by a wide structure. The existing benches were intended so that from the loutron B-

The water ran out through a drain into a series of smaller bases embedded in the floor which, like those in room D of the loutron, were intended for washing feet. The basins in exedra Q1 were probably stolen at the end of the Hellenistic period or during the Roman Empire, along with the benches, whereas five of the original eight basins for feet are still preserved in situ in exedra O. The floor slopes slightly to the southwest, where an open channel made of clay elements conducted the water under the stylobate and across the portico P1 into the courtyard P. The water intake in the two exedrae has not survived.

After their physical exercise, palaestra users could clean their bodies and feet with fresh, cold water in the various basins of the two exedrae. The installations in the two exedrae corresponded to those of the large loutron B-C-D, with its seven large basins and three basins for feet. The two exedrae differ from the loutron and the other Hellenistic baths by two important elements, however: first, marble benches run along the walls in the exedrae, similar to those found in the apodyteria, the changing rooms; second, the exedrae are open to the courtyard, whereas the bathing rooms of the gymnasiums were usually designed so that they could not be seen from the outside. This type of bathing room, functionally located between the exedra locker room and the loutron, seems to be a unique architectural device.

3.2 A palaestra with four bathing rooms

Towards the end of the Hellenistic period, then, palaestra visitors had access to several baths of various kinds (Pl. 1): a series of three rooms with cold-water basins.

---

22 Richardson reconstructed a broad staircase with three steps in Q1 in the west façade of the building and intended to identify the main entrance of the palaestra in it; Richardson 1896b, 158; cf. Mango 2003, 32. The exposure of this room in 2013 refuted this hypothesis; Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 138–139. Room O had already been partially excavated by Mango and interpreted as the bathing facility attached to the gymnasium; cf. Mango 2003, 47–48, 128.

23 This mosaic can be dated to the late phase of the Hellenistic period, thanks to a fragment of an inscription built into the floor that bears the letter alpha in a script that is typical of the second century BCE (but see Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 139). We thank Denis Knoepfler for this information. In terms of its technique, the mosaic floor can be classed between the pebble mosaics and the mosaics in opus tessellatum, without it being possible to narrow down the dating any further than between the third and second century; cf. Dunbabin 1979, 265–277; Salzmann 1984, 59–71.


25 Knoepfler suggested placing the basin in the northeast corner of room D. The basin had been donated by Kalliteles, son of Kallistratos, and Kallistratos, son of Kalliteles, toward the end of the second century BCE; cf. Knoepfler 2009, 213–219. But the basin could just as well have stood in the middle of exedra O or exedra Q1.

26 The holes created by the removal of the basins yielded ceramic material dating from the latter half of the second century BCE and the beginning of the first century BCE.

27 The water conduit found by E. Mango in the west wall of room O was not intended to supply water to the central basin; cf. Mango 2003, 48, 76–77.


(loutron B-C-D), a pyriaterion for the sweat bath (rotunda G), and the two exedrae Q1 and O, which had their own cold-water basins as well. These rooms were not sequential, as would be the case in a public bath, but distributed across the two different parts of the palaestra. The three bathing rooms of the western part are located in the north and west of the courtyard and each have their own respective entrances (the loutron B-C-D could be accessed through portico A1, the pyriaterion G through the large exedra F, and the exedra Q1 through the portico A2). As far as we know so far, however, the eastern part of the complex accessed only one bathing room (O), in its north wing. This eastern part could thus be used independently of the western part.

4 The palaestrae in Eretria

4.1 A palaestra with two courtyards

The originality of the Gymnasium of Eretria lies in the arrangement of the palaestra, with its two different peristyle courtyards (Pl. 1). As far as we know, there are only four other gymnasiums of ancient Greece that have a similar two-courtyard layout.

According to W. Hoepfner, the gymnasium of Rhodes should be reconstructed with two large palaestrae, one of which, according to an inscription found there, was reserved for the epheboi, the other for the neoi. A third palaestra in the southeastern quarter of the city was then used by the paides. According to W. Martini, the gymnasium of Samos in the Hellenistic period was comprised of an east peristyle and a west peristyle, the “Ionic hall.” The latter, however, is the result of a reconstruction based on scant leads. In fact, only the architectural connection with the likewise hypothetically reconstructed loutron and the running tracks suggests a functional correlation with the gymnasium complex.

W. Hoepfner posits that the gymnasium of the Hellenistic period consisted of two palaestrae in Nysa, in the Meander River valley, one of which was used by the epheboi, and the other by the neoi. During its second construction phase halfway through the second century BCE, the gymnasium of Ai Khanoum in Bactria took the form of a large palaestra without columns (courtyard 39) and a second courtyard in the south (courtyard 26) that directly accessed the first courtyard, which is why it was interpreted as a space for sporting activities.

The dimensions of the courtyards in these four gymnasiums are considerably larger in size than those in the palaestra of Eretria, but probably were not always associated with additional rooms such as exedrae or baths. From an architectural point of view, these large courtyards were not as organically bound to a palaestra as those in Eretria; in addition, the two courtyards in Eretria likely did not perform the same function as has been reconstructed for those at Samos, Rhodes, Nysa, and Ai Khanoum: for example, the more modest dimensions of the courtyards of the Gymnasium of Eretria did not permit training in track and field athletics such as javelin or discus throwing.

In Eretria, the two parts of the building probably also served as military, sporting, and intellectual training facilities for various age groups, as W. Hoepfner has suggested of the gymnasium of Rhodes; we think of the paides, the epheboi, the neoi or neaniskoi, and presbyteroi. Both building parts included exedrae (F in the west, S and U in the east) for changes of clothing, and lessons probably also took place here. The two inner courtyards P and A were large enough for exercise in individual sports such as boxing, wrestling, and the long jump. The only differences were in the washing facilities: whereas the eastern part had only one bath (O), the western part featured three different baths (loutron B-C-D, Q1, and G). The only warm-water bath, however, pyriaterion G, was a later installation that did not come about until the.

30 Hoepfner 2002, 69–70; on the reconstruction of the ensemble cf. figs. 87, 90.
31 This would be the Ptolemaion mentioned by Diodorus (XX, 100, 3–4). Filimonos 1989; Hoepfner 2002, 71–72 fig. 90.
32 Martini 1984, 26–36 (“east peristyle”) and 49–52 (“Ionic hall”).
33 Hoepfner 2002, 73–74 fig. 97.
34 Veure 1987, 33 (courtyard 39); 103, 105 (courtyard 26).
35 Approximately 150 m on a side for the two peristyle courtyards of the gymnasium of Rhodes; cf. Hoepfner 2002, 69–70; approximately 78 m for the “Ionic hall” of Samos; cf. Martini 1984, fig. 36; 70 m for the two palaestrae of Nysa; cf. Hoepfner 2002, 73; 118.5m to 96.5m for courtyard 26 of the gymnasium of Ai Khanoum; cf. Veure 1987, 103. For comparison, courtyard A of the Gymnasium of Eretria, together with the porticoes, is about 31m on a side, and courtyard P approximately 21 m.
end of the Hellenistic period and therefore was not available to athletes at the beginning. The cold-water baths located in the two parts of the building were apparently sufficient in the early days of the gymnasium. The eastern and western parts could thus be used in parallel and independently of each other for athletic and intellectual training.

4.2 The southern palaestra

There is another building in Eretria designated as a palaestra that was located in the southeast of the city, near the interior port (Pl. 3). This building was excavated by K. Kourouniotis in 1917, who interpreted it as a small gymnasium or palaestra (Pl. 4). His plan, however, with its square courtyard of 22.5m on a side (A) and three halls in the south (B), west (C), and north (D), does not reflect the otherwise usual four-sided peristyle that occurs in classical and Hellenistic palaestrae. But the large room in the north (D), with its six interior columns and the four columns that partition its opening to the courtyard, can be compared to the exedrae in the gymnasia.

P.G. Themelis doubted the reading of this building as a palaestra and suggested that it be interpreted as a sanctuary with a *hestiatorion*, comparable to the one in the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. Themelis’s arguments were later discussed by D. Knoepfler, who for his part did not rule out the existence of a second palaestra in Eretria, especially since the large courtyard with the porticoes was thoroughly suited to athletic activities. Knoepfler refuted the arguments by Themelis advocating the palaestra’s use as sanctuary.

Following its exposure by K. Kourouniotis in 1917, the southern palaestra was cleaned and redocumented by V. Petakos around 1960. Since a more in-depth study of this building does not yet exist, at present we can only declare that various phases of construction occurred before it reached its final form, and we cannot specify the dating any further. The study by Auberson and Schefold on the technique used in the construction of the walls of the palaestra led to the assumption that the structure dates around 400 BCE. This dating seems to us to be rather high compared to other buildings of this type. If we were to follow Auberson and Schefold’s method of dating based solely on the construction technique of the walls, with their foundations of rectangular conglomerate blocks and polygonal limestone plinths, we could generally date the building to the fourth or early third century BCE. Because of the lack of dateable material, however, we cannot say whether the palaestra is older, younger, or contemporaneous with the gymnasium located at the foot of the Acropolis. In the summer of 2016, the ESAG collaborated with the Ephorate of Antiquities of Euboea to carry out a new clean-up of the ruins and draw up a more detailed layout of the floor plan. There are also plans to use stratigraphic soundings to clarify the question of how to date the different phases of construction.

---

36 The building was subsequently referred to as the “Unterter Gymnasium” (Lower Gymnasium); Auberson and Schefold 1972, 145; see also Emme 2013, 332; as the “Gymnase du Bas (palestre)”; Knoepfler 1990, 125, 127; or as the “Lower Gymnasium – Palaestra”; Sapouna-Sakellariaki 1995, 45. Because of the lack of inscriptions that explicitly identify the building as part of a gymnasium, for example by mentioning *ephebos* or gymnasiarch, we here prefer the term proposed in the 2004 guide to Eretria, “palestre sud” (southern palaestra); Ducrey et al. 2004, 260.


38 Themelis 1987, 117–118.

39 Knoepfler 1990, 122–123.

40 Auberson and Schefold have speculated that the rooms north of the two tholos baths in the Hellenistic bathing complex at the port were also used for physical exercise, arguing that bathing facilities of the Hellenistic period were always associated with palaestrae.; Auberson and Schefold 1972, 129. We do not think that the surviving ruins support such an assumption, especially since the public baths of this period did not usually have additional palaestrae.

41 The bases found there for inscriptions could also have been used in a palaestra for inscriptions to honor the athletes or magistrates. The votive offerings that surfaced in the building may also have been dedicated to Hermes or Herakles, the gods of the gymnasium. The inscription horos ierou, which Themelis invoked as a major argument for the sanctuary interpretation, was used in a wall as spolia and seems to have come from another sanctuary nearby. As Knoepfler put it, “rien, en fin de compte, n’obligerait à renoncer à l’idée – très raisonnable – qu’il s’agit d’une palestre”; Knoepfler 1990, 123.


43 Auberson and Schefold 1972, 146.

44 This work was carried out by G. Luisoni as part of a master’s thesis at the University of Lausanne.
4.3 A palaestra for the paides?

The large room E in the northwest corner of the southern palaestra was interpreted as a sanctuary of the goddess Eileithyia (Pl. 4). There was a base located across from the rear wall in this room, which served as either an altar or a support for statues. The base of a stela stood in front of the western entrance. K. Kourouniotis writes that several terracotta figurines and fragments of a dedicatory inscription were found that very likely name the goddess Eileithyia as the recipient. Knoepfler connected these finds mentioned by the excavator to the dedicatory inscription to Eileithyia assembled by B. Petrankos in the Museum of Eretria, which has strengthened the assumed interpretation of room E as a sanctuary of this kourotrophic goddess.

On the basis of this interpretation, Knoepfler ventured the hypothesis that the southern palaestra was where young boys (the paides) were educated, especially since the goddess Eileithyia watches over not only childbirth and delivery, but also the stage of adolescence in a broader context. Furthermore, the cult dedicated to this deity is often associated with palaestrae, for example those in Megara (Paus. 1.44.2), Delos, and likely in Megalopolis (Paus. 8.32.4).

According to Knoepfler, this proposal to interpret the southern palaestra as a site of education for the paides does not rule out that young boys were also being trained in the gymnasia at the foot of the Acropolis (Pl. 1). Two inscriptions would seem to confirm this: The decree in honor of the Elpinikos gymnasion mentions the employment of a rhetor and a hoplomachos in the gymnasion for the education “of the paides, the epheboi, and for all who would like to benefit from this offer.” Another inscription, which was found in room I of the gymnasion, cites victory in the endurance run in the boys’ category (philoponias paidon). The paides of Eretria therefore had access both to the gymnasion at the foot of the Acropolis, at least during the late Hellenistic period, and to the southern palaestra, which was probably reserved for them alone.

4.4 A gymnasium for different age groups

Given what we know, there is nothing wrong with assuming that in the case of the gymnasion at the foot of the Acropolis, the building complex was used by various age groups: the paides, epheboi, neoi or neaniskoi, and presbyteroi. Two courtyards of the palaestra seem to confirm this assumption: as an example, the epheboi could be training in the western part while exercises with the paides would be taking place in the eastern part at the same time. But one could also imagine the two parts of the building being used at the same time for different activities by one age group. The various age groups could frequent the palaestra at different times, as is attested for example in the gymnasion of Veroia in Macedonia. In any case, the presence of two different parts of the building, each with its own courtyard, had decisive advantages over a single-courtyard palaestra.

5 The abandonment of the gymnasion

The various excavations of the palaestra have so far provided few indications for dating the last phase of construction, or the point when the gymnasion was abandoned (Pl. 1). The excavations that Richardson carried out in the western part of the building in the late nineteenth century were dug to ground level throughout the north wing (rooms B – J) and left no remains behind from the use or destruction layer. Only the statues, in

45 Knoepfler 1990, 23–24.
47 Kourouniotis 1917a, 239; Kourouniotis 1917b, 18; cf. Themelis 1987, 117.
48 IG XII suppl. 562 and 572.
50 Knoepfler 1990, 122–124. This hypothesis was adopted by Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 254–255 and Trombetti 2013, 120–121.
52 IG XII 9, 234, l.9–12. Cf. Martin Pruvot, Reber, and Theurillat 2010, 186 no. 189, with bibliography.
54 Cf. Gauziere and Hatzopoulos 1993, 72–74, 78.
55 We will not go into detail here on the hypothesis of a first destruction of the gymnasion in the early second century, which is thought to have taken place in conjunction with the conquest of Eretria by the Roman troops under L. Quinctius Flamininus in 198 BCE; cf. Mango 2003, 66.
scriptions, and a few architectural elements are known from these excavations. The soundings that Mango took were concentrated mainly on the lower levels beneath the ancient soil layers. The Ephorate’s cleaning work in courtyard A of the eastern part has likewise yielded little useful material.\textsuperscript{56} The situation looks a little better for the north wing of the eastern part, where we found parts of the destruction layer.

5.1 Dating the last use of the western part

According to Mango, the north wing of the western part was rebuilt in the first half of the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{57} Her work confirms that the gymnasium was not abandoned following the Mithridatic War and the capture of the city by the Roman general Sulla in 86 BCE.\textsuperscript{58} Several other indications also suggest that the gymnasium continued to be used after Sulla’s conquest. The 29 inscriptions found in the gymnasium and presented by Mango and Knoepfler\textsuperscript{59} include two dating to the Roman era, including a herm from the first or second century CE,\textsuperscript{60} as well as the base of the statue of Kleonikos, the “Ephebe of Eretria,” whose inscription Knoepfler attributes to the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{61} Mango dates six of the eight sculptures found in the western part to the early days of the Roman Empire, arguing that these confirm that this part of the palaestra continued to be used until at least the late first century BCE.\textsuperscript{62} We can add to this a marble antefix that Mango dated to the third of the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{63}

Considering the sparse material that Mango found in her soundings, the absence of coins from imperial Rome is especially astonishing.\textsuperscript{64} Mango dates the abandonment of the gymnasium to the first half of the second century CE based on various glass fragments and two bronze fibulae from the rooms H, I, and J in the northwest of the building.\textsuperscript{65} The three rim fragments of blown-glass cups are typical of the Flavian period, but circulated until the early second century CE, whereas the fibulae were probably made in the second half of the first century CE.\textsuperscript{66} It thus would not contradict Mango’s assumption if the rooms H, I, and J were abandoned in the second century AD, but the terminus post quem for this event seems to be in the Flavian period or the last third of the first century CE. An overview of the material found between 1993 and 1995 reveals that no Roman pottery turned up, apart from a fragment of a lamp and some fragments of a trefoil jug found in the street to the north of the palaestra.\textsuperscript{67} The scarcity of Roman ceramic material is undoubtedly explained by the thorough exposure of the northern wing during the excavations of the nineteenth century.

The inscriptions, sculptures, and sparse material from the destruction layers, then, suggest that the western wing was abandoned in the latter part of the first century CE, or no later than the early second century CE.

5.2 Dating the abandonment of the eastern part

Glass fragments and two other bronze fibulae found in the destruction layers of exedra O and portico P1 like-

\textsuperscript{56} The foundation walls of the porticoes were only about 0.2m below the modern surface; the uppermost layer of earth was also disturbed by later agricultural activities.

\textsuperscript{57} Mango 2003, 61–63: “third construction phase”.

\textsuperscript{58} Knoepfler 2009, 235 with note 128; 235. It is impossible to say whether the gymnasium was damaged or destroyed in these events. Nor is it clear whether the renovations were carried out shortly after that date or later, at the beginning of the Roman Empire. On the conquest of Eretria by Sulla in spring 86 BCE cf. Schmid 2000, 176–179.


\textsuperscript{60} IG XII 9, 235 = Mango 2003, 148 E8.


\textsuperscript{62} These are the following fragments: 1) Fragment of ephebe likeness, found north of portico A2 and dated to the Tiberian-Claudian period; Mango 2003, 103–104 fig. 120, S1; 2) fragment of the face of an ephebe or herm from portico A1, dated to the first century CE (Mango 2003, 104 fig. 121, S3); 3) herm head from room E dated to the first or second century CE (Mango 2003, 104–106 fig. 122, S2); 4) male tondo likeness also from room E, dated to the late first or second century CE (Mango 2003, 109–111 fig. 125–126, S3); 5) statue of the “Ephebe of Eretria” from the Augustan period (Mango 2003, 111–115 fig. 127–129, S6); 6) tondo bust fragment, which was found in the loutron and can be dated to the first or second century CE (Mango 2003, 115–116 fig. 130–131, S4).

\textsuperscript{63} Mango 2003, 98, fig. 115, A13.

\textsuperscript{64} Cf. Mango 2003, 138; Spoerri Butcher 2011, 426.

\textsuperscript{65} Mango 2003, 66 fig. 77.

\textsuperscript{66} We are grateful to Brigitte Demierre Prikhodkine and Matthieu Demierre for this information. The parallels proposed by Mango do not a priori support a terminus post quem after the first century CE; cf. Mango 2003, 117, K44.2–4, 6–7.

\textsuperscript{67} Mango 2003, 23 fig. 10, K33.2.

\textsuperscript{68} Mango 2003, 66–67 fig. 77, K28.1–6.
wise let Mango date the abandonment of the eastern part to the first half of the second century CE (Pl. 2). One glass fragment belongs to the same category as the fragments from the blown-glass cups in the western wing and therefore probably also dates from between the Flavian period and the beginning of the second century CE. The fibulae, however, date back to the first half of the first century CE.

The excavations of the eastern part that we carried out over the last two years did not yield any material that can be dated so late. The material found in the destruction layers of this sector of the palaestra belongs exclusively to the period that falls between the end of the Hellenistic age and no later than the beginning of the Roman Empire. There are a few fragments of blown-glass vessels and a dozen ceramic fragments from the early decades of the first century CE. The lack of sufficiently dateable material does not allow us to isolate a more specific date when the eastern part was abandoned. It does seem, however, that this part of the building was vacated earlier than the western part.

The well that we cleared in room K3 has provided the latest material yet. A few ceramic fragments from the Roman Empire and a bronze coin from Chalcis with the image of Emperor Caracalla were found in its fill layer, which provides a terminus post quem in the late second century CE for the filling of the well. A clear indication that the palaestra had ceased operation by that time is the find of three fragments from a bronze statue of a young man or a youthful god; these had been disposed of in the well. Some late walls suggest that elements of the eastern part of the building were redesigned and reused after their original function was abandoned. One of these walls separated portico P1 from portico P4; another wall, installed between the columns and the eastern pilaster of exedra S, closed off the open access to the former exedra. The construction of these walls cannot be precisely dated, unfortunately, but the modification of the porticoes and of exedra S would suggest the installation of a modest home or stable that was built into the existing ruins after the palaestra had been abandoned.

5.3 The abandonment of the gymnasium and the decline of the ephebeia in Eretria

The Gymnasium of Eretria was still in operation at the beginning of the Roman Empire, as the sculptures and inscriptions confirm. But its operations seem to have ceased around the mid-second century CE. The reason for the abandonment of the gymnasium probably has to do with the decision to build a new thermae facility with hypocaust heating slightly further to the south (Pl. 3). The apodyterium of this facility featured a marble bench running along the walls, with feet of sculpted lion's paws...
and Griffin’s claws (Fig. 3).

This bench is very likely to have originated from one of the exedrae in the gymnasium, where it would have been stolen no later than the mid-second century CE. The institution of the ephebeia in Eretria seems to have come to an end during the same period. The latest inscription that still mentions the ephebeia uses letters that date back to between the first and the second century CE.72

6 Concluding remarks

In contrast to other Greek cities, where one can observe the integration of thermae facilities into the Hellenistic palaestras during the Roman period, the gymnasium of Eretria was not equipped with hot water baths in that era.73 The users of the gymnasium in the imperial era still had to wash with cold water, but they had the opportunity to take a sweat bath in pyriaterion G.

Outside the gymnasium, however, several public bathing facilities were being built in the city during the Hellenistic period (Pl. 3). These were the tholos baths in the mosaic house quarter, in the northeast of the Agora, and near the port, as well as a small bathing facility at the Acropolis.74 These bathing facilities were not reserved only for the users of the gymnasium, but also met a general need among the entire Eretrian population for hygiene and comfort.

Two public bathing facilities have been excavated in recent years by the ESAG: a tholos bath, constructed about a hundred meters from the gymnasium toward the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE,75 and the Roman thermae complex that arose directly south of the gymnasium around the middle of the second century CE, replacing both the older tholos bath and the gymnasium (Fig. 3).76 Accordingly, we find a good example in Eretria of the transition from a Hellenistic palaestra that was used for the athletic, military, and intellectual training of young men, in line with Greek tradition, to a Roman bathing facility that was more concerned with the necessities of hygiene and personal care. The thermae had only a small courtyard available for physical education, which hardly qualifies it as a palaestra in the Greek sense.77

71 In the bathing rooms Q1 and O as well as in the exedrae S and U, only the bases or negatives of such bench supports were found, indicating that these were torn out after the gymnasium was abandoned, probably so that they could be reused elsewhere (in the Roman thermae).
72 IG XII 9, 253.
74 On these public bathing facilities cf. Kanali 2015; Thierry Theurillat, Guy Ackermann, and Simone Zurbriggen. “From Classical Loutron to Roman Thermae: The Romanization of Baths at Eretria?” In What’s New in
75 Cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Zurbriggen 2015.
77 This facility stands in contrast to the bath/gymnasium complexes of Asia Minor that attest to the continuity of athletic exercises in their large peristyle courtyards; cf. the examples in Miletus, Trümper 2015, 196–203.
Pl. 1 Schematic plan of the palaestra of the Gymnasium of Eretria.
Pl. 2  Aerial view of the eastern part of the palaestra after the excavations in the summer of 2016.
Pl. 3  Archaeological plan of the ancient city of Eretria indicating the palaestrae and public bathing facilities.
Pl. 4  Schematic plan of the southern palaestra.
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Ulrich Mania

Gymnasial Buildings and Sanctuaries. A Contribution to the Formation of the Palaestra and an Interpretation of the So-Called ‘Echo Stoa’

Summary

The emergence of the palaestra as a distinctive building in the form of the peristyle is commonly assigned to the last third of the 4th century BC. While sources show that palaestras existed already earlier, no example has yet been safely identified. This paper argues that some buildings in extra-urban sanctuaries on the Peloponnesus with a set of functions in the context of athletics and competition could represent such early gymnasial buildings. The examples from Nemea and Epidauros lead to the building complex of the Echo-Stoa in Olympia which was very likely built as the first palaestra of the precinct. This building complex might reflect the appearance of early gymnasial buildings before the peristyle was introduced as an obligatory architectural form of palaestras.

Keywords: Olympia; Epidauros; Nemea; gymnasium; palaestra; Echo stoa
I Introduction

The building type of the palaestra – a peristyle with aisles for circulation and adjacent rooms, often in the design of exedras – occurs in the archaeological record at several places in different regions first in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. The earliest known palaestras are located in Athens, Eretria, Delphi, Amphipolis and Priene.¹

The widespread occurrence of these buildings within a short historical period suggests that the idea of the palaestra is older than the buildings in the archaeological record and in fact the term ‘palaestra’ for a gymnasiaal building is already attested in Plato’s Lysis shortly after 400 BC: He reports that Socrates was walking along the northern city walls of Athens when he noticed a door next to a well leading into a precinct (περίβολος). Inside, handsome young men lingered. Socrates asked what the building could be and got the answer it was a palaestra, recently built and it served the purpose of instruction and discussion.² Despite the fact that the first peristyles date to the same time and were well known in Athens since the so-called Pompeion was built next to the Dipylon gate around 400 BC, it is not known what Plato’s gymnasiaal building looked like.³ As the earliest known palaestras in the form of a peristyle were erected at least half a century later, probably Plato’s palaestra was nothing else than a walled court.

As there is a time lag between palaestras attested in literature and the widespread earliest palaestras in the shape of a peristyle, we have to widen our view to find further potential gymnasiaal buildings of the 4th century BC. Since Pausanias records the existence of a gymnasion and a palaestra in the Sanctuary of Zeus of Olympia it might be possible to find candidates in extra-urban sanctuaries.⁴ According to him, it was customary for the pentathletes participating in the Olympian Games to practice there. Running, jumping, discus-throwing and javelin-throwing are mentioned by the author in connection with the so-called gymnasium. Wrestling, the fifth type of sport in the pentathlon, took place in a second enclosure. Pausanias calls this the palaestra and locates it to the left of the entrance to the gymnasium. Scholars agree in the identification of gymnasium and palaestra with a large building complex in the northwest of the sanctuary (Pl. 21)⁵. The Olympian palaestra perfectly corresponds to what we understand by the synonymous building type: an unpaved quadrangle framed by a Doric peristyle, surrounded by Ionic exedras and with an emphasized northern wing housing a main exedra in the middle and a loutron with washbasins at both ends. Following the stylistic characteristics of the Ionic ornament of the palaestra and a terminus ante quem in 280 BC given by Pausanias who mentions a victory inscription from that year, which was present in the building, the palaestra was built not later than in the first quarter of the 3rd century BC.⁶ The suggested usage of the building as a place for wrestling and physical exercise corresponds with the design of the floors in the quadrangle, the aisles and the exedras with an unpaved and thus soft surface. Circumferential benches along the walls of the exedras served as resting places and as seats for visitors. Directly linked to the building’s proposed use for physical exercise are the two wash rooms among further facilities for body care.⁷

1 Athens: Palaestra in the so-called Academy (Delorme 1962, 38–42, 51–54; Travlos 1971, 42–51; Wacker 1996, 145–160; Trombetti 2012 320–329; Trombetti 2013, 6–29; Emme 2013b, 148–149, 316 no. 12; Kazakidi 2015, 213–214; A. Caruso in this volume); Eretria: double palaestra of the North Gymnasium (Delorme 1960, 16–164; Mango 2003; Emme 2013b, 324–325 no. 24; Trombetti 2013, 6–29; Emme 2013b, 148–149, 316 no. 12; Kazakidi 2015, 213–214; A. Caruso in this volume); Priene: according to the latest excavations in the so-called Upper Gymnasium by the author the building dates back to the 4th century BC.

2 Plut. Lyo. 203a–204a.206e. The book dates to shortly after 400 BC; cf. Delorme 1962, 60.

3 According to Emme 2013b, 295 buildings with proto-peristyles trace back to the 6th century BC. In Delos the earliest peristyle buildings occurred in the middle of the 5th century BC. Athens determined further developments with the earliest relatively large peristyles like the Pomeion and the θ-shaped portico in the sanctuary of Artemis in Brauron at the end of the 5th century BC.

4 Paus. 6.13.1.

5 Firstly Adler, Curius, and Dürrfeld 1892, 113–121 (cf. B. Emme in this volume).

6 Wacker 1996, 25–44 (with earlier sources) and Pausanias 6.6.3. Wacker dates the capitals to the early 3rd century BC but there is no compelling reason to exclude an earlier construction date (cf. B. Emme in this volume).

7 The loutron at the northernmost corner of the building is well preserved. The corresponding room in the northeast was heavily remodeled in later times but since it has the same outline as the western room and since there is evidence of water supply, it is very likely to have been used as a second loutron. An open air loutron between the early Roman Propylon and the northernmost corner of the palaestra with a row of sinks in front of the northern wall and a row of recessed basins along the south side of the yard is a later addition. Finally, brick paved areas along the northern and western side of the court of the palaestra have to be mentioned.
Pausanias’ ‘Gymnasium’ was erected on the northern side of the Olympian palaestra probably in late Hellenistic times. Excavations brought to light mainly a huge double-aisled Doric portico. The width of its front opening measures roughly 192.5 metres and coincides perfectly with the length of the Olympic stadium. This and the existence of a starting block determine the function of the portico as a roofed dromos or xystos. According to Pausanias, the gymnasium originally was an enclosure with buildings which framed a courtyard on all four sides. Following this, the appearance of this building would have been similar to several 2nd century BC enclosures, for example in Miletus, Kos and Ephesus which were part of civic gymasia and served most likely as training grounds for types of sport requiring space.

Looking at the palaestra and the gymnasium in Olympia raises the question of what the terms mean in the context of a sanctuary. Since a palaestra firstly was seen as a place for wrestling it is connected to the physical evidence of an open-air sand courtyard or, more elaborate than that, a peristyle building with the wrestling place in its center. The term gymnasium embraces a wider range of meanings. The designation of a certain building is only one part of it. Beyond physical exercise, it designates generally the school as an institution or the youths as a group attending it. In summary, a palaestra is first of all a place for physical exercises whilst a gymnasium describes a key institution of the polis state with all its functions, offices, user groups and buildings, amongst them the palaestra as a central part of a gymnasium. The wider sense of the term with a close relation to the polis state does not work in an extra-urban sanctuary several days’ journey from the nearest polis: This fact is proved by the complete absence of gymnasial officials in Olympia. As there is no evidence for the institution of the gymnasium in Olympia it may be assumed that the terms refer, above all, to the visual appearance of the ‘palaestra’ and the ‘gymnasium’ and their use as sport facilities.

2 Athletic Facilities in Panhellenic Sanctuaries of the 4th century BC

As we have seen, the gymnasial building complex in Olympia is unique but ‘gymnasial buildings’ occur in other sanctuaries as well. They differ from Olympia in their architectural form but contain a similar set of functions. This is demonstrated by the example of the Ne-
mean sanctuary: With the sanctuary of Olympia the precinct shares not only the worship of Zeus but also the position in a rural landscape and its periodical use with thousands of visitors during festivals.\textsuperscript{15} For the holding of diverse athletic contests within these festivals the sanctuary is equipped with specific infrastructure. Above all, there is the stadium at the eastern edge of the precinct. It was built in the last third of the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{16} A tunnel through the western embankment of the stadium connects the race track with a rectangular building (Fig. 1). Its dimensions are 16 by 13 m. An entrance in the north leads into a square court about 8 m in size surrounded by a three-sided Doric portico. The excavator named it the ‘Apodyterion’, changing room.

A very similar and even more elaborate building is situated north of the stadium at the Asclepius Sanctuary of Epidauros.\textsuperscript{17} It covers an approximately square area with a width of 40 m (Fig. 1). The building consists of an oblong courtyard with a Doric colonnade on its southern side; a hall to the north of this courtyard with a number of passages on each long side and five Ionic columns along its axis; and a kind of vestibule on the northernmost side of the complex.\textsuperscript{18} Again there is a tunnel connecting the building, which was called a palaestra by its excavator, with the racetracks in the stadium. It is believed that the stadium, tunnel and the above-mentioned building at the northern embankment of the stadium originate from one building program from the period between the last third of the 4th century BC and the early 3rd century BC.\textsuperscript{19} It has been pointed out that Argos controlled the Sanctuaries of Nemea and Epidauros during the 330s and 320s BC.\textsuperscript{20} Thus, it is no surprise to find similar architectural patterns in similar contexts within the same time frame. Stephen Miller defined these building units in Nemea and Epidauros as stadium-tunnel-locker complexes, an architectural type which connected stadia and facilities for athletes. A possible set of functions for these facilities was deduced from their position and design: Athletes used them for undressing/dressing, warming up, oiling or cleaning the body before and after competitions.\textsuperscript{21}

If athletes used these buildings for body care, washing facilities are missing. I suggest that the stadium-tunnel-locker complexes of Nemea and Epidauros were functionally supplemented by a particular form of baths, the so-called athlete baths, which contain a lourtron with its characteristic sinks and a plunge basin. Only the example in Nemea is well investigated. It is contemporaneous with the stadium complex and lies in the center of the precinct next to the so-called Xenon.\textsuperscript{22} The bath consists of two square compartments. The eastern compartment is divided into three sections by two rows of Doric columns. One section houses a plunge pool framed by two rooms with washbasins (loutrons). The middle section was probably a courtyard and the third a portico. The second compartment with the same size as the first one is attached at its eastern side and has four columns inside, most likely creating a peristyle-like structure with a wooden entablature.\textsuperscript{23} Also the less well known bath in the sanctuary of Asklepios in Epidauros is not placed in the vicinity of the stadium but next to the hesittiorion. Again it contained at least one lourtron with the characteristic washbasins and at the eastern side most likely an immersion pool. It is said the bath was built in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{24}

Washbasins for cold ablutions such as in the two athlete baths are known from the second half of the 5th century BC onwards and were an integral part of palaestras

\textsuperscript{15} Whilst in Olympia and Delphi the Panhellenic festivals recurred every four years, in Nemea and Isthmia the interval was only two years. Local festivals were celebrated here as well; Miller 1990, 2–3.

\textsuperscript{16} Miller 2001, 92–93. The building complex was not finished by 271 BC when the Nemean games were transferred to Argos. It began falling into disrepair already in the 3rd century BC.

\textsuperscript{17} Kavvadias 1929; Tomlinson 1983, 69, 91; Miller 2001, 178–190. The building is not properly published as its excavator, P. Kavvadias, died shortly after its discovery. Thanks to Miller’s efforts the building was superficially re-examined in the 1990s.

\textsuperscript{18} Patrucco 1976, 16 ff. published a sketchy (and incorrect) plan of the building for the first time. The only published, but quite small-scale, plan was published by Tomlinson 1983, fig. 44. This figure depicts an obliquely orientated room at the western side of the building. Miller 2001, 178–182 demonstrated that this structure did not belong to the ancient building.


\textsuperscript{20} Miller 2001, 189–190 n. 440.


\textsuperscript{22} Miller 1992, 246. Evidence comes from some sherds in the foundation trenches dating no earlier than the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. On the athlete baths in Nemea and Epidauros and a further example in Oropos (Lykeion mountains) Trümper 2014, 209, 214 n. 22, and 16.

\textsuperscript{23} Miller 1992, 232–236 reconstructs a west-east orientated gabled roof over the entire building.

\textsuperscript{24} Kavvadias 1900, 154–155, with the idea that the building represents a Hellenistic bath; cf. Ginouvès 1962, 359; Aslanidis and Pinati 1999; Wassenhoven 2012, 125; Trümper 2014, 216–222.
until Roman imperial times. Therefore the two baths have been interpreted as facilities for athletes, like the stadium-tunnel-locker complexes.25

3 An Early Palaestra in Olympia?

At this point we have to go back to Olympia where Miller again identified a stadium-tunnel-locker complex.26 It consists of a 96 m long and 8 m wide semi-roofed court between the Echo Stoa and the western embankment of the stadium (Fig. 2, 3, Pl. 1, 2).

A door in the northern narrow side of the court provides access into the passageway between Altis and stadium. The similarities to the above-mentioned building complexes in Nemea and Epidauros are evident but as Miller neglected in his consideration a huge part of the building complex and its specific building history it seems necessary to reinvestigate the issue.

The complex incorporates the Echo Stoa at the eastern edge of the Altis, the courtyard behind this stoa, and the passageway north of the two buildings. At first glance the courtyard seems to be an accidental result of the erection of the portico in front of the stadium embankment but it has been shown that portico, courtyard and the retaining wall at the bottom of the embankment are linked together and are part of an integral building concept.27 The construction date of this ensemble is the early second half of the 4th century BC.28 Miller’s interpretation of the building focuses on the courtyard and the passageway into the stadium only. Furthermore, he attributes the shed roof attached to the rear side of the Echo Stoa

25 Miller 1992, 244–250. The distance to the tunnel-stadium-locker complexes and the vicinity to other public buildings of the sanctuaries imply that the baths served as washing facilities not only for athletes but also for other guests of the precincts. Trümper 2014, 217–219 argues for a multifunctional usage of the building according to its topographical and architectural characteristics.

26 Miller 2001, 192–210. A further candidate might be the Panathenaic Stadium in Athens: This stadium also was built in the last third of the 4th century BC but the rebuilding phases of Hadrianic times and the late 19th century make study difficult today; Miller 2001, 210–222.


28 Koenigs 1984, 1–6, and especially 4. Ceramic findings from the filling of the foundation trenches give a terminus post quem in the middle of the 4th century BC. To the dating of the completion of the first building phase in the timeframe between 340 and 330 BC see also footnote 48. Following Koenigs, this date coincides with metrical characteristics of the building; Koenigs 1984, 20–22; cf. Kunze and Schleif 1938, 36; Schilbach 1992, 35; Miller 2001, 192.
Fig. 2  Reconstruction drawing of the Echo stoa and adjacent buildings, section from south. Black = first building phase in the 2nd half of the 4th c. BC; red = Monuments erected in the front of the unfinished stoa and Hellenistic modifications; green = completion of the Echo-stoa in Augustan time and later.

Fig. 3  Echo-stoa from north-west and the area of the court behind the building and the stadium wall.

Fig. 4  Retaining wall of the western stadium embankment (left) with water channel in the front and a later wall cutting the channel (right).
to the first building stage (Fig. 2). Only this assumption provides evidence to establish a link to the other ‘lockers’ with the combination of courtyard, portico and stadium tunnel. But the contrary was the case: the shed roof was not built before the final building phase of the Echo Stoa in Augustan times. If we omit the shed roof from the discussion, the question arises why the Echo Stoa itself is not recognized as a part of the building complex under consideration.

Surprisingly, the intention behind the erection of this building – a nearly 100 m long Doric portico with an impressive depth of 9.5 m and 44 columns in the front – has never been convincingly explained: The description of a battle between the Arcadians as defenders of the sanctuary and the Eleans as attackers during games in the year 364 BC by Xenophon represents the starting point for all related considerations. Xenophon reports that the Arcadians and Pisatans held the competitions of the pentathlon in the race tracks of the stadium. When the competitors, who had reached the wrestling contest, were no longer on the race track but were wrestling in the space between the stadium and the altar, the enemy arrived. This information is important for the identification of the area between the Altar of Zeus and the stadium, commonly known as the Altis, as the wrestling area or rather literally the palaestra. The following sentences refer to the battle between the two warring parties: The Eleans fought from the roofs of the porticoes, the Bouleuterion and the temple itself while the others tried to defend the area between the Bouleuterion, the temple of Hestia and the Theatron that adjoins these buildings. According to J. Schilbach the peak of the western stadium wall, which was raised in the first half of the 4th century BC, and the steep slope in front of the terrace of the Treasure houses formed this so-called Theatron and served as a place for spectators at the wrestling contests in the Altis. W. Koenigs identified at least the western embankment of the stadium with the Theatron and concluded that the Echo Stoa inherited its function as an audience space. Furthermore the terrace of the treasure houses with its stepped retaining wall, which was built at the same time as the Echo Stoa, would have used as stands and provided a good view on the scenery (Pl. 2). It is to assume, that the Echo stoa was not solely used as an audience hall. With its depth of 9.5 m only its front provided view on the Altis. The interior of the stoa must have had rather a multifunctional use. I would like to suggest to interpret the whole building ensemble as the first palaestra of Olympia consisting of a patch of ground for wrestling in front of the stoa, a huge multifunctional portico and space for an audience. In this setting the portico formed an architectural frame and provided opportunity for assembly and practice during bad weather. Furthermore, the building complex gave access for athletes to the stadium and contained facilities for body care. These two features have to be explained more carefully:

3.1 Water installations

Along the front side of the Echo Stoa runs an open water channel with inserted basins in front of every tenth column (Fig. 2, Pl. 1). Usually, such channels served as drainage for rainwater pouring down from the water-sprouts along the sima. But this was not the only function of this gutter: Its gentle gradient is directed to the south. In the north it continued up to the foot of the retaining wall of the terrace of the treasure houses. This wall contained a fresh-water feeding channel and permanently supplied the gutter with its basins in front of the

29 Miller 1992, 192 n. 45 c, misunderstood Koenigs 1984, 84, and assumed that the shed roof could be already part of the original plan. Sinn 1996, 58–59, refers to the court behind the portico as an apodyterium without any discussion of the relation between the portico and the shed roof.

30 Koenigs 1984, 26, 84 fig. 15. “Über das zeitliche Verhältnis der Echonhalle läßt sich nur sagen, daß das Pultdach selbst nachträglich an die fertige Halle der Phase C angebaut wurde […]”

31 Xen. Hell. 7.4.29 and 31. The Arcadians ruled over the sanctuary between 365 and 362 BC. On the historical background see Ringel, Siewert, and Taeuber 1999, 414; cf. Diod. 15.78.2.


34 Originally, the archaic treasure houses were built on a terrace made from dumped material. Towards the Altis this terrace merged into a slope. When the Echo Stoa and its attached buildings were erected, this slope was cut away and replaced by a stepped retaining wall with a height of more than 5 m. Each step of this wall is about 0.24 m high and 0.22 m deep (a section of this stepped wall in the area of its western end is shown in Schilbach 1984, 233 fig. 12). In the east towards the stadium entrance, this wall becomes steadily higher as the level of the Altis falls. The higher parts of the wall consist of a stepped upper zone and a vertical lower base zone. On the erection date of this wall at the time of the erection of the Echo Stoa and its adjacent buildings, see Schilbach 1992, 35, and with an extensive discussion of previous scholarly research Miller 2001, 190–210.
stoa.\footnote{The description of the channel by Kunze and Schleif 1938, 37–39, was updated by Koenigs 1984, 84–85. The chronological relation between the channel and the terrace wall of the treasure houses is debated: Kunze and Schleif 1938, 58, pointed out that the retaining wall must be younger than the portico, Schilbach 1992, 35 and Miller 2001, 208–209, date both buildings to the same building phase.} Similar channels fed with fresh water and supplemented with basins are well known from stadiums like Nemea and Epidaurus and from several palaestras.\footnote{Permanently water fed gutters with or without inserted sinks are known from the palaestras of the Lower Gymnasium in Priene, the Upper Gymnasium in Eretria, the Gymnasium in Pergamon, Messene, Kalydon, Sikyon and the palaestra of Olympia. The striking difference to many similar installations in buildings of other purposes is the permanent water flow in the channels of these palaestras.} The water supply and the existence of these water systems not only in front of columnar halls but also in stadiums make clear that we have to assume functions not only in relation to the drainage of rainwater but also to athletic activities. Well investigated is the channel system in the stadium of Nemea with a small fountain at its southern narrow side feeding water channels with interposed basins extending along both sides of the race track.\footnote{The hydraulic system belongs to the original plan of the stadium from the last third of the 4th century BC; Miller 2001, 15–23, 92–93.} The installation demonstrates that one important feature was the provision of water allowing the athletes to wash and refresh themselves. The inserted basins in this context must have serve as water deposits and facilities for drawing water.

A second water facility in the context of the building complex in Olympia is situated in the courtyard behind the portico where a channel runs along the top of the retaining wall of the stadium embankment (Fig. 2, 4, Pl. 1). Also this gutter is connected to and fed by the water channel at the foot of the retaining wall of the treasure houses and conducts water possibly to the hippodrome which location in the southeast of the stadium is a debated issue.\footnote{As the entrance into the stadium crosses the connection between the channel in the wall in front of the treasure houses and the channel on top of the retaining wall of the stadium embankment, the connection is managed by a siphon (Pl. 1). Conversions of the stadium entrance resulted in modifications of the siphon which ensured that the water always flowed through the open channel on top of the embankment wall. Miller 2001, 206–209, summarizes these construction phases; cf. Heilmeyer 1984.} For a length of about 71 m, the east side of the court is flanked by this raised water channel. It is 0.35 m wide and around 0.22 m deep. Its upper edge reaches a height of 1.1 m above ground. Consequently, the water was easily accessible from the court and the channel might have served as a washing facility in the postulated first palaestra of Olympia. Already Koenigs on the basis of the water channel vaguely assumed the court was used as washing place.\footnote{Koenigs 1984, 84.} As the usage of an open raised channel for body cleaning would be unique, Miller considered the possibility that washing basins had stood along the retaining wall and have been fed by the channel.\footnote{Miller 2001, 210.} As the very scarce remains of the channel do not show any outlets which could support this hypothesis, one appropriate washbasin made from limestone was found in secondary use at the base of the terrace wall of the treasure houses and might be interpreted as a remnant of such a Lutron in the courtyard.\footnote{Kunze and Schleif 1938, 55–59.} A comparable example for this setting provide the two Lutrons in the athlete bath in Nemea: Its wash basins were aligned along the rear walls of the bathing rooms. A horizontal channel in each of the walls led water to outlets from where it poured into the basins.\footnote{To the bath in Nemea see Miller 1992, 188–261. The bath dates in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. Miller 1992, 20–210, assumes that metallic nozzles in the holes generated jets which gushed in the basins.} Also in the Lower Gymnasium of Priene a channel run along the walls of the Lutron and fed a row of basins below.\footnote{Wiegand and Schrader 1904, 269–271; Krüchen 1925, 141; Delorme 1960, 193–194; Schede 1934, 86–88; Rumscheid 1998, 208; Ferla 2005, 174–175.} In difference to the Lutron in Nemea and the supposed Lutron behind the Echo stoa in Olympia the channel in Priene contained a pipe with nozzles which ended in the waterspouts.\footnote{H. Fahlbusch verbally pointed out that only lead pipes and nozzles would have created a controlled jet which was suitable to fill the basins. Similar systems with lead pipes and nozzles very likely existed in the Lutrons of the palaestrae of Amphipolis und Delphi.} The two examples from Nemea and Priene at least show that the height of the channel in the court behind the Echo stoa with 1.1 m would have been in a range which was suitable for feeding washing basins.\footnote{The two examples from Nemea and Priene interpreted as a remnant of such a Lutron in the courtyard. However, if the channel on top of the embankment wall fed washing basins or was used as washing facility itself remains uncertain. Also the question whether the floor of the court was covered with stone slabs and if}
there existed a drainage or not is not answered since the remains are scarce. Last but not least the Lutron in the palaestra of Delphi has to be mentioned as a comparable example. This Lutron was situated in a court under open sky too and the washing basins were fed by a pipe system with waterspouts in a retaining wall at the eastern side of the court.\textsuperscript{46} Stone slabs on the floor and sewers of this Lutron are preserved.

3.2 Access to the stadium

I have already pointed out the fact that Miller did not consider the possibility of a connection between the Echo Stoa and the courtyard behind it. This made him believe that Olympia represented again a stadium-tunnel-locker complex like in Nemea, Epidauros and elsewhere. But is it likely that a nearly 100 m long courtyard was only accessible from a single door in its northern narrow side wall (Pl. 1)? Already Koenigs pleaded for the existence of passageways in the rear wall of the Echo stoa connecting the portico with the courtyard.\textsuperscript{47} As the rear wall of the early Echo Stoa has not survived in the required height, these postulated doors remain in the darkness of conjecture. However, the existence of the court behind the stoa calls for more accesses than the single door. Therefore I would like to follow Koenigs suggestion and assume that passageways in the rear wall of the stoa created a spatial and functional connection between the wrestling place on the Altis and the adjacent stadium via the stoa and the court with their different washing facilities. Following this the building complex in the east of the Altis displayed distinctive features of many later palaestras in Hellenistic poleis.

The following building history of the Echo stoa in the context of the development of the whole sanctuary can support the interpretation of the building complex as the first palaestra of the precinct. Surprisingly, at the end of the first building phase around 340–330 BC only the courtyard, the krepis, the rear and side walls of the portico were completed.\textsuperscript{48} For the next three centuries the ensemble stayed in this incomplete state until it was finished in Augustan times using the architectural members of a dismantled 4th century portico of unknown origin (Fig. 2, Pl. 1 green colored building parts).\textsuperscript{49} An explanation for this sudden slowdown of the building activities at the Echo stoa during the last third of the 4th century BC could be the erection of the four-sided peristyle-like palaestra with all the appurtenances of the building type at the north-western edge of the precinct precisely during this period. The construction of a further building with a similar set of functions and, above all, with the up-to-date design of a palaestra might have caused less enthusiasm for the building project between Altis and stadium. It is even possible that with the erection of the four-sided palaestra wrestling did not take place in the Altis anymore but moved completely into the new building. This functional change of the wrestling place on the Altis is illustrated by the erection of many dedications in front of the unfinished Echo Stoa during the Hellenistic era: These monuments occupied the space which was used for wrestling contests during the 4th century BC and they covered over time the front of the unfinished stoa. Furthermore, the so-called Zanes bases were placed along the base of the terrace wall below the treasure houses and terminated the use of the stepped wall as stands.\textsuperscript{50}

4 Conclusion

Pausanias named the two huge buildings in the north-west of the sanctuary of Olympia palaestra and gymnasion. As the institution of the gymnasium did not exist in the extra urban precinct the naming refers to the visual appearance of the building complex: As comparable examples several Hellenistic gymnasia can be named with similar extended training areas flanked by Xystoi. The ‘palaestra’ precisely quotes the eponymous building

\textsuperscript{46} Jannoray 1953, 55–61; Ginouvès 1962, 133–135.

\textsuperscript{47} Koenigs 1984, 82.


\textsuperscript{49} Koenigs 1984, 28–64. The shed roof in the court behind the Echo Stoa belongs to this Augustan building phase. According to Koenigs 1984, 83–84 it is not likely that this roof was a provisional substitute for the unfinished portico during Hellenistic times.

\textsuperscript{50} Unfortunately, we have no evidence for the function of the Echo Stoa when it was finished in Augustan times. The erection of the so-called ‘Südostbau’ in Early Imperial times as a seat for a congregation of athletes (Sinn 1995, 231–238) suggests that the complex was connected with athletic activities also in later times.
type in the form of a peristyle building which emerged in the archaeological record during the last 3rd of the 4th century BC.

The palaestra and the gymnasium are not the earliest ‘gymnasial buildings’ in Olympia. Already during the 2nd half of the 4th century BC not only there but also as in Nemea and Epidauros buildings appeared which Miller named as “stadium-tunnel-locker-complexes”. Furthermore, there have been athlete baths which belonged functionally to these complexes too. The erection of such gymnasia buildings in sanctuaries in the Peloponnese took place roughly in the same period as the earliest palaestras emerged in the Greek world, and can be seen as a result of experimenting, like Miller does in relation to the free-standing athlete baths in Nemea and Epidauros.  

With the Echo stoa in Olympia there is further opportunity for interpretation of these gymnasia buildings in sanctuaries: Whilst Miller focused his considerations on the “stadium-tunnel-locker-complex”, he neglected the Echo stoa as a part of the building complex between Altis and stadium. The Echo stoa was erected exactly in the area which Xenophon described as the wrestling place in 364 BC. It connected spatially and functionally the wrestling place on the Altis with the stadium and provided as a multifunctional building space for audience, exercise and body care like the later palaestra in the northwest of the precinct did. Before this background gymnasia buildings in sanctuaries and in particular the building complex of the Echo stoa in Olympia might reflect the appearance of early palaestras before the building type adopted the peristyle as an obligatory architectural form in the thirties of the 4th century BC.

51 Miller 1992, 244–250.
Pl. 1  The building-complex around the Echo-stoa in Olympia. Black = first building phase in the 2nd half of the 4th c. BC; red = Monuments erected in the front of the unfinished stoa and Hellenistic modifications; green = completion of the Echo-stoa in Augustan time and later.
Pl. 2. Olympia, Sanctuary of Zeus.
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A New Athenian Gymnasium from the 4th Century BC?

Summary

Literary sources attest that the gymnasium of the Athenian Academy was used from the 6th century BC to at least the 2nd century AD. The site, located based on texts and a horos stone, has been variously explored since 1929. Of the excavated structures, a rectangular courtyard building in the South has commonly been identified as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium, whereas a large square peristyle building (so-called Tetragonos Peristylos) in the North has received little attention. This paper critically revises the identification of these two buildings and argues that the southern building, whose courtyard belongs to the Late Antique period, cannot have functioned as a palaestra. Instead, the square peristyle building, which was surrounded by rooms and dates to the 4th century BC, should be identified as a palaestra, due the plan and epigraphic evidence.

Keywords: Athens; Academy; gymnasium; palaestra; Tetragonos Peristyle

For the accomplishment of this study many thanks are due to: Prof. Emanuele Greco, former Director of the Italian Archaeological School of Athens, who supported it, as well as Prof. Panos Dimas (Norwegian Institute of Athens); Dr. Aris Koronakis, Effie Lykgouri Tolia, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Dr. Manolis Panayotopoulou (Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens) for their kind assistance and the discussions on the topography of the Academy; the Archaiologiki Etairia, for the permission to read the notebooks of Ph. Stravopoulos, and the Akadimia Athinon, for the permission to access P.Z. Aristophron’s reports and for the kind help in reading them. I would like to extend my gratitude to the late Prof. Enzo Lippolis (Sapienza University of Rome), for his advice during our visit to the site, which I will keep forever in my memory, and to Prof. Fausto Longo (University of Salerno). Finally, I am grateful to Paul Beston for the revision of my English.
The Academy, named for the hero Akademos (also Ἐκόδημος), who first lived in the place, is the northwestern suburb of Athens, situated one kilometer east of the river Cephisus, and approximately one mile to the north-east of the city wall starting from the Dipylon Gate (Pl. 1). This location, initially given by the literary sources, is confirmed by a boundary marker, a Horos, which was discovered in situ, 116 m south-east from Aimos and Tripoleos streets. Here, one of the three most ancient gymnasia of Athens was located, which are attested by authors from the Archaic period onwards.

The topography of the area has been variously discussed: scholars have mostly dealt with the two main buildings, more occasionally with Plato’s school premises or with religion-linked topographical features. My aim here is to discuss the identification of the two main buildings, the so-called gymnasium or rather palaestra of the Academy and the Tetragonos Peristylos. Since its discovery in 1929, a building on the south-eastern edge of the area has been identified as the palaestra of the Academy (Pl. 2 a). Going against the common opinion, I suggest identifying the palaestra as the building lying 200 m further north, which is generally called the Tetragonos Peristylos (Pl. 2 b). My hypothesis stems from a critical approach to the architecture and building technique of the two monuments. In order to look at the problem from as complete a perspective as possible, I will undertake a brief re-examination of all of the testimonies related to the facilities in the gymnasium area.

1 Chronological history of the facilities pertaining to the Gymnasium of the Academy according to the literary sources

The Academy gymnasium was in use from the Archaic period onwards, as we know from Demostenes, who recalls a law of Solon for the protection of the three city gymnasia from thieves (the Academy, the Cynosarges and the Lykeion). Shortly afterwards, in the Peisistratid age, Charmos, Peisistratus’ eromenos, dedicated an altar to Eros, as Athenaeus tells us. Athenaeus’s testimony, containing the expression ἐπί τέρμας γυμνασίου, is very interesting for our topographical analysis, as the term τέρμα, (τοῦ, τό), means: “end, boundary, limit”, but also: “goal round which men, horses and chariots had to turn at races”? This last meaning would lead us to conclude that in the 6th century BC the gymnasium of the Academy was provided with a running track.

Shortly after the dedication by Charmos, Hipparchus, Pisistratus’s son, wanted to build a peribolos wall in order to protect the place. All the testimonies noted here imply that the 6th century BC Athenian ruling class paid great attention to the Academy gymnasium, a sign that the nascent institution was already conceived of as something more than a gymnasium. It must be said that when we think of the gymnasium of the Academy in the Archaic age, we must not imagine any specific buildings, but rather a large area, within which premises were disparate and unconnected. To summarize, they presumably were:

---

1 Scol. ad Arist. Nu. 1205a; Hsch. s.v. Ακαδήμης. Likewise ΄Εκόδημος, the form Ἐκόδημος is also attested in the source beside Ακαδήμης: cf. Morison 1988, 178–183.
4 Caruso 2013, 31–117 with bibliography.
5 Billot 1989; Marchiandi 2003, in particular for the Archaic period; Caruso 2013, 38–42, for the cult of the Muses.
6 In accordance with common practice in scholarship, a building with a central peristyle courtyard is called palaestra here, whereas a gymnasium includes different features, such as a palaestra and running tracks (xystos, paradromis). Therefore, the Academy is referred to as a gymnasium, but single peristyle buildings within the area of the Academy are referred to as palaestrae; for a detailed discussion of palaestrae, see B. Emme in this volume.
7 Demos. XXIX 114: “Καὶ εἰ τις Λυκείου ἢ εἰ Ακαδημείας ἢ εἰ Κοινοσάρ-γους ἢ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἢ ἄλλων ἡμάτων ἔφτιγνυ, οὗ εἰ τῶν σκευῶν τι τῶν ἐκ τῶν γυμνασίων οὐφλείν ἢ ἐκ τῶν λιμένων, ὑπὲρ δὲ καθρέφτης, καὶ τούτων βοῶντων εὑρωπήσεις εἶναι τὴν ξήμην”. On this law see: Jüther 1965, 79–81; Glucker 1978, 243 n. 68; Billot 1989, 705.
8 Ath. XIII 609c–d (XIII, 89): Παρακλήθησα Ἕρως, σοὶ τὸνδ’ ἱδρύσατο βοῶν / Χάρμος ἐπί σκιεροῖς τέρμασι γυμνασίων. English translation (Yonge 1853–1854): O wily Love, Charmos this altar raised/ At the well-shaded bounds of her Gymnasium. – The dedication of the altar by Charmos is also attested by Paus. 1 30, 1; Apul. Plat. 1 1; Clem. Al. Protr. III 44.2–5.
9 TLG s.v. τέρμα.
10 This is quite plausible, as running was the most ancient competition held during athletic games, and the only one disputed in the initial stages of Pan-Hellenic festivals.
11 Suid. s.v. Τὸ Ἱππάρχου τειχίον: Ἰππάρχος ὁ Πεισιστράτου περί τὴν Ἀκα- δήμην τέχνος ὕκοδόμησε, πολλὰ ἀναγκαζότας ἀνάλογα τοὺς Αθηναί- ους. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ δεισδιοντικῶς πραγμάτων ἑπαροίματα εἴρεται.
Literary sources attest that in the 5th century BC the area of the Academy was provided with additional venues:

- a number of roads (dromoi), groves and paths for walking (peripatos) during Cimon’s age
- tracks for chariots races, according to Xenophon
- altars and sacred installations
- venues for paideia, according to an Aristophanes comedy written around 420 BC: ἡλικιώτου σώφρονος μετὰ σώφρονος ἡλικιωτοῦ.

Aristophanes does not directly mention any facility for the paideia, but implies it by mentioning the κάλαμος, the normal writing implement, and training in racing (ἀποθρέχω) among the activities of two young boys. Notably, one of them is described as well-educated (σώφρονος ἡλικιωτοῦ). Aristophanes aside, the 5th century BC educational activity in the Academy is also attested by about a hundred schist tablets carrying names of gods (e.g. Athena, Ares) and famous men (Aristides, Demosthenes), which have been regarded by some scholars as indicating the presence of a didaskaleion in the place.17

In the 4th century BC the Academy is firmly connected with Plato’s philosophical school, once he started teaching in the gymnasion’s confines in 387 BC on his return from Italy.18 The main source is Diogenes Laertius,19 but many other authors attest the presence of the philosopher, whose school was actually called ‘Academia’.20 If the use of gymnasia for philosophical lessons was a custom in Athens (e.g.: Socrates and Aristotle in the Lykeion; Antisthenes in the Cynosarges), Plato’s teaching must imply that at this period the gymnasium of the Academy was provided with rooms and all the other venues suitable for performing lessons, even if they are not explicitly attested.

Sources attest instead that in the 4th century the gymnasion of the Academy was provided with a palaestra. In a discourse of 324 BC, Hyperides recalls the episates of the Academy, Aristomachos, being accused of having moved a vane from the palaestra of the Academy to his own garden.21

Training facilities in the Academy were used at least down to the early 2nd century BC, as an inscription dated to 184–171 BC clearly attests:

ἐρήμησον | - - - | - - - | ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ γυμνάζοντας - - - (ll. 4–5).

Unfortunately, this is the last mention of activity in the gymnasion before Pausanias’ visit in the 2nd century AD.23 It is possible that during his siege of Athens, in 87–86 BC, Sulla occupied and destroyed the site when he wanted to cut the trees in the Academy grove with the aim of building war machines.24

12 Karo 1933, col. 212; Karo 1934, coll. 139–140; Stavropoulos 1969, 343; Travlos 1971, 43, figs. 54, 55, and 62.
14 X. Eq. Mag. III 14: Ὅταν εἰς τὸ ἐπικρότημα ἐν Ἀκαδημαίᾳ ἔρχεσθαι δέχηται. On the chariot races held on the dromos of the Academy see also Ael. VH II 27.
15 Two scolia to Sophocles attest these; one (Schol. OC 56) refers to a sculptured basin near the entrance (on which Prometheus, seated and holding a sceptre, was represented with Hephaestus standing close to an altar); the other (Schol. OC 705) a ιερὸν of Athena and an altar of Zeus Katakhate: “περὶ Ἀκαδημίαν ἐστὶν ὅ τε τοῖς Κατακάθισίον Δίως βουρσός, ὄν καὶ Μόριον καλοῦσι, τῶν ἐκεί μορίων παρὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν ἱδρύμενον.”
16 Ar. Nu. 1025–1026.
18 Plato’s reasons for why Plato started teaching in the Academy are discussed in Caruso 2013, 32–37.
19 Diog. Laert. III 7; Ἐπανελθόν δὲ εἰς Λήδην διετρίβετο ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ. Τὸ δ’ ἐπὶ γυμνάσιον προσέφει σώφρονς ἱδρύμενον ἑκαδήμου.
20 Epikrates ( mixes this passage). LXXXIX 306).
22 Reimnuth 1961, 15–17 n. 9 pl. 3. It is a decree honouring a houmeite.
23 Equally, no mention of the gymnasium of the Academy occurs in Strabo, who merely includes the Academy among the richest places of history and myth (Strabo IX 1.17).
24 Plut. Sull. XII 4. Perhaps it is for the same reasons that Platonic philosophers disappeared from the area, as the last scholar, Philo of Larissa, moved to Rome in 86 BC, precisely during the Mithridatic war (Cic. Brut. LXXXIX 326).
As said, for the imperial age, the main source is Pausanias. The traveler, who arrived at the site from the Dipylon Gate, provides a description only of the altars (bomai), which he describes in sequence, starting from the outermost to the innermost. The gymnasium he simply mentions:

Outside the city, too, in the parishes and on the roads, the Athenians have sanctuaries of the gods, and graves of heroes and of men. The nearest is the Academy, once the property of a private individual, but in my time a gymnasium.26

After Pausanias, we are in the dark regarding the gymnasium of the Academy. The unhealthy character of the site (which is often mentioned by ancient authors),27 and the general decline of the institution of the gymnasium led to the abandonment of the area, which was neglected at least until the 4th–5th centuries AD. In fact, sources do not mention the Academy until Proclus’ age.28

2 Discovery and interpretation of the main buildings of the Academy

Systematic excavation of the site began in 1929, through the initiative and enthusiasm of the architect Panayotis Z. Aristophron. Under the patronage of the Akadimia Athinon,29 and with the aim to revive ancient Plato’s philosophical school,30 Aristophron not only financed the excavations at his own expense,31 but also provided annual reports, which are central to the topographic reconstruction of the Academy.32

After locating the area of the Academy along the Demosion Semá,33 the excavators found large limestone foundation blocks at the intersection between the modern streets of Alexandrias and Maratonomachon, just north of the Church of Haghios Tryphon. These belonged to a large-scale building, with a big rectangular courtyard surrounded by porticoes on three sides. Several factors persuaded Aristophron that this was the gymnasium (or rather palaestra) of the Academy:34 a) the plan; b) the position; c) the roughly 1500 m distance from the Dipylon Gate, which matched Livy’s testimony of one thousand Roman passus between the two places; d) the vicinity to a Roman bath complex lying in the south-east, a pattern which occurs in several gymasia all over the Greek world; e) the presence of nine tombs along the east side of the building, which were supposed to be those of agonothetai.35 This interpretation was reinforced by the discovery in the same area of the remains of a wall (identified as a retaining wall, analemma), and of a long portion of beaten earth. Because of the proximity to the building regarded as the palaestra, both were regarded as traces of the stadion.36

In 1933, further to the north-east of the so-called gymnasium (palaestra), archaeologists found large foundation blocks pertaining to a building with a peristyle courtyard. Only Aristophron, hugely enthusiastic, interpreted it as Plato’s philosophical school,38 while...
others generically called it Τετράγονος Περίστυλος because of its square plan.\textsuperscript{39} In the vicinity, sporadic finds from the Archaic period were brought to light: terracotta antefixes; fragments of tiles and a fragment of a painted metope, with the scene of a man holding a hare.\textsuperscript{40} Recently, D. Marchiandi, after an astute analysis, has interpreted the metope as an iconographic testimony of the Archaic gymnasium. In particular, she has connected the scene of the man with his prey to the sphere of homosexual love, which was no stranger to the aristocratic world of Archaic ephebeia.\textsuperscript{41}

After the Second World War and Aristophron’s death in 1945, excavations were undertaken by Ph. Stavropoullos (1955–1963). He returned to the so-called gymnasium building and discovered two small masonry buildings: one, quadrangular in plan, in the middle of the courtyard, and another, rectangular, along its northern edge.\textsuperscript{42}

These were the last excavations carried out on the site; all subsequent actions were sporadic surveys or consolidation works, such as the recent cleaning work undertaken in the summer of 2011. In 1993 the area became a public park, after the expropriation and demolition of hundreds of houses all around.\textsuperscript{43}

3 Towards a new interpretation

Before moving to a new interpretation, it must be said that our knowledge of the site is still partial because fieldwork was not always done in a systematic way; furthermore, research was hampered by the frequent flooding of the Cephisus, which caused alluvial deposits of about 6 m thickness.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, the publication of data was not always timely and most of the materials and plans are still unpublished. Clay mining, begun in 1952,\textsuperscript{45} and local urban growth were further causes of data loss. For all these reasons every interpretation of the ruins, previous and new, must be considered as hypothetical and not exhaustive. Nevertheless, I think that it is possible to look at the two main monuments of the area, the so-called gymnasium and the Tetragonos Peristylos, with a more critical approach.

3.1 The so-called gymnasium of the Academy

As said, from its discovery in 1929, the gymnasium (or rather palaestra) of the Academy was identified by Aristophron with the building on the south-eastern edge of the area (Pl. 2: building a). Aristophron’s interpretation was soon broadly accepted\textsuperscript{46} and became standard in archaeological literature.\textsuperscript{47}

The building follows a rectangular plan, contains rooms on the northern side and a big rectangular courtyard (44.4 × 23.4 m), surrounded by three corridors on the east, west and south sides. Inside each corridor, square bases are situated at a distance of 2.5 m from each other (Fig. 1). On the north, foundations of a portico stand in front of the rooms; behind the portico, rectangular masonry marks the courtyard’s northern side. In Aristophron’s view, the square bases along the long sides would indicate a peristyle, with the palaestra in the inner space\textsuperscript{48} while the rooms behind the peristyle (no longer

Fig. 1 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: sequence of bases inside the west side.

\textsuperscript{39} Aristophron 1933b, 71.
\textsuperscript{40} Karo 1933, col. 210; Karo 1934, coll. 139–140.
\textsuperscript{41} Marchiandi 2003, 28–32 figs. 8–10.
\textsuperscript{42} Stavropoullos 1963.
\textsuperscript{43} Lygkouri-Tolia 1993 [1998], B1, 61.
\textsuperscript{44} Stavropoullos 1965, 6 fig. 1.
\textsuperscript{45} Orlandos 1956, 15.
\textsuperscript{46} Keramopoulos 1933, 247; Karo 1933, coll. 208–209; Béguignon 1933, 250–251; Blegen 1933, 491; Lemerle 1935, 251.
\textsuperscript{48} Aristophron 1933c, 1.
recognizable) would be exedrae.⁴⁹ The building has been variously dated over the years: from the Archaic age⁵⁰ to Late Antiquity,⁵¹ when, at the beginning of the 5th century AD, it would have been rebuilt ex fundamentis, according to some scholars.⁵²

After examining anew all of the data (archaeological reports, sources and materials) and comparing the building with other palaestrae all over the Greek world, I do not believe it is a palaestra.⁵³ Some of the reasons why the building cannot work as a palaestra are evident. First, there are very few rooms, and none of them is typical for the two main activities undertaken inside gymnasia, athletics and teaching; which room would be, for example, the exedra? And which room would have been the sphairisterion or the loutron? Second, the disposition of the rooms on the northern side is not comparable to that of other palaestrae. Third, the peculiar rectangular plan is not very common among palaestrae, at least in the eastern Mediterranean world.⁵⁴

Apart from these general arguments, the main difficulties for the interpretation of the building in the Academy concern:

a) the plan, which does not show the characteristics of a palaestra;
b) the lack of any evidence (inscriptions or other finds) that could attest its function as part of a gymnasium.

Thus, at the moment it is quite difficult to explain why and how the building was originally built and subsequently restored. In order to avoid any further misinterpretation, we must reconstruct, as far as possible, the building phases. Through autopsy, I have recognized four (Pl. 3)

- Phase 1: an unknown building, of which only architectural members survived in the second phase building.
- Phase 2: a rectangular oikos in the north (8.8 × 13.6 m). It consists entirely of soft white limestone blocks, reused from the first phase of the building (Pl. 3 a). This reused material dates to the Archaic or Classical periods, as indicated by double-T clamps and anathyrosis marks (Figs. 2, 3).⁵⁵ In the same period, or shortly afterwards, a six-columned portico was constructed 4.5 m south of the oikos.

---

⁴⁹ Aristophron 1933a, 245: “εἰς τὰς πλευρὰς τῶν ὁποίων διακρίνονται τὰ διάφορα διαμερίσματα, αἱ ἐξέδραι λεγόμεναι” (εἰκ. 4).
⁵⁰ Karo 1934, coll. 136–150; Blegen 1934, 602; Payne 1934, 188.
⁵¹ Travlos 1960, 134: the architect dated the building on the basis of the planimetric similarity with the ‘Palace of the Giants’ in the agora, and considered the building in the Academy "ἵππους ἐν τῇ ἀκρωτηρίῳ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ 500 μ.Χ. αἰώνος".
⁵³ For a full discussion of my thesis see Caruso 2013, 90–96.
⁵⁴ While some buildings with similar rectangular plans have been identified as palaestrae in literature, such as the so-called Hellenistic gymnasium in Miletus, this interpretation has recently been challenged; for such ‘fal-sae’ palaestrae see in detail B. Emme in this volume. Confer, however, the safely identified palaestra in Solunto, which has a rectangular plan with a rectangular peristylium; see M. Trümper in this volume.
Foundations for column bases (1.28 × 1.1 m with a distance of 2 m) are still visible (Fig. 4).

- **Phase 3**: enlargement of the oikos. Three rooms were constructed from reused conglomerate blocks on the eastern side of the oikos, at a higher level (Pl. 3 b). While there is no evidence, a similar arrangement may have existed on the western side. The previous oikos was demolished, and a larger room created in its place. Perhaps at this stage, the facing portico was covered with large conglomerate blocks (Fig. 5), probably in order to convert it into a long basement.

- **Phase 4**: the building achieved its monumental form (Pl. 3 c). A big rectangular courtyard (44.4 × 23.4 m) was created by adding corridors on three sides with foundations of small blocks and mortar, in a typical Late Antique manner (Fig. 6).

The corridors in the east, west and south of the courtyard with width of 5.40 m each are characterized by a sequence of square bases (0.72 × 0.72 m) at a distance of 2.75 m from each other (Fig. 1). Perhaps at this stage (judging by the building technique), a rectangular basin with a length of 11.5 m was created along the northern edge of the court. It was built with blocks of poros and abundant mortar. Traces of a waterproof plaster are still visible. A second square basin (7.6 × 13 m) was erected in the middle of the courtyard with a pavement of bricks, similar to that of the northern rectangular basin. Like the northern basin, the central basin may have been used as a fountain, as it is connected to a tiled water duct coming from north-west.

The two basins and the courtyard foundations are set into virgin soil which does not give a hint for any previous buildings in this area. Thus, according to the building technique and to the ceramic finds in the area, the courtyard was not made before the Late Roman period (4th–5th centuries AD).

Only at this time the building achieved the plan with courtyard that resembles a palaestra. But at this time, gymnaia no longer existed in Athens, as evidenced by the fact that the last references to paidotribes and kosmetes from Athens come from inscriptions dated to AD 263 or 267. After this date, the Athenian ephebeia seems to have disappeared and gymnaia were not mentioned anymore in the sources. According to this reconstruction, one has to conclude that this building was never a palaestra of a gymnasium.

### 3.2 The Tetragonos Peristylos

In my opinion, a better candidate for a palaestra may be the so-called Tetragonos Peristylos, which is located 220 m farther to the north-east, in the block of the Monasteriou, Eukleidou, Tripoleos and Platonos streets (Pl. 2 b). Remains of the northern, western and southern sides of this building survived. On the northern side, foundations with a length of 1.4 m were discovered: they are made of limestone and large conglomerate blocks (1.3–1.5 × 0.8–0.9 m), and belong to a portico. Foundations on the western side consist of identical conglomerate blocks, belong to the same building and can be followed for a length of 21.9 m (Fig. 7). A few limestone blocks follow the orientation of the western foundations: they lie about one meter away from these foundations and probably belong to the back wall of the western portico. From the findings so far, we can assume a peristyle courtyard, with, five columns on the northern side and seven on the western side.

On the southern side of the peristyle blocks continuously emerge at the surface of the ground: they are made of the same material and run perfectly parallel to the northern side. All foundations together encircle a central square courtyard with a size of 40 by 40 m. In the middle of the courtyard archaeologists made a huge trench; the absence of architectural finds here confirms that this was very likely a courtyard.

While the plan of the building is not debated among scholars, its function has never been defined more closely, and the monument still appears in literature under the generic name of Tetragonos Peristylos.
Only A. Papayannopoulos-Palaios interpreted this building as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium, but he did not provide any arguments, only general reflections on the peristyle plan. In my view, there are arguments for identifying the building as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium. This hypothesis may be confirmed by some features of the plan and two inscriptions found during excavations:

Regarding the plan, the main features of a palaestra are the square courtyard and rooms behind the porticoes. The courtyard seems to be fairly typical of palaestrae, and has parallels in several palaestrae of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods: the Lykeion in Athens, which was discovered and identified by Effie Lygouri in 1996 in the eastern suburb of the city, and the palaestrae at Amphipolis, Delphi, Eretria, Olympia and Priene. In respect of the second planimetric feature, the rooms behind the peristyle, previous scholars did not recognize these rooms, and they simply labelled the building square peristyle. In my view, rooms are quite plausible, as limestone foundations were brought to light during recent excavation work in the north-eastern corner six m away from northern portico (Fig. 8). In ascribing them to the building in question, it is quite significant that they are in axis with the peristyle’s northern side and date to the 4th century BC, as does the rest of the building.

---


65 Papayannopoulos-Palaios 1937.
66 Lygouri 1996, pl. 21b; Lygouri 2002.
69 Another room was built in the north-western corner of the building in Late Antiquity with blocks of conglomerate and limestone reused from a previous Hellenistic room (Chatzioti 1982, B1, 39–40, fig. 2). Another room (8.70 × 12.70 m) is recognizable in the north-western corner of the building; it has been identified as a loutron, albeit without providing any convincing evidence; Wacker 1996, 133; Trombetti 2013, 28–29. An alleged fountain is in reality a well with a Turkish pit; Chatzioti 1982, B1, 37–39 fig. 2. Furthermore, the room was built in Late Antiquity with...
The Tetragonos Peristylos is currently dated to the second half of the 4th century BC, with reference to the building technique, notably the combination of conglomerate and limestone blocks. This combination is commonly dated to the second half of the 4th century BC (e.g., north analemma of the theater of Dionysus; base of the monument of Lysikrates; proteichisma in the Kerameikos). However, this building technique was used from the first half of the 4th century BC onwards. An early example of this technique is provided by the base of Dexileos’ funerary monument in the Kerameikos, where the two materials are employed together (Fig. 9). As is known from the dedicatory inscription, the monument for Dexileos was erected in 394/393 BC, after the death of the young man in the battle of Corinth. Therefore, the Tetragonos Peristylos could also have been built in the early 4th century BC, and not necessarily in the second half.

The identification of the Tetragonos Peristylos as a palaestra and part of the gymnasium of the Academy is also supported by two inscriptions. The first is a 3rd century BC dedication to Hermes. It was found during early excavations by P. Aristophron in 1933, but never given due prominence. The inscription runs along the upper section of a rectangular marble stele (1.27 × 0.33 m): “Θηβαίος Λυσιάδου Ἀλοπεκήθεν Ἐρμήν φυλαρχήσας ἀνέθηκε” (Thebaios, Lysiades, son of the deme of Alopeke, dedicated (this) to Hermes having been φυλαρχος). In my opinion, this inscription is fundamental in identifying the building as a palaestra for two reasons: First, Thebaios was φυλαρχος, head of the young people of his phyle, who likely trained in the gymnasium of the Academy. Second, he dedicated the monument to Hermes. The god is particularly significant for the institution of the gymnasium, as he is the divinity most intimately associated with gymnasia, along with

blocks of conglomerate and limestone reused from Classical buildings in the vicinity, and therefore cannot belong to the 4th century BC edifice; for the chronology see Chatziantoni 1982, 39–41.

Aristophron 1933b, 71.

Herakles. As it is well-known, they are the two θεοὶ παλαιστρικοί.\(^{72}\)

The second inscription is a *stoichedon* decree for Demetrios Poliorcetes.\(^{73}\) He is honored for having freed the city of Athens and all the Greeks from the threat of the Macedonians between the years 307 and 304 BC. Among the honors is a bronze statue, which was destined to be placed in the agora, next to that of Democracy, and an altar for performing annual sacrifices to Demetrios, who was called Soter (ll. 14–17). As already noticed by Antonios Kerampoullos,\(^{74}\) this type of dedication was typically displayed in the most visible places in the city, such as the agora, the acropolis, the great shrines and even gymnasia, in order to inspire young people to perform worthy actions for the common good. In this respect, it is worth noting that about 70 decrees come from the excavation of the Tetragonos Peristylos. Unfortunately, they are not yet published, but they are currently being studied. Their presence indicates that the building was used for the exhibition of public documents.

### 4 Conclusion

A full revision of both the monuments allows for a new interpretation. As I have demonstrated, there are reasons for interpreting the Tetragonos Peristylos as the palaestra of the Academy. Regarding the building to the south-east, the so-called gymnasium, both its dating and interpretation need revision. Its plan differs significantly from that of typical palaestrae, and it presents several building phases, none of which resembles those of known palaestrae. The final plan, including the court-
yard which inspired the comparison to palaestra, dates to the Late Antique period. In the same phase two basins (fountains?) were created. I believe this enlargement should be associated with the Late Roman architectural remains on the two sides of the building (Pl. 2 c): large rooms of different dimensions on the western side, and a bath complex on the eastern side. These remains belonged most likely to the same large complex, because of their orientation and date.

If the building previously identified as the palaestra is another kind of building (maybe a residential domus), this allows us to argue that the Tetragonos Peristylos, the only other monumental building in the area, could be the palaestra of the Academy. It dates back to the 4th century BC, perhaps even to the beginning of the century, according to comparison of the building technique with that of Dexileos’ monument. If so, it could have been used by Plato, who in 387 BC made use of the facilities of the Academy gymnasium for his philosophical lessons.

Finally, the correspondence between the building phases and the sources on the history of the gymnasium of the Academy is relevant. The sources do not mention any activity at the gymnasium after the first century BC, and the Tetragonos Peristylos does not provide evidence of building activity beyond the Hellenistic era.

If this reconstruction is plausible, we would have another example of a 4th century BC palaestra, which matches the plan of safely identified contemporary palaestrae; if not, we will have at least reopened a discussion on two remarkable monuments of Athens that for their complexity and history deserve comprehensive attention.

75 Walter 1940, coll. 164–165.
Pl. 1  Athens, map of the north-west area.
Pl. 2  Athens, Academy, general map; a so-called gymnasium; b Tetragonos Peristylos.
Pl. 3. Athens, Academy, building phases of the so-called gymnasium: a phase 2; b phase 3; c phase 4; d phase 5-6; e phase 7.
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Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Heart of Athens: Change and Continuity

Summary

While the old gymnasia (Academy, Lyceum, Kynosarges) were situated outside the walls of Athens, two new gymnasia were built in the city’s heart soon after 229 BC: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. This paper discusses the history, architecture and function of these two gymnasia, reviewing both literary and epigraphic evidence and the archaeological remains in the area of their probable location. These complexes had a remarkable urbanistic impact, introducing a touch of modernity into the chaotic and old-fashioned centre of the town. While their exact location is still debated, they established a firm topographical and ideological connection with the older city-centre (‘Old Agora’) and served the headquarters of ephebic training and education throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods.
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The aim of this paper is to focus on ancient Athens, namely on one or possibly two gymnasia belonging to the Hellenistic period: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. Built most likely in the third century BC, they survived until the second half of the third century AD. At the present state of research, it is not possible to obtain a concrete view of their physical appearance because – at least in this writer’s opinion – they have not yet been found nor securely identified. Nonetheless, the available documentary sources testify the relevance they had in the life of the polis. Thus the history of both complexes can serve as a useful case-study to explore the connections between the buildings, the polis identity and the shaping of the urban spaces through time.

Old evidence can now be re-examined taking into account the enhanced knowledge of the archaeology of the city. Recent explorations by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens in the area north of the Acropolis, where the gymnasia are likely to have been, have provided new data; a review of the archaeological evidence, deriving both from systematic excavations in the key monumental sites and from the rescue-activities carried out in the modern city centre, can contribute when taking a fresh look at the urban history and to focus on some specific points related to the gymnasia under examination (Pl. 1).¹

1 Gymnasia in the urban history of Athens: an outline

As is well known, the gymnasion (as an institution as well as a facility) played a key role in defining the identity of the polis. The study of gymnasia is therefore essential for understanding urban development and exploring the dynamics of change and continuity in the history of a city, both as a space and as a society which produce the city’s monumental image.

Throughout the centuries, Athens had many gymnasia. Three dated to the Archaic age: the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Kynosarges, all located outside the city walls in the proasteion (the liminal ‘belt’ of the asty), respectively to the north-west, to the east and to the south-east.² These were the traditional and most renowned gymnasia of the polis, each provided with a distinct ‘personality’ and with local cults and legends. They were deeply-rooted in the religious, military and civic life and served as centres for educating young citizens.

The Academy, sacred to the hero Hekademos, housed the olive-trees of Athena; it was associated then with the poliadic goddess and with other gods, such as Hephaistos. At some major civic festivals magnificent torch-races began there and continued along the wide procesional route that linked the Academy with the Kerameikos and the Acropolis. Close to the Kolonos Hippios and frequented by the Athenian cavalry, the Academy was the most ‘aristocratic’ among the Athenian gymnasia, embodying and bolstering the values of the archais paideusis (the traditional education), focused upon athletic training and music.³ Coherently it was the ideological term of the Demesion Sema, the state cemetery for the war dead, who were rated as heroes and ideal citizens.

The Lyceum originated from a precinct sacred to Apollo Lykeios, while the Kynosarges adjoined a sanctuary of Herakles. The former gymnasion was used by horsemen and hoplites for exercise and, like the Academy, was frequented by ephebes, as attested in Hellenistic inscriptions.⁴ The latter was associated with nothoi (those born from a foreign mother), but it was soon equated to the other main gymnasia.

Literary tradition connects distinguished Athenians with the foundation, the architectural refurbishment or simply the presence in one or the other gymnasion: the Peisistratids and Kimon with the Academy, Peisistratos, Pericles, and Lycurgus with the Lyceum, and Themistocles with the Kynosarges. Since the Archaic age, these gymnasia probably also served as aggregation points for political groups. From large open spaces with running tracks, places for wrestling, a water supply and

---

¹ For recent research activities by the Ephorate in the area to the north of the Acropolis: Tsoniotis 2007 [2014]; D. Sourlas 2007 [2014]; Tsoniotis 2006 [2014]; Tsoniotis 2012; D. Sourlas 2013; Tsoniotis 2013; Tsoniotis 2014; D. Sourlas 2014. For an overview of the archaeological data concerning the areas to the east and the north of the Acropolis, see Longo 2011; Di Cesare 2014, with references to the excavations reports.
³ Ar. Nah. vv. 961–1023.
⁴ Lynch 1972, 157, with a list of second century BC inscriptions.
groves, they developed into more elaborate facilities during the Archaic and Classical ages. Furthermore, from the fourth century BC they became the seats of concurrent philosophical schools.

In the Hellenistic age, two more gymnasia were added to the urban landscape and will be discussed in this paper: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. Unlike the old gymnasia of the polis, they were given a central position in the town, thus following a trend in Greek city planning of the fourth and third centuries BC. As will be examined below, this location was nonetheless of specific significance.

At least in the second century AD there were other gymnasia in Athens which Pausanias refers to: one, known as “of Hermes”, was posited along the road leading from the Dipylon Gate to the Agora; another, of uncertain position, was named after the emperor Hadrian.

In addition to these examples, there are epigraphic testimonia of more unidentified gymnasia. A fragmentary inscription of 325/324 BC, found in the Piraeus, which contains a decree in praise of the officials of the ephebeia and the ephebai, was to be published ev τῶι γυμνασίωι τῶι ἐφήβων. A boundary stone of a gymnasion (ὅρος [γυμνασίου]), dating to the third century BC, was found near the Odeion of Herodes Atticus, not far from the place where, according to recent studies, the Lycurgan Panathenaic Stadium would have been located. A second stone, with a similar text (ὅρος γυμνασίου) but of unspecified date, was found by K. Rhomaios at the south of the Acropolis, re-employed in a wall found between the Dipylon Gate to the Agora; another, of unspecified date, was found by K. Rhomaios at the south of the Acropolis, re-employed in a wall found between

2 Athens in the third century BC

Before trying to place the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion within the monumental palimpsest of the city, a glance at the archaeological plan of Athens, namely of the northern quarters, is required. Leaving out of consideration the Roman Market, the so-called Hadrian’s Library and some adjoining buildings of Hellenistic/Roman date, it is not difficult to obtain a view of what the Late Classical and Hellenistic city looked like. The many remnants of walls, floors and streets unearthed under the modern town give the idea of a maze of houses and streets, many of them related to the urban Gates. A large part of Athens to the north and east of the Acropolis was, in fact, residential: houses were attached to small sanctuaries, streets and other buildings, while outside the walls they were interspersed amongst cemeteries and workshops. Athens was a very old city and it differed radically from other Hellenistic centres which adopted different, more up-to-date, urbanistic principles. This was the forma Urbis Athenarum perceived by Heraclides Criticus (or Creticus), the third century BC author of a treatise On the Greek Cities: the city was dry and looked ugly with small and uncomfortable houses; streets were badly arranged because of their antiquity. A visitor would hardly believe that he had reached the famous Athens. But soon the writer re-qualifies the city, thanks to the grandeur of its monuments: the Parthenon, the theatre, the unfinished Olympieion, and its three charming gymnasia – γυμνασία τρία, Ἀκαδημία, Λύκειον, Κυνόσαργες – all surrounded by trees and lawns.

In Heraclides’ treatise there is no mention, however, of the one or two Hellenistic gymnasia of Ptolemy and of Diogenes, possibly because both were built some years later, and after the writer’s visit, or because they were too recent to deserve any mention. It may be argued that the

5 Von Hesberg 1995, 14–15; this was, however, not the rule, see the remarks of von den Hoff 2009, 232–253.
7 IG II 478, 30.
8 M. Levensohn and E. Levensohn 1947, 63 no. 2. The location of the Panathenaic Stadium: Kalligas 2009; contra, Körres 2011, 133, 135 n. 23.
9 Threpsiadis 1952, 65 n. 2. Sometimes the two stones are considered the same; Ma 2008, 14 n. 26.

10 As the one described in Pl. Lys. 203a–207a.
11 Ps.–Xen., Arth. Pol. 2.10, with Kyle 1987, 66–69, 144; Antipho, Fr. 66 Blass–Thalheim (palaistra of Sibyrtios); Pl. Chrm. 153a (p. of Taureus); Ps.–Plut., X orat. 837e (p. of Hippokrates); Lys. Fr. 75 Thalheim (anonymous p.); see Di Nicolo 2014.
12 Monaco 2013b; Monaco 2013b; Di Cesare 2014c, 721–725.
13 Heraclides Fr. 1 Pfister = 1 Arenz. As for the date, Arenz 2006 favours 271–267 BC, while Chaniotis 2008, 109 n. 24, argues for 229–220 BC.
newly built Hellenistic facilities had a great impact on the traditional urban landscape, introducing a touch of ‘modernity’ into the chaotic and antiquated center of the town. Public building activity had shaped, in the past, the physical image as well as the civic awareness of the Athenians; but, after the big era of Pericles and Lycurgus, no great buildings were added to the asty. Therefore, the two third century BC gymnasias opened a new building season, which was pursued in the following decades and century, by the gift of the Lakydeion garden to the Academy by Attalos I, the reshaping of the Agora between the second and third quarter of the second century BC (Middle Stoa, East Building, South Stoa II, Attalos Stoa, Metroon), the construction of the Stoa of Eumenes on the south slopes of the Acropolis (197–159 BC), of the portico(es) (around 160 BC) flanking the large street at the east of the Tower of the Winds, the new building stage of the Olympieion by Antiochus IV (175–163 BC) and the Ptolemaic foundation of the Serapeion.  

2.1 The Diogeneion

The Diogeneion is linked with a remarkable event in the Hellenistic history of Athens: the liberation from the last Macedonian garrison in 229 BC. In that year, the Athenians convinced the commander Diogenes, after paying him a large sum, to leave the Piraeus and Athens with his troops. Diogenes received Athenian citizenship, the front seat (proedria) in the theater and probably public maintenance (sitedia) in the Prytaneion; he took the title of Euergetes and the new annual festival of the Diogeneia was instituted, centred in the Diogeneion.

It is not clear who funded the construction – if it was the person honored by the Athenians or the Athenians themselves as a token of gratitude. What was the Diogeneion and what did it look like? The earliest epigraphic reference to it dates back to 170/166 BC. The Diogeneion was already an old structure at the time, since the ephebic decree records the repairs to its walled precinct (peribolos), which had fallen down. These repairs were made by the kosmetes Eudoxos and paid for at his own expense. It contained (or at least was) a temenos, as inscriptions record that the epheboi and the kosmetes were attending sacrifices at the Diogeneia in the temple. This temenos, therefore, was consecrated to the cult of the Euergetes and hence it contained at least one altar.

As is clear from the epigraphic evidence, from the Hellenistic age until the second half of the third century AD, the Diogeneion was one of the main centres of ephic activity; this is why the kosmetes paid for its partial rebuilding. A reference in Plutarch helps to better understand the functions of the place.

The author was well acquainted with the Diogeneion: he had probably been ephebos in Athens, studying under Ammonius, a Platonic philosopher and strategos. The dramatic date of the Quaestio convivialis under consideration is AD 70 and the relevant passage reads: “While in charge as hoplite general at Athens, Ammonius heard a demonstration (apodeixis) given in the Diogeneion by the ephebi who were studying literature, geometry, rhetoric and music; then he invited the successful teachers to dinner.”

Some other information is added by the officials in

15 Plut. Ant. 34.5–6; Paus. II.6.6.
18 IG II* 1211, 41: κατασκευής δὲ τοῦ περιβόλου τοῦ Διογενείου προ-
charge there, such as hypopaidotribes, the grammateus, the hypogrammateus, the didaskalos, the hegemon, the hoplomachos and the kestrophylax. A thyreros is also known: another official, ὁ ἐπὶ Διογένειοι, was probably a caretaker of the grounds and the building(s), stationed permanently at the Diogeneion.\textsuperscript{26} The kosmetes as the head of ephebic training was also a key figure there.\textsuperscript{27} Finally, a group called “those around the Diogeneion” (οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον) was at home in the gymnasium from the end of the second century AD.\textsuperscript{28}

Some scholars have pointed out that in not one of the extant sources the Diogeneion is expressly called a gymnasium; hence the possibility that it could have been just a heroon or a palaestra attached to a larger gymnasium, that of Ptolemy.\textsuperscript{29} Furthermore, as will be observed later, Plutarch and Pausanias, writing in the Imperial age, mention only one gymnasium in the centre of the city.

On the other hand, the literary and epigraphic testimonia so far taken into account, spanning from Hellenistic to Roman times, give the Diogeneion the status of a gymnasium in its functions.\textsuperscript{30} The ephebes there were given both an intellectual and athletic/(para)military instruction, as is clear from the presence of the specific staff.\textsuperscript{31} At the same time, the Diogeneion emerges from the sources as an easily distinguishable place which is never mentioned in association with the Ptolemaion. It is less likely, then, that it constituted just a part of the other gymnasium.

A palaistra used by ephebes, mentioned in an inscription, may perhaps be connected with the Diogeneion.\textsuperscript{32} The text refers to the erection of a kosmetes herm in that palaestra, and herms of the same kind, that is supporting portrait-heads of the officials of the ephebeia, were found in the Post-Herulian Wall near the church of Agios Dimitrios Katiphoris along with ephebic decrees mentioning the Diogeneion,\textsuperscript{33} with one of these texts expressly pointing out the Diogeneion as the place of display.\textsuperscript{34}

\section*{2.2 The Ptolemaion}

Writing at the end of the first century/beginning of the second century AD, Plutarch in the \textit{Life of Theseus} affirms that the hero’s bones lie buried “in the heart of the city, near the gymnasium of our days”, i.e. μὸς τῇ πόλει, περά τὸ νῦν γυμνασίου.\textsuperscript{35} He is referring to the Ptolemaion, since some decades later Pausanias established the same spatial relation between the gymnasium and Theseus’ sanctuary, the Theseion, said to be ‘near’ the former: πρὸς δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ (scil. of Ptolemy, mentioned just before) Θησαύρος ἐστὶν ίερον.\textsuperscript{36} In the same passage the writer supplies other short but invaluable information about topography (see \textit{infra}) and the historical circumstances of the construction: from the verb employed, κατασκευάζω, the gymnasium emerges as a gift to the polis by King Ptolemy (Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατα- σκευασμένου καλουμένῳ).\textsuperscript{37} Pausanias briefly refers to the sculptural adornment of the place: herms (suitable to the setting) and statues, viz. of a Ptolemy (probably as the founder of the gymnasium), of the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus and of Juba II of Mauretania (a friend of Augustus). The portrait-gallery included also historical persons on gilded shields.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{footnote1} The ‘officials’ mentioned above are listed in IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2221, 70–76, under the heading τοῖς ἐν Διογένει. For the ἐπὶ Διογένειου κατορθόλος compare IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2228, 39 (218/217 AD or later).
\bibitem{footnote2} Compare e.g., IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2018, 142; 2228, 41; 2239, 25. This caretaker appears in inscriptions dating back from the beginning of the second century AD.
\bibitem{footnote3} For his ἐπιμέλεια περὶ τὸ Διογένειον see IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3741, 9–10 (145/146 AD).
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\bibitem{footnote10} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1078, 41–42 (ca. AD 220).
\bibitem{footnote11} Plut. Thes. 16.4.
\bibitem{footnote12} Paus. I.17.2.
\bibitem{footnote13} Schaaf 1992, 73–74; 81–82; Kotsidu 2000, 69–70. According to Lauter 1986, 16, and Habicht 1982, 112–117, the gymnasium was, on the contrary, a gift of the Athenians to the King.
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This gymnasium has been assigned to different Ptolemies of the third and second centuries BC.\(^\text{39}\) Historical probability favors Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 BC) or Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 BC). The hitherto oldest epigraphic occurrence of the Ptolemaion is of 122/121 BC\(^\text{40}\) but, accepting a plausible restoration of a more ancient inscription, the gymnasium would date back at least to the third last decade of the third century BC.\(^\text{41}\) In 224/223 BC, under the rule of Ptolemy III, a new tribe was created, called Ptolemais, so that the Egyptian king became one of the eponymous heroes;\(^\text{42}\) a priesthood of Ptolemy and his wife Berenike II was established; a festival, the Ptolemaia, was added to the sacred calendar of the Athenians.\(^\text{43}\) The gymnasium is likely to belong to this very political climate and was strictly connected with both the honors received by the King and with his role as warrantor of the freedom of the polis in the years following independence from the Macedonians.

Like the Diogeneion, the Ptolemaion was a centre of the ephebeia and the seat of intellectual activity, provided with lecture halls and facilities for gymnastic training. Apollodoros reports that in the middle of the second century BC an unknown philosopher founded a school there among athletes intent on training;\(^\text{44}\) in 122/121 BC the ephebes are praised for having attended academic courses held by Zenodotus (a Stoic philosopher) at the Ptolemaion and at the Lyceum, as well as by other philosophers in the Lyceum and the Academy.\(^\text{45}\) Cicero could write to Brutus that he, along with Piso, was used to hearing Antiochus (the head of the Academy) lecturing in eo gymnasio, quod Ptolemaeum vocatur.\(^\text{46}\) Such a use of the place explains why statues of philosophers, like the one of Chrysippus, were erected there.\(^\text{47}\)

From 116/115 BC onwards, epigraphic sources attest the existence of a library, the contents of which increased with an annual donation of one hundred books by the ephetae when they graduated.\(^\text{48}\) The model was that of the great Hellenistic capitals, such as Alexandria and Pergamon: the gift of Ptolemy for the city willing to honor him had a cosmopolitan allure.\(^\text{49}\)

Other architectural features of this gymnasium gathered from the inscriptions are: a staos;\(^\text{50}\) a balbis and an exedra, if the ascription to the Ptolemaion of an inventory found in the Athenian Agora is correct. It also records statues of gods (Asclepios, Hygieia, Artemis, Hermes), the Mousai, personifications such as Komodia and mythological figures like the Centaurs and the Kouretes, all subjects at home in a gymnasium.\(^\text{51}\)

### 3 In search of the urban gymnasium

Pausanias describes the Gymnasium of Ptolemy after the agora, stating that the Gymnasium was not very far: ἐν δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῆς ἐγγορᾶς ἀπέχοντι οὐ πολύ.\(^\text{52}\) Since the writer repeatedly refers to the Athenian Agora as the Kerameikos, he seems to use the term agora to denote the...
marketplace of his time: the Roman Agora. Such an interpretation would better explain why the next topographical fixed point is the sanctuary of Theseus, which was near the gymnasium, as seen above. Pausanias’ description is seemingly structured as a clockwise ‘route’ from the Kerameikos to the Ilissos; after the Ptolemaion-Theseion pair, he mentions the Anakeion (the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi) and Aglauros’ sanctuary firmly located in the cave at the eastern slopes of the Acropolis. Therefore the Gymnasium of Ptolemy must be sought in the area encompassed by the Roman Agora and the Aglaurion.

In search of the Ptolemaion, some scholars have looked with good reason at the area eastwards of the Tower of the Winds (Pls. 2–3). S. G. Miller’s hypothesis is to consider modern Kyrristou Street, unusually straight in the modern Plaka, as a relic of the xystos: the portico covering the running-track should be recognized in the Hellenistic stoa behind the Tower of the Winds, flanking the so-called Agoranomion. The characteristic façade with a three arched marble lintel would have been an original part of the Gymnasium, which was later transformed (Figs. 1–2).

Although with a different reconstruction, E. Lippolis sets the Gymnasium in the same area: the huge building whose remains are still visible along Adrianou Street (Fig. 3), traditionally reconstructed as a basilical building and identified as the Pantheon or the Panhellenion, would not be Hadrianic in date, as is usually believed, and should be considered as the north wing of the Ptolemaion in a first century AD reshaping.

A different restitution of the archaeological evidence has been advanced by M. Korres. The so-called Agoranomion (or Sebastion) would simply be a formal entrance to a broad street flanked by two porticoes, the architectural members of which were re-employed for the late-antique restorations of the cella of the Parthenon and of the doric stoa of the Asklepieion. The street would then enter the Roman Market (Fig. 4).

A new scenario has been introduced by recent studies and investigations in the same area, conducted by

53 Vanderpool 1974. The term agora is used by Pausanias only one other time in I.17.1. For the description of the Kerameikos (i.e. ‘The Athenian Agora’ as excavated by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens): I.3–16.

54 The structure of Pausanias’ text: I.16, end of the description of the Kerameikos Agora; I.17.1, agora with the Altar of Eleos and other things; I.17.2 Gymnasium of Ptolemy and (I.17.2–6) Theseion; I.18.1, Anakeion; I.18.2, Aglaurion; I.18.3, Prytaneion; I.18.4, Serapeion; I.18.5, Temple of Eileithyia; I.18.6, sanctuary of Olympian Zeus.


56 Lippolis 1995, 47–51. For the building and the preceding architectural phases see Dontas 1969; D. Sourlas 2013, 155 n. 29; 160–161, 162 n. 50; Malacrino 2014a; Karvounis 2016, 141–142 (7; D2. 3, 10–12, 20); Di Cesare 2018.

57 Hoff 1994.

58 Korres 1994, 140–145; Korres 2009, 75 fig. 4. 1: 85–93. These same architectural members were previously assigned by Miller to a colonnaded courtyard: Miller 1995, 208–209, 232–233.
Manolis Korres and Dimitris Sourlas, which have revealed the existence of a marble propylon of Ionic order west of the Tower of Winds and probably antedating the latter.\textsuperscript{59} Further research will clarify whether this propylon corresponds to the entrance of a gymnasium which eventually incorporated the Tower of the Winds, or to some monumental layout whose purpose is still to be explained (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{60}

Some points may be stressed here. First, the general, coherent orientation of the structures does not mean that they are part of a single complex; instead, it is justified by the orography and the artificial terracing of the area at the lower northern slopes of the Acropolis. Such a terracing is recognizable from the east, where a massive retaining wall has been found in Tripodon Street, to the west, where a similar wall has recently been brought to light by the Ephoria in Dioskouron Street.\textsuperscript{61} Second, the structures found in the area belong to different

\textsuperscript{59} Korres 2009, 86–88, fig. 4. 11–13; D. Sourlas 2013, 160–162. The structure, Hellenistic in date, was previously interpreted as an exedra.

\textsuperscript{60} Korres 2009, fig. 4. 13: “πρόπυλον γυμνασίου (;)”, D. Sourlas 2013, 162 and n. 50; D. S. Sourlas 2015, 313; see also Saladino 2012, 176–178, for the attribution of the propylon to the Gymnasium of Ptolemy, reconstructed as a two–level complex including the Hellenistic stoa and [at a higher level] the so–called Agoranomion. The arched façade would date back to the Hellenistic period (for comparisons with a gymnasium in Delos and other Hellenistic examples see Saladino 2012, 176–178, n. 90–99).

\textsuperscript{61} Analemma in Tripodon Street: Di Cesare 2011; analemma in Dioskouron 5: Tsoniotis 2007 [2014].
Fig. 4  Reconstruction of the area to the east of the Roman Agora according to Korres 1994.

Fig. 5  The area to the east of the Roman Agora according to recent excavations; ΠΠΓ: former exedra, now interpreted as a propylon.
phases, dating at least from the second century BC to the second century AD. The long stoas flanking the street to the east of the so-called Agoranomion (the foundations of one survive), for instance, may be explained as an Attalid gift, while the huge Hadrianic building, instead of being a remodeling of an existing complex, is likely to have been an entirely new structure which overlaid late Hellenistic and proto-imperial structures.

When trying to identify the archaeological evidence of the area from the Roman Agora to the Aglaurion (and surroundings) with the help of the literary sources, it should be recalled that Pausanias used selective criteria and did not describe the entire architectural heritage visible in his days, nor is the archaeological record complete. Thus it is not easy to make two different and incomplete series of literary and archaeological data coincide. Without independent proof for the identification (inscriptions or artefacts implying the function of a space or a building), it is not possible to label all the archaeological remains in the modern Plaka.

There is little doubt, however, that the general area for the search of the Ptolemaion is that between the Roman Market and the Aglaurion. Through terracing, in fact, the entire district at the bottom of the Acropolis would be suitable for building. Arrangements on multiple levels are best detectable in the columned street, which runs higher than the level ground of the first floor of the Hellenistic stoa and of the Tower of the Winds.

Apart from monumental architecture, most of the northern quarters inside the walls, pertaining to the demes of Kydathenaion and Skambonidai, were taken up by houses. The large quarter west of the second century BC Tower of the Winds was a market area, with houses, shops, streets and free open space: an extension of the Agora proper, whose functions were later inherited by the Roman Market.

Without attempting to suggest a hypothetical location for the Ptolemaion, it will suffice to identify the urban space in which it was situated, and that is somewhere to the east of the Roman Agora (Pl. 1). The spot close to the foot of the Acropolis cannot be entirely ruled out either, in keeping with both the route of Pausanias and the terracing that has been attested, from at least the Classical age, for the Acropolis slopes.

Turning to the Diogeneion, it is necessary to deal with the inner Late Antique teichos, the so-called Post-Herulian Wall, a long section of which was dismantled in 1861 near the already demolished church of Ag. Dimitrios Katiphoris. The wall was built from second-hand material, which was architectural as well as epigraphical and sculptural. Inscribed blocks and herm shafts were used in the two faces of the wall, while many portrait-heads, removed from their shaft, were used to fill the interior (Fig. 6).

The majority of the notable finds consisted of ephritic catalogues, honorary decrees and other epigraphic material pertaining to the ephebia; the herms ranged from the Julio-Claudian period to AD 260 and, aside from a few epheses, supported portraits of the kosmetai and other officials (antikosmetai, sophronistai, paidotribai). As stated above, many documents mentioned the Diogeneion; some mentioned the Ptolemaion, and others the Theseion. Originally exposed in the temenos of the hero, catalogues of winners at the Theseia were in fact found in the wall.

P. Graindor observed that both gymnasia and the Theseion should not be sought very far by the findspot of the inscriptions. The second-hand materials were in fact

---

62 According to recent research, Kienast 2014, the Tower (which had exterior sun-dials) was internally a sort of planetarium viz. a model of the firmament.

63 See for instance Travlos 1971, 577 fig. 722, no. T-V; Heczner 2006, 15 fig. 13. Terracing walls are recorded by 18th century scholars in the area near the Church of Ag. Anargyroi, and others are still visible today in the surroundings of Ag. Nikolaos Rangavas; Lippolis 1995, 55–56; Longo 2011, 519–523.


65 Ptolemaion: IG II² 1041, 123; 1043, 50; Theseion: IG II² 936, 16; 957, 11; 958, 14.
built in the lower courses of the wall as they were used first, and before the builders could draw material elsewhere. Contrasting this view, G. Guidi stated that the source of all the ephebic material was the Agora, where many ephebic inscriptions were also found, connected in part with the same late fortification circuit near the Church of Panagia Pyrgiotissa, built into a tower of the wall.66

What is undeniable is the massive number of ephebic inscriptions and portraits from the lower courses of the wall near Agios Dimitrios; they are also consistent in chronology, ranging from the first century BC to the third century AD (Fig. 7). What were the consequences of the Herulian sack of AD 267 on the city? According to common belief, the materials removed from the destroyed gymnasia were built into the wall soon after; recent studies try to postpone the construction of the wall, dating it to the sixth century AD if not later.67 If so, the ephebic epigraphic corpus, which seems to end in the last quarter of the third century AD, would have been left lying around somewhere for a very long time before being re-used. The association of the ephebic material from Ptolemaion, Diogeneion and Theseion is a reasonable argument to locate the Diogeneion not far away from Agios Dimitrios and also the old city centre, in which the ephebes had been at home for some centuries. It is not possible to ascertain if the Diogeneion adjoined the Ptolemaion, or if it was in the environs; a location outside the Post-Herulian Wall, not far from the Eridanos River, could also well suit a gymnasium.

The search for the Diogeneion in the proximity of Agios Dimitrios has not given results: A. Koumanoudis, after dismantling the Post-Herulian Wall, extended the excavation but could not find anything relevant; P. Pervanoglou, some years later, wrote of ancient columns in a nearby house.68 Recent archaeological investigations in the site of Agios Dimitrios by the University of Athens has exposed the ruins of a building made of re-employed blocks, perhaps of Roman date.69

4 Conclusion: the historical and urbanistic meaning of the new Hellenistic gymnasia

The three old Athenian gymnasia embodied the ideology and the values of the archaic and classical polis, when the gymnasium culture was rooted in the firm con-
connection between soldier and good citizen.

The new Hellenistic gymnasia reflected a different image of the city. They were embedded in the political situation following the liberation from Macedonian rule in 229 BC and with the guarantee of enduring freedom by the Egyptian King Ptolemy III Euergetes. The ancient heroes and gods were replaced by political authorities: a strict link was established between gymnasium and **Herrscherkult**, enhanced by the central location of the complexes.

The building of the new gymnasia in the *asty*, rather than on the outskirts of the city, bore a great impact on a symbolic and practical level. As can be observed in the case of the Roman Market and of the Library of Hadrian, construction would have required the expropriation of private houses followed by demolition and levelling operations.

Even though a convincing, albeit approximate, location can be advocated only for the Ptolemaion, the Diogeneion should not be sought very far. Both complexes were intentionally linked to the civic and sacral core of the archaic city in the deme Kydathenaion, the so-called Old Agora of Athens, which housed the ancient headquarters of the archons, the sacred heart of the polis (the Prytaneion), as well as the *temenos* of the hero-founder of the Athenian institutions. The Theseion and the nearby Anakeion (the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi) were large open spaces appropriate for summoning hoplites (i.e. the *laos* of the Archaic city) and horsemen. For centuries, all this area at the feet of the Aglaurion had martial associations, and even when the agora was moved to the Ceramicus, perhaps at the end of the sixth century BC, it persisted as one of the main representative nuclei of the polis.

The same urban spaces were traditionally associated with the *ephebeia*. Theseus was the archetype of the young men training in order to become citizens: the ephebes swore at the Aglaurion, while in the adjoining theatre they received a shield and a spear from the city and took part in a military parade. Accordingly, the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion were archaistically connected with the glorious past of the city and its monumental and urbanistic cornerstones. That is clear for the Ptolemaion, in close proximity to the Theseion and the ‘Old Agora.’

By the end of the fourth century BC ephebate was no longer compulsory, and its prime military nature evolved mostly into physical training, general learning and religious duties. Hellenistic inscriptions feature the ephebes regularly frequenting the gymnasia of the polis and involved in processions, sacrifices, torch-races and participating in other contests during various Athenian festivals, including the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, the Theseia and the Epitaphia. Rising when the *ephebeia* had become an aristocratic ‘club’ and the old polis a nostalgic memory, the new gymnasia re-enacted, if only symbolically, the cardinal values of the ancient polis such as the *eleutheria* and the defense of the Attic borders, developing into athletic, philosophical and literary schools, which contributed to the urbanistic renovation as well as at the transformation of Athens into a glamorous university.

---

70 Di Cesare 2015a, 166–168; Di Cesare 2015b, 77–95.
71 As advocated by *the horoi* (IG I 1 1087–1089), dating to ca. 510–500 BC.
72 Pélékidis 1962, 211–236; Mikalson 1998, 242–249, 292–293; Burkhardt 2004, 200–202; Chaniotis 2005, 47–55, 237–240; Kyle 2015, 234–236. For ephebes in “the gymnasia” of the city see e.g. SEG 26, 98.14 (late third century BC); IG II 1006, 16, 60, 75 (122/121 BC); 1028.12, 34 (100/99 BC); 1043.43 (38/37 BC).
General plan of ancient Athens: the central area, with the main evidence discussed in the text:

1. The Athenian Agora (Pausanias’s Kerameikos);
2. Section of the Post-Herulian Wall in the Agora and Church of Pyrgiotissa;
3. Hellenistic houses and shops under the Roman Agora and Hadrian’s Library;
4. Library of Hadrian;
5. Roman Agora (Pausanias’s agora of L 17.1–2);
6. Tower of the Winds;
7. Hellenistic Stoa;
8. Arched façade and columned street (so-called Agoranomion);
9. Site of the terracing wall recently discovered in Dioskouron Street;
10. Hadrianic building above Hellenistic and Early Roman structures along Adrianou Street;
11. Post-Herulian wall: section dismantled in 1861;
12. Location of the demolished church of Agios Dimitrios Katiphoris;
13. Church of Ag. Anargyroi and site of ancient terracing walls;
14. Church of Ag. Nikolaos Rangavas and nearby terracing walls;
15. Retaining wall of Late Classical/Hellenistic Age in Tripodon Street;
16. Cave of Aglauros;
17. Ancient Tripodes Street;
18. Olympieion.

Highlighted areas in the circles: OA. Supposed site of the so-called Old Agora (with the Prytaneion, the Theseion, and the Anakeion); PT. Supposed area in which the Ptolemaion was located; D. Supposed site of the Diogeneion.
Different proposals for the sites of the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion: D – Diogeneion; GoP – Gymnasion of Ptolemy; P – Pantheon; RA – Roman Agora. 1 Travlos 1971; 2 DNP s.v. Athenai. II. Topographie (H. R. Goette) (OA: approximate site of the Ptolemaion, the Theseion and the Old Agora).
Pl. 3 Different proposals for the sites of the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion: D – Diogeneion; GoP – Gymnasion of Ptolemy; LoH – Library of Hadrian; P – Pantheon; RA – Roman Agora; T – Theseion. 1 Hoepfner 2006; 2 Lippolis 2006; 3 Miller 2005.
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Trombettì 2013

Summary

While the honorary practice in gymnasia has received significant attention in literature, posthumous honors and depictions of youths have not yet been studied comprehensively. The aim of this paper is to discuss this phenomenon. After a brief overview of the known repertoire of sculptural decoration in gymnasia, epigraphic evidence of posthumous honors for youths, who had trained in the gymnasia and died prematurely, is discussed. Focus is then on the identification of sculptures that, according to their context and iconography, may have served as posthumous depictions of youths, among them e.g. the statue of Kleoneikos from Eretria. It is argued that three different iconographic types were available: the naked, ‘heroic’ type, the himatiophoros type, and the herm.

Keywords: gymnasium; portraits; honorary statues; herms; posthumous honors

I would like to express my warmest thanks to the Editors Dr. Ulrich Mania and Prof. Monika Trümper for their kind invitation. I am also most grateful for the discussions I had with Profs Theodosia Stephanidou-Tiveriou, Emmanuel Voutyras, Panagiotis Nigdelis and Ralf von den Hoff. I also owe a particular debt to Dr. Marianne Mathys for her help on a variety of issues and to Valerie Nunn, who provided the English translation of this paper.
Studying ancient sculptures as collected works integrated into architectural structures with a particular function is one of the objectives of recent research in the field of ancient Greek and Roman sculpture. Achieving an understanding of the purposes for which statues were erected in Hellenistic gymnasia has been one of the most recent results of this research. Like any other civic or sacred public space in ancient Greece, gymnasia were packed with works of sculpture, which had specific purposes, closely linked with the function of the gymnasium and its various educational and cultural objectives. In the following, I will refer especially to statues erected in gymnasia after the death of the depicted person, and more specifically to statues of youths who had still been training in the gymnasium when they died prematurely. In order to understand the context in which these statues were set up, I will start with some introductory remarks about the sort of sculptures that were erected in gymnasia in general.

1 Sculptural decoration of gymnasia

From Archaic times onwards, statues of Hermes and Herakles were erected in gymnasia as cult statues and dedications. Later other gods and heroes, who embodied the ideals of youth in their myths, were added. The adjectives ἀγώνιος or ἐναγώνιος, δρόμος, παλαιστήριος, ἐπιτέρμως, τύχων, ἐπινίκιος, λόγας reflect the cultural content that the worship of the gods acquired in the context of the educational role of gymnasia. In sculpture the above mentioned characteristics acquire visual substance through the use of specific iconographic types and motifs. The beardless, naked representation of a youth with prominent depiction of the musculature and cauliflower ears is characteristic of the sculptural types of the Hermes/Herakles Enagonios, e.g. the Hermes of Kyrene, the Richelieu Hermes and the Landsdowne Herakles types, and is associated with the ideals of athleticism and physical combat.

However, it was chiefly herms that were used for religious purposes in gymnasia. Scenes depicted in Attic vase painting show cult practices involving herms, flanked by youths holding strigils, and by aryballoi as symbols of the palaestra, depicted in the background. Herms with a bearded or beardless Hermes and/or of Herakles were dedicated in gymnasia by gymnasiarchs at the end of their period of office and by the youths of the gymnasia. The latter set up herms as individuals or collectively, as a thank offering to the gods and as a reminder of some victory in the gymnastic contests, on the celebration of the Hermaia (or other festivals) that were generally celebrated at the end of the gymnasia year.

Moreover, from the third century BCE onwards, portrait statues of rulers, leitourgoi and/or other officials of the gymnasia and other benefactors, who were honored in life or after death for their various acts of generosity to these institutions, were set up in the gymnasia. As a special honor, rulers or benefactors could be equated with Hermes or Herakles. Imagery on the coinage and in the minor arts depicting rulers with the symbols of Hermes or Herakles may represent their statues in divine form set up in gymnasia, which functioned

1 Sculptures from Hellenistic gymnasia and their uses was the subject of my Ph.D. thesis. The thesis was completed under the supervision of Prof. Theodoria Stephanidou-Fiveriou, was submitted to the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki in 2011 and published in 2015; Kazakidi 2015. Earlier literature on the same subject includes Delorme 1960, 362–373; von Heberg 1993; von den Hoff 2004; Martini 2004; Trombetti 2013, 165–169; Mathys 2016.
2 Roscher 1965, 2167–2169; Scherer 1912; Siska 1931, 26; Wrede 1986, 17.
3 Inan 1975, 19 no. 3 pl. X. 1–2; Kazakidi 2015, 74.
4 Maderna 1988, 82–84, with literature.
5 For the Landsdowne Herakles type see mainly Kansteiner 2000, 3–24. I assume that the prototype of the Landsdowne type depicted Herakles in his capacity as enagonios, regardless of where it was sited (on the debate over its location see Kazakidi 2015, 82–83). This is evident from the cauliflower ears, regarded as a feature of the prototype, as well as from the fact that the head of the Landsdowne type was extensively reproduced in the form of the herm; see Kazakidi 2015, 82–83. Despite the fact that we do not know whether any of the respective prototypes was intended to be set up in a gymnasium of the classical period, we assume that classical creations, which incarnated the young, athletic nature of Hermes and Herakles, most probably inspired Hellenistic sculptors who worked on assignments for the gymnasia, regardless of where their prototypes had been erected. In reality though, the way that gods were represented in the Hellenistic gymnasia can be deduced with certainty only in a very few cases thanks to evidence from documentary sources or due to the survival of the works themselves, Kazakidi 2015, 76–79, 82–86; von den Hoff in this volume.
8 See recently Kazakidi 2015, 132–141 (with earlier literature).
9 For examples see Gauthier 1985, sporadically; Gauthier 2005 and recently Kazakidi 2015, 141–153, with earlier literature; see also Pantelis Nigdelis and Nikoleta Vouronikou: “Early Evidence of the Imperial Cult from the Gymnasium of Amphipolis.” Nikephoros (forthcoming). – Teachers (πανδικτοι) are more seldom honoured, Chaniotis 2014, 273 n. 88.
10 Kazakidi 2015, 149–150.
as counterparts of the statues of the gods of the palaestra. Yet rulers also flaunted their power and prestige in other ways, as is attested by the fragments of the group of colossal marble statues from the gymnasium in Pergamon, where the Attalid kings were depicted in armor.

It is well known that, in the Late Hellenistic period, the gymnasium became one of the most important places for honoring – whether in life or after death – the benefactors of a city. These honorific statues were for the most part made of bronze. Their symbolism peaks when these statues are associated with religious practices, in other words in cases where the honorand was deified or heroized. These honorific statues were mainly commissioned by various groups of youths and others involved in the gymnasium or – more often from the late first century BCE onwards – by the city through its collective bodies.

There is also evidence of statues of athletes who had brought glory to their home cities with enviable victories in the Panhellenic games and who were then turned into ideal models of youth and vigor through their statues.

Among the statues of gods and mythical heroes, Panhellenic victors and officials, benefactors and rulers, statues of young men too were erected in gymnasium because of their premature deaths. Since there has hitherto been no special study of this kind of posthumous honor-statues, whose presence in the gymnasium is attested in the written sources, the aim of this paper is to specifically focus on these sculptures. The relevant textual references come from the Late Hellenistic period; and there are not many of them. Yet they are of interest not only because we can use them as comparand in our attempts to understand the content and the function of certain statues found in the gymnasium, but also because they are beautiful examples of the perceptions and beliefs of the ancients with regard to youth and death. I shall refer to three of them by way of example.

2 Posthumous honors of youths – written evidence

The most complete text of this kind is the inscribed decree from Aegiale on Amorgos of the end of the second century BCE, well known in the literature, in respect of the heroization of Aleximachos, son of Kritolaos – undoubtedly a young man of the gymnasium. This decree gives details of the activities (sacrifice, a sacrificial meal and games) that would take place after his death over two days in the city’s gymnasium and that were to be repeated every year. Aleximachos’s statue would have been set up as part of the heroization process.

Around the same time, at the end of the second century BCE in Chios, the demos voted to erect in the gymnasium statues of the sons of the Roman benefactor Lu-cius Nassius, who – we are told – died young.

Over a century later, in the early Imperial period the ephesbes of Sparta set up an image of one of their number, Damokrates, in each of the two palaestrae where they exercised. In the verses that have come down to us, Damokrates is described as being “like another Hermes” (or “like a young Hermes”) – thus we are most probably dealing with a posthumous image of an adolescent.

The erection of the statues must have been part of posthumous honors awarded to these young men, as the Aegiale decree attests. The awarding of posthumous honors to young men, which involved the public performance of blood sacrifices and gymnastic contests, is also attested in relation to gymnasium, e.g. on Kos and on Amorgos.

We do not know for sure in what circumstances it was decided to award public honors to a youth who had died before or immediately after finishing his time in the gymnasium. Unfortunately, we have no information on how the young men thus honored died; if, for example, they died heroically in battle. The sources refer

12 Von den Hoff 2004; Gans 2006, 101 cat. no. 37, pl. 15; 1; Laube 2006, 80; von den Hoff and Petersen 2011, 76 cat. no. 3 (E. Seitz); Kazakidi 2015, 133–135; von den Hoff, in this volume.
14 Kazakidi 2015, 153–161; Mathys 2016. Another category of statues is that of the intellectual. Apart from the statues of philosophers in Athenian gymnasium, in association with which the famous philosophical schools operated, statues of poets and historiographers are attested in gymnasium in other cities, even if we have very little information on this, Kazakidi 2015, 172–186.
19 IG XII, 7, 447; Delorme 1960, 209; SEG XLVI, 1179; Sieve 1996; Chankowski 2010, 466 cat. no. 97; Maranzou and Papazarkadas 2013, 192; Kazakidi 2015, 286 cat. no. 46.E1. For the interpretation of the Heroon of Calydona as a palaestra see recently Charatzopoulos 2006.
only to the virtue and discipline that characterized these teenagers in their lifetimes. Over and above their premature death, putting up the necessary money would have been a basic requirement for the creation of the statues dedicated to them, as would founding the funerary rituals, including the setting up of the statue.

The sponsors in the cases mentioned above were relatives or friends of the deceased. On Amorgos, Kritolaos gave 2000 drachmas to the demos, from the interest on which the costly celebrations of his son’s heroization would be paid. Probably something similar happened with the wealthy Roman Lucius Nassius and the statues of his prematurely deceased sons. For Damokrates of Sparta, his fellow ephebes paid.

The ceremonies for awarding posthumous honors to youths in the gymnasium must have been associated with the long-established tradition of burying heroes, and periodically awarding them honors in the gymnasium. As is well known, from the late Hellenistic period onwards, not only benefactors but also their descendants were buried in gymnasias as a way of honoring them.

Like the hononofric statues of benefactors, it seems that the statues of these young men were set up in rooms with some official function and in conspicuous places in the gymnasium: those of the sons of Nassius were in the ἀκροατήριον of the Chios gymnasium, a spot that their father, the benefactor, would have chosen himself; Aleximachos’ statue probably stood at the entrance to the triclinium of the Aegiale gymnasium, as can be inferred from the inscription. The statue had to be placed in an atrium, because of the altar in front of it, which was used for carrying out blood sacrifices.

When youths were honored with burials within the gymnasium, it is reasonable to assume that monumental tombs (ἄγαλμα) were erected. Tombs of this kind honoring local benefactors have been identified, for instance, in the gymnasium of Messene and Nikopolis.

However, the erection of a statue of a youth within the gymnasium is not necessarily an indication of his public burial there: for example, the burial of Aleximachos is not recorded in his decree. Moreover, statues of deceased youths had been erected by their relatives or friends in public places unrelated to the location of their tombs from as early as the fourth century BCE onwards, as the sources reveal.

The decree relating to Aleximachos also sheds light on a more specific function assumed by these statues in the gymnasium: during the annual ceremonies in honor of Aleximachos a ram was slaughtered and then set in front of the statue of the deceased. At the end of the gymnastic contests, with which the festivities were brought to an end, “Aleximachos” was crowned as the symbolic winner of the pankration. (100–103 ... ὁτι στείφοντοσιν φίλιαι [η]υιος [τ]οῦ [ἀ]λεξίμαχου [κριτολαος] τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀλεξιμάχου καὶ παραθέτωσαν παράθεσιν ἐκ ἁμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κριὸν ὡς βέλτιστον πρὸς τῷ ἀγάλματι ὧι στήσῃ... Κριτόλαος τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀλεξιμάχου καὶ παραθέτωσαν παράθεσιν ἐκ ἁμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κριὸν ὡς βέλτιστον πρὸς τῷ ἀγάλματι ὧι στήσῃ...

3 Posthumous statues of youths – archaeological evidence

So how were these dead youths depicted in the gymnasium? As is well known, when it comes to honorific statutory, the character and deeds worthy of note of the honoree, which would be recorded in the lines of verse written on the pedestal of the statue and above all in the honorific decree inscribed close by, were indicative of the iconographic type that would be chosen to depict this person, who might be shown with further attributes or symbols.

In the decrees from Amorgos and Chios there is no hint of the iconography of the statues that were to be erected. The fact that the term ἄγαλμα (statue) was used in both decrees probably points to statues in marble.
Though we do not know what the images of the heroized Aleximachos and the sons of Lucius looked like, we may be able to identify similar content in some other marble statues found in other gymnasia.

A statue of Kleoneikos, son of Lysander, was erected in the gymnasium in Eretria in the late first century BCE by his friend Amphikrates, son of (most probably another) Lysander (Fig. 1).\(^{30}\) The statue and its base were found at the end of the 19th century at the northern side of the western palaestra, which was most likely the most important place of the gymnasium.\(^ {31}\) The inscription says nothing about the identity of the honorand. However, according to Stefan Lehmann’s interpretation of the relief scene on the base, it was a youth who trained in the palaestra, shown with his training gloves.\(^ {32}\) Klaus Fittschen had previously proposed another interpretation of the work based on the use of marble and its iconography: he suggested that it was a young man who had fallen on the battlefield.\(^ {33}\) But this has been challenged recently by Elena Mango, who argues that, since the work was set up in an urban context, it could not have been a funerary monument. She interpreted it as a live “gebildeter Palaistrit”, who had been honored by a friend for some victory in athletics or more generally for his exceptional achievements in the gymnasium.\(^ {34}\) Nevertheless, erecting a statue to a live palaistrites in a gymnasium in honor of his achievements has no parallels in the written sources. According to written sources, statues of athletes were erected in gymasia in the Hellenistic period only for winners in Panhellenic Games.\(^ {35}\) Yet Kleoneikos was certainly not a Panhellenic champion, because in this case, his victory would have been commemorated in the inscription on the plinth and the iconography of the work would most likely have been different. However, he cannot have been an official or a benefactor either, as in such cases the individual’s rank is usually mentioned in the votive inscription that accompanies the work.\(^ {36}\) Moreover, the type of gloves depicted on the statue’s plinth, which were, according to Lehmann’s research, used only in training, points to a young man. The idea that someone had set up this marble statue in a private capacity might be easier to explain in the context of the tradition of awarding posthumous honors in gymasia, as described above based on the evidence of the roughly contemporary decrees relating to the sons of Nassius on Chios and young Aleximachos on Amorgos.

Moreover, it should be noted here that the head of Kleoneikos presents an interesting technical detail, which has not been mentioned in the literature. The statue must have been crowned at regular intervals with a wreath. This is attested by an inconspicuous indentation on the back of the head, at the nape of the neck that extends to just behind the ear (Fig. 2).\(^ {37}\) There is evidence of wreaths being put on statues of the living, at least in exceptional cases. However, there are perhaps some discreet iconographical hints that this is a statue of someone who has died, possibly someone who has been elevated to the status of a hero; these hints include, as already recognized by Klaus Fittschen, the naked feet and the idealized face,\(^ {38}\) but also the hairstyle modelled on that of the Richelieu Hermes. Consequently, maybe we can posit that Kleoneikos was celebrated in rituals like those attested for the heroization of Aleximachos.

If the statue of Kleoneikos was indeed used like the statue of Aleximachos, in front of which sacrifices took place,\(^ {39}\) then we can also assume that the former was originally placed in the north stoa or rather in front of it.\(^ {40}\) Since the overall height of the statue including its

---

30 Athens, National Archeological Museum inv. nos. 244, D305, 1924; IG XII, 9, 281; Fittschen 1995, 98–128; SEG XLIV, 1219; Mango 2001; Lehmann 2001; Mango 2003, 159 cat. no. 56; Kazakidi 2015, 251–252 cat. no. 32:EnT4 with n. 1477 for a date at the end of the first century BCE.
31 Mango 2001, 280 fig. 40.3; Mango 2003, 159 cat. no. 56 who argue that the statue was set up in room F; Ackermann – Reber, in this volume. For the north side as the most prominent place of the gymnasium, see Kazakidi 2015, 197–198.
33 Fittschen 1995.
37 Detailed argumentation in Kazakidi 2015, 171 pl. 14. Many late Hellenistic heads present analogous technical details; for examples see recently Mathys 2016, fig. 4; Kazakidi 2018, 294 fig. 2, 295. The provision that some statues should be crowned at regular intervals is attested in honorary decrees already since the fourth century BCE, see for example IG XII, 4.1, 348 l. 20–23; cf. Günther 2003. The crowning of statues is also the subject of a Ph.D. thesis by Elena Gomez under the supervision of Prof. Ralf von den Hoff.
38 Fittschen 1995, 98.
39 IG XII, 7, 515 l. 74–78.
40 A possible location could be one of the plinths that were found in front of rooms E and F; cf. the plan of Ackermann and Reber in this volume, fig. 1. In gymasia, most dedications should have been set up in the peri-style of the palaestra; see ID 1417, Al. l. 118–154. Especially honorary statues were presented πάντα ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τόμῳ of gymasia, notably in the north side of the palaestra; for examples see Kazakidi 2015, 189–190.
Fig. 1 Statue of Kleoneikos, from the gymnasium of Eretria; Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. no. 244.
base is about 3 m, a ladder, either portable or fixed, must have been used for the crowning. As comparison, one may cite the built ensemble of statue base, altar, and staircase that was found in situ in the Samnite palaestra of Pompeii and must have served for some kind of honorific or even cultic ceremony.  

The idealized head of Kleoneikos’ statue is combined with the civic-style himation. As is well known, this form of dress and the way it is worn creates a picture that reflects the prevailing view of what constituted the appropriate appearance of ephebes being educated in the gymnasium at the time. Other marble himatiophoroi were also set up in gymnasia to honor the dead, of course not only young men, but also, and probably even mainly, benefactors of the gymnasium. The age of those depicted is often not easy to ascertain when epigraphic evidence is lacking. The finds from the mid-first-century CE gymnasium in Messene are revealing. In the empty space behind the stoa of the gymnasium monumental tombs were built in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial period, while chambers were created on the back wall of the stoa for funerary cult purposes, where statues of mortals posthumously elevated to the status of heroes were erected. In one of these chambers, soon after the middle of the first century CE, a heroized benefactor is depicted, like Kleoneikos, in the form of a himatiophoros (Fig. 3). Yet naked idealized types of statuary could easily be understood as embodying the heroized state of the deceased. From the room in which the himatiophoros of Messene was found comes another statue of a naked youth, which can also be dated to shortly after the mid-first-century CE (Fig. 4).

The individualized features and find spot of this statue suggest that we are dealing with a depiction of a deceased mortal in the form of a god. In the adjoining chamber the heroized Dionysios Aristomenos was depicted in a similar type, as is suggested by the evidence of an inscribed pedestal and few sculptural fragments.

It is well known that contemporary research is inclined to see posthumous portrait statues, i.e. heroized depictions of mortals, generally young ones, in statues of the late Hellenistic period that preserve more or less faithfully certain types of Hermes, even when they have survived without their heads. On the basis of this generalized premise, the suggestion has been made that the mid-first-century BCE headless statue from the gymnasium of Melos in the type of the Richelieu Hermes was also a depiction of some dead ephebe in divine form. There are other Late Hellenistic marble torsos and heads from gymnasia that imitate idealized models and probably depicted posthumous portraits, as their iconography suggests. These include a head from the gymnasium in Kos or another showing signs of annual crowning with a wreath from Pergamon, as well as the youth shown putting a wreath on his own head.

41 Avagliano – Montalbano in this volume; Henzel in this volume; Trümper in this volume. See also the staircase of the base from the Heroon of Palatiano, Stéphanidou-Tiveriou 2009, 378 fig. 2; 383 pl. 4-6.
42 Zanker 1995, 221; Hallett 1998, 82 n. 54.
44 Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8664: Themeles 2001, 14 pl. 5; Palagia 2000, 434-436 fig. 5; Kazakidi 2015, 238-239 cat. no. 21.74.
45 For the date and the statue type see Kazakidi 2015, 238–239 cat. no. 21.74.
46 Themeles 2001, 15 fig. 5, 4; Kazakidi 2015, 235 cat. no. 21.77; 240–241 cat. no. 21.79.
47 Maderna 1988, 225; Kazakidi 2015, 287 cat. no. 47.72.
48 Paris, Louvre inv. no. Ma 8520: Kabus-Preishofen 1989, 164, 286–287 cat. no. 83 (with further literature), pl. 73, 1–2; Hamiaux 1998, 63 cat. no. 68; Kazakidi 2015, 298 cat. no. 57.16.
Fig. 3 Statue of a himatophoros, from the gymnasium in Messene; Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8650.

Fig. 4 Statue of a naked youth, from the gymnasium in Messene; Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8664.
that comes from the same gymnasium.\textsuperscript{51} The sculptures mentioned above have been identified as athletes by certain scholars – independently of one another – on the basic grounds that they had been found in gymnasias.\textsuperscript{52} Yet we should make a distinction, in terms of their respective roles, between statues set up in order to honor an athlete for a glorious victory in the games and those that were set up on the occasion of the death of some honored person. However, when there is no inscription, this distinction is not easily made based on iconography alone. Nevertheless, we might venture to distinguish between certain works as regards their content simply because of their iconography. The powerful marble head of the boxer from the gymnasium at Olympia of roughly the mid-third century BCE\textsuperscript{53} is perhaps a good example of how we might imagine a dedication to a victorious professional athlete.\textsuperscript{54} By contrast, the sybaritic ephebe from the gymnasium in Kos, with his downcast gaze, probably depicted a dead youth.\textsuperscript{55}

While the late Hellenistic decrees for Aleximachos and the sons of Nassius refer to statues – i.e. they were sculptures in the round\textsuperscript{56} – the late first-century/early second-century CE verses for Damokrates were found carved on the torso of a now lost headless herm.\textsuperscript{57} We can only imagine a beardless head for the young Damokrates. Thus, this monument is evidence of a herm being connected with a portrait head of a beardless youth.

There is another mid-first century CE monument that may depict a dead youth in the form of a herm, notably on the relief of Doras from Perinthos, an unfortunate young palaistrites (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{58} A herm with a beardless head in the center of the scene is surrounded by the triumphal symbols of the palaestra and verses in which Doras introduces himself in the first person. Several facts suggest that this herm does not depict Hermes or Herakles but embodies the deceased himself: the prominent place the herm occupies in the composition; the content of the verses surrounding it, in which the deceased is compared with Herakles (l. 2: “... ἐξεύω Ἡρακλέους”, i.e. worthy of Herakles), and described as a hero himself (l. 13–14: “... ἤρωκον οὐδενὶ λειπόμενος”; i.e. who lacks nothing of the hero or who is in no way inferior to the heroes); and the fact that the figure of the dead youth is otherwise absent from the scene. In this case, the verses, written in the first person, are spoken by the herm itself, which depicts Doras, in other words the deceased, as a hero. The relief plaque must have been part of the revetment of a built monument, perhaps a heroon in a gymnasium.\textsuperscript{59}

Though they have been published for many years, the two above mentioned monuments have not hitherto been used in the debate over the interpretation of herms with beardless, youthful heads. Some of these heads, dating from the mid-second century BCE onwards, display individualized features and cauliflower ears. Generally speaking, they have survived without their inscribed pedestals. Consequently, this has presented scholars with a dilemma: are they busts of mortals – as, for example, Kazimierz Michalowski, Jean Marcadé and others have maintained\textsuperscript{60} – or of Hermes adopting the features of his worshippers, as Henning Wrede finally deduced in his study on herms, taking into account the corresponding suggestion by Paul Zanker about the depictions of herms in fifth-century BCE vase painting.\textsuperscript{61}

Examples of Hellenistic herms depicting young, beardless heads and preserving their inscriptions substantiate the identifications with Hermes, e.g. the well-known relief depiction of the himatiophoros herm of Hermes Typhon,\textsuperscript{62} as well as an intact mid-second-century BCE herm from the gymnasium of Tinos with a swollen right ear (i.e. the so-called ‘cauliflower’ ear of a pugilist), only recently documented in literature.\textsuperscript{63} But

\textsuperscript{51} Izmir, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 571; von den Hoff 2004, 385 n. 87 fig. 6; Gans 2006, 124 cat. no. 39; Kazakidi 2015, 311 cat. no. 60.Γ6; Mathys 2016, 140 fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{52} Hübner 1986, 13; Gans 2006, 125; cf. Heilmeyer 1997, 74.
\textsuperscript{53} Geominy 2007, 71 fig. 92 a-c (with earlier literature); Kazakidi 2015, 226–227 cat. no. 13.Γ1.
\textsuperscript{54} On the function of this statue as a dedication of a victorious athlete, see Kazakidi 2015, 159.
\textsuperscript{55} Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB inv. no. P 136; von den Hoff 2004, 385 fig. 7; Gans 2006, 101–102; Kazakidi 2015, 310–311 cat. no. 60.Γ3; Mathys 2016, 138–142 (with further literature), figs. 3, 44.
\textsuperscript{56} IG XII, 7, 515 l. 78; l. Kos 15, l. 12–13.
\textsuperscript{57} IG V, 1, 493, l. 3–7.
\textsuperscript{58} Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 944; Adam-Velene, Tsankarake, and Chatzenikolaou 2016, cat. no. 19 (N. Kazakidi); Kazakidi 2017.
\textsuperscript{59} See Kazakidi 2017, 284–285, for further argumentation.
\textsuperscript{60} Michalowski 1932, 35; Marcadé 1953, 311; Marcadé 1969, 274; Pfuhl and Mobius 1977, 46.
\textsuperscript{61} Zanker 1965, 95, 99; Pfuhl and Mobius 1977, 46; Wrede 1986, 71–72; Harrison 1965, 125.
\textsuperscript{62} Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB inv. no. Sk 1936; Wrede 1986, 17; Megow 1997.
\textsuperscript{63} See Kazakidi 2015, 282 cat. no. 42.Ε1/Γ1.
when and in what circumstances was the herm first combined with a youthful, beardless portrait head, as happened around the middle of the first century CE in the depictions of Damokrates and Doras?

As is well known, herms bearing portrait busts, for the most part historic depictions of important intellectuals, are known from the mid-first century BCE. As Klaus Fittschen noted recently, mass production of these works must have begun in Athens in the neo-Attic workshops and the aim was, above all, to supply the Italian market with sculptures for private villas.

But when it comes to the herms of the heroized youths of the gymnasium we shall have to turn, for lack of earlier inscriptions, to the iconography of the works themselves. In the Hellenistic period, beardless heads on herms were generally works created using a certain amount of artistic license, adopting the basic iconography of the athlete, developed as early as the Classical period, while at the same time following contemporary trends in individual portrait busts. The late fourth/early third-century BCE examples are characterized by idealization and a lack of individual features. However, it was not long before individualized features began to prevail, giving each head its own character; this is obvious from the heads of the second century BCE, such as those from the gymnasium of Melos. Even more forceful depiction of physiognomy is found in late Hellenistic heads, such as those from the gymnasium of Delos (Fig. 6) and Amphipolis (Fig. 7).

Perhaps, with the albeit later examples of Damokrates and Doras in mind, which are backed up by inscriptions, we might wonder whether some of these late Hellenistic works may indeed depict specific *palaistrites* – just as Casimir Michalowski once asked himself regarding the herms from the gymnasium of Delos, or as we might suggest for those from the gymnasia of Melos and Amphipolis. Moreover, the contemporary use of statuary types of Hermes in the posthumous depictions of young men, which can be observed, according to Caterina Maderna, from as early as the mid-first century BCE onwards, represents a similar phenomenon.

Thus, as stated above, even if linking the herm with a youthful portrait bust is only attested epigraphically from around the middle of the first century CE onwards, heads with individualized features can perhaps point to

---

64 Raubitschek 1949; Harrison 1965, 127; Richter 1965, 116 no. 10.
70 Michalowski 1932, 35.
a somewhat earlier date for the concept of this kind of depiction of a youth in divine form in the type par excellence of Hermes ἐναγώνιος, the herm. In this case, in the context of posthumous rituals, these particular herms would probably have had a similar purpose to that of the honorific posthumous statues of young men known to us from inscriptions, such as the decree relating to Aleximachos. In other words, they were posthumous portraits that preserved, thanks to their iconography, the divine influence of the presence of the god Hermes. Even though, in fact, some individual features are recognizable in these portraits, as noted above, nevertheless the main objective in making them must not have been to depict the realistic physiognomy of the youth concerned. Moreover, we must take into account the conditions in which these works were created: i.e.

they would have been made after the deceased had been buried. Thus, they were more likely images of the heroized state of the subject, whose human dimension had ceased to exist. And indeed on the basis of everything that has been demonstrated above, I think it is reasonable to suggest that the link between the herm and the youthful portrait bust emerged in the context of the tradition of awarding posthumous honors to ephebes associated with the gymnasium.

4 Conclusion

Thus, in creating posthumous depictions in the gymnasium, a practice that is well attested thanks to the corresponding decrees from the end of the second century
BCE, it was the type of the himatiophoros, various types of the god Hermes in the round and the herm that were used. We cannot be certain as to when the godlike types were first employed, perhaps at some point well into the first century BCE. Similarly, we are not in a position to know what criteria were employed to select the iconographic type used to depict the deceased on any given occasion.

The death of a young man, and in particular before he had managed to complete his ephebate or soon after completion thereof, was handled with sensitivity by the society of the time, as a host of moving Hellenistic epigrams reveal. And as emerges from the decree for Aleximachos, setting up statues of prematurely deceased young men in the gymnasium became part of the periodically celebrated public cult of the dead in accordance with contemporary attitudes to the hereafter. In this context, the posthumous statues ensured, above all, that the memory of the deceased was preserved. Moreover, in addition to the honorific reference to the person depicted, they also served another specific purpose: they suggested the presence of the youth himself at the funerary sacrifices and during the funeral banquet. Indeed, with its crowning, the statue took on a leading role as the symbolic winner of the gymnic contests. The deceased was raised to the sphere of the heroes through the veil of ceremonial practices and public awarding of honors that endowed the statue with a heroic aura. These heroic honors earned by the deceased would have been eternally echoed in the verses on the statue’s pedestal, and perhaps by a decree set up next to the statue, but also by the statue itself through his depiction in divine form.

The statues of the sons of Nassius, of Aleximachos, Damokrates, and Kleoneikos functioned primarily as forceful expressions of the perception of the immortality of youth, which even the advent of death could not extinguish. The repeated ritual celebrations in which the statues played the lead role ensured that the deaths of these young men continued to be remembered. These statues were erected not in the cemetery, a place cut off from everyday life, but in the gymnasium, the beating heart of young men’s everyday lives, and they were put not only among their former companions, but in the company of the statues of gods and benefactors. Thus, the statuary forms acquired life and a heroic air, and served as a consolation and even exoneration for a society that was unable to protect its young members. On a collective level, these works also functioned as symbols of the immortality of youth; a response to the awe inspired by death.

74 For examples see Peek 1955, 104, 303, 615, 2281; IG XII, 6, 740; IG XII, 6, 1253; IG XII, 7, 115; IG XII, 7, 447; SEG 49, 361; CIG 2240; Vérilhac 1982.
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Ruler Portraits and Ruler Cult in the Pergamon Gymnasion

Summary

A large number of archaeological and epigraphic testimonia refer to statues of Attalid kings in the gymnasion of Pergamon. The various records and media have not yet been systematically correlated. This article aims to compile and describe the corpus of royal statues installed in the Pergamon gymnasion during the Hellenistic period, as well as to assess the function of these statues and their importance for royal representation in the gymnasion. Particular focus is on the relationship between royal statues and the ruler cult practiced in the gymnasion as well as how these statues were preserved and transformed until Late Antiquity. Visual integration and visual continuity seem to have played a major role in this process.
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Over the past decade, new and intensified research has increased our knowledge of the great gymnasion of the Hellenistic royal capital of Pergamon in its early state, during the period in the first half of the second century BCE when it was established by the Attalid king Eumenes II. The vast, architecturally ambitious terrace facility reaches its conceptual and architectural zenith on the upper terrace with hall H, which is approximately 30 m wide. There, in a rectangular niche 6.4 m wide and 2.8 m deep, built into the center of the back wall of the room, stood a semicircular statue base made of local andesite (Figs. 1–2).

The base supported the installation of Attalid statues of approximately 3 to 4 m in height — armored and barefoot — on the right and left side of a slightly larger statue of Heracles in the center. The famous head of a portrait statue presumed to be Attalos I, and a larger-than-life head of Heracles, both now in Berlin, have since been proved to have been part of these statues, and of the decoration of the gymnasion in the early second century BCE. The remains of the armored statues and the Heracles head belong to the workshop surroundings of the Pergamon altar, which fits in with the construction period of the gymnasion. The surviving base in the niche created for it belonged to the original building stock of the gymnasion, there are no traces of its expansion, and the remains of the surviving statues likewise date back to the original construction period, which means there is no reason to doubt that the group of five statues in total was erected there under Eumenes II. The dimensions of the base, which has a front edge length of about 7 m, illustrate that it was originally used with two portrait statues on each side, that is to the right and left of Heracles. Because of the customary symmetry of such statuary groups, the larger Heracles figure should be positioned in the center.

But how does this royal and divine statue group relate to the epigraphic finds? Until now, the sculpture finds and the inscription testimony have been rather unsystematically grouped together, which identifies the few that have survived on the one hand with the few that are known on the other. This method is not without its problems, which will be examined below. Above all, the question arises as to which functions ruler statues fulfilled in the High Hellenistic Pergamon gymnasion and how they related to the ruler cult practiced there.

1 This article was written as part of the research on the Pergamon gymnasion funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) until 2011, and within the Berlin Sculpture Network finalized in 2013 (see Scholl 2016). It seeks to clarify and revise ideas from studies on statues in the Pergamon gymnasion (von den Hoff 2004, 382–391) that preceded this project and have since been advanced and corrected; some results have already been implied in earlier papers (von den Hoff 2011; von den Hoff and Petersen 2011; von den Hoff 2015a); others can only be substantiated in a more comprehensive publication that is still pending. The following text and its references were finalized in 2017.


3 Schazmann 1923, 58–61 with pl. 4–5; Radt 2011, 126–127; von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011, 273 with fig. 5; von den Hoff 2015a, 127 with note 34 fig. 5; von den Hoff 2015b, 59–60 with note 28 fig. 13.


5 Recent work: Queyrel 2003, 41–49; von den Hoff 2004, 383–384; 386–387 fig. 8 (still presuming only one armored statue; the portrait head of Alexander the Great from fig. 9 mentioned there was not found in the same place); Laube 2006, 78–82; von den Hoff and Mathys 2011, 42 fig. 2–3; von den Hoff 2011, 128–129 fig. 6–7; von den Hoff 2015a, 127–129 fig. 11–13; 15. On the height of the armored statues see Queyrel 2003, 43. Radt and Filigs 1986, 119–120 note 397–398 considers it possible that the statues did not originate until the first century BCE, but this is based on equating them with the sculptures associated with Diodoros Pasparos in the inscriptions and assuming only one of the possible additions to these inscription texts; see below.


7 On the later reduction of the base width see below.

8 The well-preserved plinth with feet, which presumably belongs to the armored statues (von den Hoff 2015a, 128 with note 42 fig. 15), measures approx. 70 cm in width, so that at least 90–100 cm of space on the circular arc must be estimated for each statue, and even more for the larger Heracles figure in the middle.

9 Following, e.g., von den Hoff 2004, 383–384, 386–390 (before the new studies in Pergamon and Berlin); von den Hoff 2013a, 128.
1 Attalid statues in the Diodoros inscriptions

The first important epigraphic information can be found in a decree by the Pergamenes honoring Diodoros Pasparos. It belongs to the era just after his gymasiarchy (69 BCE), and its text was made available to the public in the gymasion (Fig. 3).11

According to this text, a statue (ἀγαλμα) of Diodoros was placed in an exedra of the gymasion where a likeness of Philetairos (282–263 BCE), the first autonomous Attalid ruler of the city, had been installed (l. 36).12 A little before this mention of the exedra of the statue of Philetairos, there is discussion of an agalma of the same Philetairos Euergetes (l. 19–20). A missing patch of the text (l. 20) leaves it unclear whether Diodoros installed this likeness for the first time (ἀνατιθέναι) or merely had it newly erected or repaired (ἐπισκευάσαι).13 The latter addition seems more plausible, but Diodoros was considered the new founder of the

---

gymnasion after the Mithridatic destruction. He is not likely to have been concerned with the statues of long-dead kings that were not visible before the wartime destruction in the gymnasion. In any case, the Philetairos portrait is probably that statue mentioned shortly thereafter in the text of the same decree as standing in an exedra, near which a likeness of Diodoros was then also erected, precisely because of his concern for this portrait of Philetairos. So here we learn about one Philetairos statue, which was an agalma. Diodoros had at least one other statue of a king erected or repaired: an agalma of Attalos III Philometor (138–133 BC) that is mentioned in the same text (l. 20), after the Philetairos likeness. Diodoros’ benevolence with the royal portraits is also highlighted in another inscription dossier inscribed on a column of the upper gymnasion terrace.

It is not certain from these texts that the two Attalid portrait statues were only in one room of the gymna-
Fig. 3 Honorific inscription for Diodoros Pasparos from the Pergamon gymnasion ("AM 29, 1924, no. 1").
sion or installed on one base. In addition, it is unclear if there were further likenesses of other persons. Along with the indications of the two statues, the texts mentioned have several parts missing. First, the lacuna in lines 19 and 20 of the first Diodoros decree is significant. It precedes the name of Philetairos and that of Attalos III, with Philetairos immediately following. It is difficult to add the names of other Pergamenian rulers here — there would be space for two — and thus attest to their agalmata, such as those of Eumenes I and Attalos I.

The names would then not be listed in chronological order, which is a problem. At a later point in the same inscription (l. 39) sacrifices for Philetairos are mentioned, and Attalos III immediately follows. There is uncertainty as to whether this was followed by the name of another ruler, who would then be an earlier king (Eumenes II?) — and thus not in chronological order. This would still result in only three kings being listed. Unfortunately, the naming of the statues in the large Diodoros dossier also has elements missing: before the name of Philetairos (l. 17), and perhaps also before Attalos III (l. 19). No conclusive proposal to fill in these lacunae has yet been made. The Diodoros dossier remains unclear with regard to the number of royal statues and the persons portrayed. Statues next to those of Philetairos and Attalos III are conceivable, but not definitively determinable.

If we leave the statue of Attalos III aside, which certainly only arrived in the gymnasion after 138 BCE and therefore was not part of the original decoration, then the lacunae offer too little space to name more than two Attalid agalmata in the gymnasion besides that of Philetairos, at least in the founding phase.

2 Other Attalid statues

In addition to the indications from the Diodoros inscriptions, fragments of four marble bases also attest to portrait statues of Attalids in the gymnasion before Attalos III. The first fragment is the left part of a base block that names Attalos I as a soter, in the accusative case (Fig. 4).

Found on the upper terrace of the gymnasion, the fragment belongs to a statue base which, according to its inscription and connecting surface at the left, continued for at least one block. The letter height of about 5 cm is relatively large; the statue would have been slightly oversized. The holes on the top surface suggest a bronze statue of the first king of Pergamon. Another likeness of this king is probably attested by a block, later reused, of

20 This has now been added by Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”), as well as the earlier W. Dittenberger (OGIS no. 764); Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152–160 no. 1 l. 39 does not list another name here.
21 The missing text in front of the statue of Philetairos in Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152–160 no. 1 l. 19–20 (and potentially also in Heping 1902, 265–272 no. 8 b–c l. 17–18), could also mention a statue of Seleukos I, with whom Philetairos initially aligned himself in order to make Pergamon independent. But this would have been out of the question, since Seleukos obviously received no cult in Pergamon. In Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152–160 no. 1 l. 39, which deals with sacrifices, he would thus rightly be missing from before Philetairos. The king who may have followed Attalos III, by contrast, did receive sacrifices, but then had no statue in the gymnasion, since he would not otherwise have been named under the agalmata following Attalos III. At least one statue (εἰκὼν) of the non-local king Ptolemy existed in the gymnasion (Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152–160 no. 1 l. 42: Ptolemaios; cf. Kotisidou 2000, 409 K., no. 32), but this dates to after the end of Attalid rule; but cf. the statue of Antiochos III from the sanctuary of Athena: I. Pergamon 182. I do not consider a statue of Seleukos to have been plausible in the gymnasion during the era of conflicts between Pergamon and the Seleucids in the early second century BCE, when the gymnasion was built; cf. the discussion about the naming of the presumed Attalos I, who is also interpreted as Seleukos; von den Hoff 2013b and below.
23 Chankowski 1998, 190–191 with note 123. He considers Eumenes or Attalos for the lacuna in l. 17 preceding Philetairos, but the singular form of the corresponding adjective (σωφρόπουσιος) would require explanation.
24 It is possible that no other agalma is named in l. 18 before Attalos III, since only Heping 1902 reads “Α”: here, H. Müller later saw “ΑN”: Müller 1997b (“AM 32, 1907, no. 8”); Chankowski 1998, 190 note 123.
26 The text in Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152–160 no. 1 l. 46–48 talks about two bulls as sacrificial animals in the context of Diodoros Pasparos; they were sacrificed to the rulers in relation to the decision about a celebration of Athena and Asclepios. This could indicate that here, too, two rulers received sacrifices (cf. von den Hoff 2004, 388 note 108), but Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”) adds in Attalos I Theos before the names of Philetairos and Attalos III, inserting a third, older king in non-chronological order; Schwarzer 1999, 261 also sees Attalos I Theos named here; cf. Wörle 2000, 553.
another statue base from the gymnasium (Fig. 5)." Twenty-eight

According to the addition by Helmut Müller, this portrait was dedicated to Attalos I by a certain Menestratos. However, the text should only be extrapolated with great caution. The smaller letter size (height 2.4 cm) confirms that this was probably a somewhat smaller statue. The statue was a dedication to Attalos which advocates cult activities.

The marble block that supported a portrait statue of a Eumenes (Fig. 6) also belongs to a base with a rather small inscription." Twenty-nine

It was found as a secondary closing wall of the door leading to room O in the west part of the upper gymnasium terrace. The block seems to have supported a life-size or slightly larger-than-life-size statue. Jacobsthal mentions a pin hole for attaching a lance to the top surface, which might indicate a statue type that was nude or partly clothed. It was donated by Philetairos, the first name mentioned in the inscription: son of an Attalos, the father of the figure depicted. This would then be Philetairos Euergetes, who donated a portrait of his adoptive son Eumenes, who would later rule Pergamon beginning in 263 BCE. If we take this literally, then the donation was made during the lifetime of Philetairos, long before the construction of the gymnasion in the early third century BCE. The two statues of Attalos I could also have been set up in the third century BCE. A similar case exists with the fourth base of a royal statue from the gymnasion: this is the round base of a bronze statue of 78 cm in diameter, which was found in 1928 in

---

28 Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48 a + b; Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: “AM 32, 1907, no. 48 a”; “AM 32, 1907, no. 48 b”); Mathys 2014, 32; fig. 12; 138 Gy U8; http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316636 (visited on 17/10/2018); http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316637 (visited on 17/10/2018).

the east baths adjacent to the gymnasion (Fig. 7). The typical insertion hole on the top surface indicates that this base too supported a life-size or slightly taller bronze statue. The inscription states that Eumenes, son of Philetairos, erected this statue of Attalos, his son. This is therefore the remains of another statue of Attalos, who would later rule Pergamon as its first king until 197 BCE. This raises the question of whether we can give credence to this text in chronological terms as well: the likeness would then have been created before 241 BC, too early for it to have been installed in the gymnasion first. Could the base have been brought there later? It can never be ruled out that such stone blocks did end up being carried off in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine era, but it is equally unlikely that the statue was transferred there when the gymnasion was first being decorated. The inscription formula is identical to the base of Eumenes I just discussed (Fig. 6), and the letter heights match (2 cm). The portraits were therefore characterized as companion pieces, even if the base shapes and writing differ in the details. But we do not know of any find from the gymnasion that is certain to have come from one of the places of origin of such statues, which have been suggested, the neighboring sanctuary of Demeter, or the sanctuary of Athena, high up on the citadel.

Apparently fragments only came directly crashing down from the Hera sanctuary above the gymnasion palaestra and the adjacent 'temple R'. This leaves us with an unproven but probable proposition: assume that there was an ancient installation of these statues in the gymnasion, either through the installation of older statues – most likely during the original decoration – or through the suggestion of an older donation inscription.

32 Schober 1951, 51 (“wohl verschleppt”) and Queyrel 2003, 81 note 7 (“sans doute du sanctuaire d’Athéna”) assume that the base was taken; von den Hoff 2004, 383 with note 75 is similar. Finds from the sanctuary of Demeter (?) in the gymnasion: marble fragments of Nike figures (Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung no. S 167; S 151), Hepding 1910, 491–497, Grote 1992a, 18c pl. 15, 21; and Grote 1992b, no. 405, however, identifies Akroter figures in it from a ‘temple R’ west of the gymnasion, similarly to Rheidt 1996, 178.
33 Objects from the Hera sanctuary in the gymnasion: fragment of the dedication inscription, Jacobsthal 1928, 402 no. 27; altar of a Hera priestess, Jacobsthal 1928, 402 no. 28. Objects from ‘temple R’ in the gymnasion: fragment of a marble cult image, Radt 2011, 131 fig. 75 (found in the west baths of the gymnasion).
34 Jacobsthal 1928, 405 considers the letters on the base Jacobsthal 1928, 405 no. 34 (Abb. 6) to be those of the second century BCE, as in Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: “AM 33, 1908, no. 34”); von den Hoff 2011, 126, unlike Hepding 1910, 465, who also dates the base, Hepding 1910, 436–465 no. 45 (fig. 7), as does Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 35, 1910, no. 45"), to the third century BCE. Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 32, 1927, no. 48 a") also dates the base Hepding 1907, 320 no. 484 (fig. 5) to this period.

Fig. 6  Block of the base of a statue of Eumenes (I) from the gymnasion (‘AM 33, 1908, no. 34’).
3 Portrait statues, findings, and inscriptions

Bringing these epigraphic and archaeological findings together is not easy. No statue has been preserved with its matching inscription. The precise locations in the gymnasion of the epigraphically attested statues cannot be determined. Their sheer number, however, shows that royal statues were present in many rooms. The agalmata of Philetairos and Attalos III named in the Diodoros inscriptions must by no means have stood in one room, let alone on one base; it is unclear whether more statues were named there. And the number (four) of colossal marble Attalid statues already installed in hall H under Eumenes II, together on one base from which remnants have survived, surpasses the maximum achievable number, derived from the texts of the Diodoros dossier, of three kings’ agalmata before Attalos III. Whether these are even the agalmata named there is likewise an open question.35

What is striking is that only the statue finds in hall H have so far given indications of royal statues before the time of Attalos III that were made of marble and clearly oversized. They were accentuated by their materials and size – as well as by the prominent situation of their location. They – and not yet the incomplete epigraphic evidence – also testify so far to an early, cohesive gallery of Attalid portraits, even if we cannot be sure who exactly was depicted. The other royal statues attested only epigraphically (Figs. 4–7), were made of bronze and not linked to common bases. Only for Philetairos is there not yet any indication of a statue in the gymnasion except for his agalma; but his statue probably would not have been missing from a family group. All this supports recognizing the agalma of Philetairos as one of the statues in the central niche of hall H.36 This would have the consequence of hall H being cited as the exedra of Philetairos, as the first Diodoros decree refers to it. A portrait (agalma) of Diodoros would then also have to have been present there since the first century BCE.37 But this identification is far from being sure: early remains of rectangular foundations have been observed in rooms G and D, and they too may have belonged to statue bases that were later removed.38 Apart from this, it may come as a surprise that a single statue from the cluster of four Attalid likenesses, which had been jointly and simultaneously installed, was ascribed a special status and that this alone gave the room its name, as the Diodoros inscription attests.39

Was there a recognizable message of this corpus of

---

35 It is possible, but not compulsory, to assume a jointly installed gallery of Attalids on *one* base in the early gymnasion on the basis of the Diodoros inscriptions *alone*, as in Radt and Filgis 1986, 119–120 with note 398; Virgilio 1993, 91–92; Schwarzer 1999, 261–262, and also von den Hoff 2004, 388 with note 108; and von den Hoff 2011, 128, since the statue of Philetairos is also individually named. But cf. the skepticism in Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 265 note 125, and in Bielfeldt 2010, 163 with note 117–118, who seem to doubt a statue gallery at all, even though the finds of statues from hall H are evidence of such a gallery (thus also rightly Bielfeldt 2010, 163 note 124).


38 von den Hoff 2015a, 129 with note 56 (but not demonstrated with any certainty as having been the foundations of statue bases).

39 On this see von den Hoff 2004, 386 note 99.
Attalid statues at the time when the gymnasion was established, as far as we can determine? It became clear that at least two portraits of members of the Attalid royal dynasty stood in the gymnasion of Eumenes, which displayed ‘princes’ and had been erected by family members (Figs. 6–7). Through their inscriptions, which name the person depicted and the donor as son and father, respectively, they firmly marked the male generational succession starting with Philetaerus followed by Eumenes I and Attalos I – and thus showed the continuity of rule as legitimate, even though adoptions were part of it. In addition, there were the two statues of Attalos I (Figs. 4–5) and the four Attalid statues next to Heracles in the central niche of hall H. Under Eumenes II, then, the gymnasion was filled with statues of kings and of later kings portrayed before their accession to power – a space strongly visually occupied by the Attalids. At the same time, the statues of the young princes may also have directly spoken to the gymnasion visitors, most of whom were young. At least two of the likenesses were made of bronze; only the statues in hall H were definitely marble, and only these reached a significantly larger-than-life format. The shapes of the bases (Figs. 4–7) also show that the individual portraits were not installed as a cohesive group of statues and therefore were presumably arranged around the space: the Attalids were thus seen in the gymnasion as isolated figures and as representatives of different age roles. According to their inscriptions, the Attalid portraits were not cult statues, but honorifics or donations by members of the royal family – in a space whose statuary decoration was designed by the ruling family itself. For the figure group in hall H, by contrast, which was installed by Eumenes II at the time he established the gymnasion, there is an emphasis on the ties between the persons depicted and with Heracles, the divine patron of the gymnasion, who was also considered the ancestor of the Pergamon royal family. The dynastic and collective aspect of the representation of these rulers is also underscored here. The uniform military quality of the Attalids is especially foregrounded in this room, as it seems that at least two, if not four statues in armored breastplates were set before the viewer.

4 The ruler cult and ruler portraits: visual integration

How do the Attalid statues relate to ruler cult practices in the Pergamon gymnasion? The Attalid ruler cult is a controversial field; the space here does not permit a discussion of the ruler cult in its entirety, or the necessary differentiation between urban cults and so-called dynastic cults – as specifically these may have been formed in the royal capital of Pergamon in particular. Proof of ruler cults is found primarily in the epigraphic references to priests, sacrifices, and dedications to rulers, as well as in indications of cult sites. Priests of Philetairos, of the Theoi Adelphoi Eumenes II and Attalos II, and of Attalos III – the last while he was still alive – are known to have been present in Pergamon itself in the late second century BCE. We know of altars to Attalos I that were already being dedicated during his lifetime; there

41 Following von den Hoff 2015a, 130.
42 Only in the case of a statue conditionally related to Attalos I (Fig. 5) may the dative case in the name of the person depicted indicate a consecration to him: Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48a.
44 This essentially also confirms the connection to military training posited by Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 65; but cf. Wörre 2007, 508 with note 36.
is evidence of an Eumeneion, a cult site for Eumenes II, on
the hill of Pergamon’s citadel, within the old city walls,
in the district of Philetaira.49 Eumenes II was also wor-
shipped as Theos in conjunction with the Twelve Gods,
in the waning years of the monarchy at the very latest.50
An urban ruler cult may have begun in Pergamon under
Eumenes I, but this is disputed.51

The situation is more modest for the Pergamon gym-
nasion, even though there were generally strong ties be-
tween gymnasium and the Hellenistic ruler cult.52 Sacrifices
to Philetairos and Attalos III took place under Diodoros
Pasparos – more than sixty years after the monarchy had
ended – when Diodoros had their agalmata renovated.53
If the agalma of Philetairos receiving the sacrifices was
identical to one of the ruler statues in hall H, its installa-
tion would trace back to Eumenes II. The statue would
then already include evidence of Eumenes’ II visual and
ritual legitimacy through the statue and cult of the dy-
nasty’s founder that were linked to this site. It is an open
question whether the statue in hall H – if it depicted
Philetairos – gave its name to hall H or another room
– even though the statue was part of a group. The nam-
ing of a room alone, however, confirms its excellent qual-
ity against the other statues, indeed those of a cult image
in a gymnasium-centered ruler cult. Michael Wörle has
recently clarified the accentuated role of the Pergamene
Philetairos priests in the political and religious fabric of
the Pergamon polis as a whole.54

Further specifics about cult worship of the Attalids
in the gymnasium cannot be given, except that one of
the statues testified was probably dedicated to Attalos I there,
as was made explicit by the inscription (Fig. 5), and that
another Attalid was being worshipped there beginning
with Attalos III at the latest. It cannot be determined,
however, whether sacrifices to Attalos I, Eumenes II, or
Attalos II were ever made in the gymnasium.

But we do know the visual and functional context
of the rest of the ruler portraits in relation to what was
likely the earliest cult statue of Philetairos, wherever it
stood – so we also know the latest one, that of Attalos III.
The Attalids were meant to appear on the one hand to be
related as a family, but also as individuals and therefore as
virtually normal citizens. The historical beginning was
marked by the cult statue of Philetairos, while the uni-
form marble statues in hall H underscored the dynastic
unity of the ruling family following him. But the names
of those represented in the marble statues are open to de-
bate. In addition to the obvious Philetairos, possible can-
didates are Eumenes II, the founder of the gymnasium,
Eumenes I, but also the first king of Pergamon, Attalos
I, as well as Attalos II, the brother of the gymnasium’s
founder. Arguments could be made in favor of each one,
but it must be clarified which arguments would actu-
al be apt – the ‘completeness’ of the genealogy, the
kinship or adoption, their military accomplishments, or
their historical relevance.55 But the epigraphic findings
make it clear even without such designations that not all
of the rulers depicted in the gymnasium were also ob-
jects of cult worship at this site: probably not even all
four Attalids who appeared in the marble statues of hall
H. The result was a tense juxtaposition of cult practice,
cult statue(s) and other portrait statues of rulers.

This opens up another component of the representa-
tion of the Pergamon monarchy in its royal capital’s
gymnasium. Just grouping the four marble statues in hall
H together with Heracles – although he is represented
as more significant in size – brings those depicted more
into line with a divine hero who was worshipped in
the gymnasium and was the progenitor of the ruling dy-
nasty. This way the Attalids became synnaoi theoi of Her-
aces at least visually, without necessarily becoming sub-
jects of the cult themselves.56 If the cult statue of Phile-

49 I. Pergamon 242; OGIS no. 356; http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/
521878 (visited on 17/10/2018). On the Philetaira district cf. Wörle 2002,
531. 50 On the Eumeneion see Bielfeld 2010, 158 with n° 114.
48 I. Pergamon 246, l. 27–28; OGIS no. 332; http://inscriptions.packhum.
50 Cf. e.g., Wörle 2002; critical of this early dating is Bielfeld 2010, 154–
515; cf. also Gauthier 2003.
51 On the ruler cult in the Pergamon gymnasium and beyond see Delorme
521960, 342–346; Price 1984, 45; Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 262–268;
53 Burasalis and Aneziri 2004, 179; as well as Wörle 2002; Wörle 2007. A
gymnasion in Athens was named after Ptolemy III and housed a statue of
the king: Paus. 1,17,2.
56 On the naming of the marble statues in H, cf. provisionally von den Hoff
2013b. As has now been shown, however, the kings’ names mentioned
in the Diodoros texts alone are no help in naming these statues. The con-
troversial question of identifying the presumed Attalos I in Berlin (cf.,
e.g., Fleischer 1991, 10–15) must be further discussed elsewhere; cf. the
important replica of the head on the sarcophagus of the tomba bella in Hi-
tripolis, Romeo, Panariti, and Ungaro 2014, 222–222 and Smith 2015,
829.
stallation therefore does not necessarily imply a joint cult, cf. Burasalis
and Aneziri 2004, 179. Diodoros Pasparos later received an agalma in
the gymnasion as a συναναπτόμενος of Heracles and Hermes (Heiding 1967,
257–272 no. 8 a l. 44–45), so potentially a seated statue, cf. Chankowski
tairos were to have been standing among their likenesses, this statue would have had a specific religious value, but it would not have been more prominent than the rest of the likenesses in terms of material, format, and perhaps even iconography. If the agalma of Philetairos had been in another place in the gymnasion, however, then it would have been an additional functional portrait category of cult statue in the context of the overall sculptural decoration, alongside the oversized marble likenesses and the life-size bronze portrait statues. In any case, there is a blurring of the clearly separated functions of the portraits: honorific, consecrated, and cult statues of the same persons were found distributed all over the gymnasion; visitors under the rule of Eumenes II were encouraged to see their separation as diversity, the implicit family ties between them as a moment of integration and of a nexus of honorific, cultic, and social (read: royal) status. In the light of the cult of Philetairos – should it trace back in the gymnasion to Eumenes II – and in the company of Heracles, a divine-religious aura was conferred upon kings and princes of the Attalid family that visually distinguished them and removed them from the everyday, even though specific practices of the ruler cult may at first have been assigned only to Philetairos, and then only under certain circumstances. The installation site near the cultically worshipped founder implicitly integrated the other family members into this cult.57 The statuary decoration of the gymnasion made it a site of the union of civic and extraordinary religious as well as military qualities of the male members of the royal family – young and old – and this seems to have been a concept of its design by Eumenes II.

Attalid statues were not unique to the Pergamon gymnasion, however. Such statues are also attested in the gymnasions of Andros, Apamea, and Sestos, where they sometimes served as cult statues. Groups of statues of several Attalids were also featured, and these are more frequently cited as evidence for the Attalids in general.58 Elsewhere, too, Attalid likenesses alongside those of gods tied the Pergamon kings to the divine sphere – without having to cross the boundary into ‘equating’ the two or compelling cultic worship.59 In this respect, the Pergamon gymnasion at best represents an exception, in view of the multitude of Attalid statues with diverse functions and the resulting visual connection between them.

5 Ruler portraits after the end of royal rule: visual continuity

Even after the monarchy ended, the gymnasion did not lose its eye-catching feature of the massive visual presence of the Attalids, in the form of their likenesses and their implicit integration into the cult of the dynasty’s founder. This alone shows the intensification of the ruler cult in the late Attalid era and the cult’s existence beyond the end of the monarchy, as Michael Wörnle has investigated.60 This manifested itself specifically in the care Diodoros Pasparos devoted to the royal portraits in the gymnasion in approximately 69 BCE, when, as the “second founder” after the disaster of the Mithridatic wars, he conferred a new splendor on the structure and the institution.61 It cannot be inferred from the corresponding inscriptions with any certainty that Diodoros had ancient agalmata of the kings in the gymnasion repaired (and not originally installed), but this has already been indicated above as being rather probable. The analysis of

57 Perhaps comparable phenomena of a blurring of clear boundaries: 1) the sacrifices for the benefit of kings or their own cult (cf. Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 265); 2) the conflation of celebrations for gods and for kings (Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 265–266) and 3) relations between cult and honors. The case of Attalos III demonstrates this: he received a cult statue (εἰκὼν) as a synnaos theos of Asclepios and a golden statue (τικών) on the agora, but his priest offered sacrifices at the altar of Zeus that was adjacent to the golden τικών; sacrifices were offered to Attalos III at the same time they were offered at the altar of Zeus Boulaios and Hera Boulaia in Pergamon, as attested in the ‘Elaia Decree’ I. Pergamon 246; OGIS no. 332; Müller 1992, 206–212; Schwarzer 1999, 260–261; Queyrel 2003, 37–39; Bielfeldt 2010, 182–182.

58 On Attalid cults and statues in other gymnasia see Queyrel 2003, 34–36 (Andros: Eumenes II); 36 (Apamea: Eumenes II and Attalos II; no certain cult evidence); 37 (Sestos: Attalos III); cf. also the gold statue of Eumenes II in the gymnasion (?) of Milet: Schwarzer 1999, 256–257; Queyrel 2003, 31–34. On statue groups of Attalids see von den Hoff 2011, 123; cf., e.g., the statue gallery donated by Menogenes in the sanctuary of Athena: I. Pergamon 171–176; Bielfeldt 2010, 165–166.


60 Wörnle 2000; Wörnle 2007; cf. also Bielfeldt 2010 on the intensification in the late second century BCE.

61 Hepding 1927, 257–272 no. 8 a II l. 62–63.
the marble fragments, which can be classified according to the find location, material, and format of the Attalids gallery in hall H, has provided further evidence of this. Indeed, traces of repairs can be found on fragments of bare feet of the statues from this find context (Figs. 8–9).62

Attachment surfaces in the toes of the statues and holes for metal pins show that their tips have been inserted; sanding marks and scoring lines indicate manipulative interventions at this point and also contradict the idea to identify them as primary attachments as early as the sculptural fabrication stage, which were so common in the marble workshops of Pergamon.63 Unfortunately, these repairs cannot be dated. It is tempting nonetheless to link them to the actions by Diodoros.64 The same goes for the reworking of the king’s head in Berlin (the presumed Attalos I) that likewise belongs to this group of statues.65 The wreath of hair on this statue originates from a second phase of work, but we cannot date its production either. But since the head was reproduced with this new hairstyle on the early imperial sarcophagus of the ‘tomba bella’ in Hierapolis, and the tresses are largely identical,66 the reworking of the head must have happened before the formation of the sarcophagus midway through the first century CE – whether this happened indeed in Diodoros’ era remains unclear.67 It is not even certain that the reworking was part of a repair; it could also have been done without external reason for the purpose of updating the iconography of the royal statue, perhaps as part of a lingering cult. At any rate, the new hairstyle gave the representation a divine pull – but it does not approximate the depicted king to Alexander and does not show an anastole at all. The new hair does not refer to a concrete deification, but visually approximates the image to those of male gods, which, like Alexander himself, were depicted with such a wreath of hair.68 It also demonstrates the continuous care for the royal likenesses in hall H, as does the preservation of the statues.

Not all of the Attalid likenesses survived for long in the gymnasion. The base of the bronze statue presumably dedicated to Attalos I (Fig. 5) was probably reused in the early first century BCE for the erection of another bronze statue and the attachment of an honorific inscrip-

62 The fragments were found in 1906 in the same wall where the fragments of the aforementioned armored statues were found: feet with legs and marble plinth, Bergama, Depot der Pergamograbung/Untere Agora: von den Hoff 2015a, 128 with note 42 fig. 15. Left foot on marble plinth, Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung no. S 284: unpublished.
63 On attachments in Pergamene sculpture see Hofter 2011; Hofter 2015.
64 Following von den Hoff 2004, 388; von den Hoff 2013a, 129 with note 51.
65 von den Hoff 2013b with further literature; Scholl 2016, 42–44 no. 36 [R. von den Hoff and C. Blume].
67 Then Diodoros in fact would have commissioned repairs not only of the statues of Philetairos and Attalos III, to which the head indeed cannot belong due to its physiognomy or date, but of others that may have been named in the aforementioned lacunae of the inscriptions.
The base of a bronze statue of Attalos III was likewise later turned upside down for the installation of another bronze statue, but was then – in a third use – ground down and used as part of a subsequent wall, which is where it was found. Such destruction of statues and reuse of their base blocks is not uncommon. The marble portrait statues in hall H, the most prominent location of the upper gymnasion terrace, were evidently excluded from this process. Hall H and its environs were also a focal point for the installation of other portrait statues into the imperial era.

In the high imperial period – perhaps as early as the construction of the palaestra porticos of the upper terrace in marble, likely in the late Flavian era – the hall received a newly designed entrance and a new barrel vault ceiling suspended on pillars – a sign of the abiding significance of this space in the gymnasium. The pillars were placed in front of the walls and columns of the north and south sides of the room, as well as to the right and left of the central niche (Figs. 1–2). In the process, the parts of the semicircular base of the niche that laterally extended to the wall surfaces had to be dismantled; some of the leftover fragments were used in the underpinnings of the new pillars. Stabilizing masonry arches were placed in front of the side walls of the niche as well; these reduced the clear span of the niche from 6.4 to 5 m (Fig. 1). The remaining part of the semicircular base now no longer could have four statues alongside Heracles, but one statue each to his left and right – in consideration of the space and the symmetry.

The context in which the remnants of only three statues were found in 1907 is further evidence that two statues were actually removed at the time but that the three middle ones were preserved: not until the next construction phase of hall H, which should be assigned to the late third century CE at the earliest, did they find their way into a wall that closed off the lateral entrances of hall H but not its central one, so that the hall remained accessible and in use. Although the remnants of the three statues found in the wall in 1907 had been broken to pieces, the heads were almost unscathed in the marble surface, with bits of hair still stuck to the head of the presumed Attalos I. They were therefore most likely to have been built into the wall just after their destruction, meaning they had been standing until then, while other fragments at the time probably found their way into lime kilns. Only then did the rest of the Attalid group with Heracles disappear from hall H.

Even though we can say so little with any certainty about the date of the end of the ruler cult in the gymnasium after the end of the Attalid monarchy and how statues were included in it: It appears that, in the central hall H, where Eumenes II may have initiated the cult around Philaetairos, portrait statues of Pergamon’s kings in full military dress were preserved in colossal format as visual synnaos theoi of their mythical ancestor Heracles until at least the third century CE – more than four hundred years, as Eumenes II had donated them in the first half of the second century BCE. Even when Roman emperors retained a cult in the gymnasium, the imperial likenesses never replaced the portraits of the Attalid kings. Instead, the new rulers received other, more second-tier places in the gymnasium.

69 Hepding 1927, 320 no. 48 b; Mathys 2014, 52; fig. 10; 138 Gy U8: "dreimal verwendet".
70 Hepding 1927, 311 no. 33; http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316622 (visited on 17/10/2018).
71 Cf., e.g., von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011, 276–277.
73 On these renovations see Schazmann 1923, 60–61 with fig. 22; Radt and Filigis 1986, 119 note 396; Trümper 2015, 194 with note 82; on the renovations in other rooms see Trümper 2015, 178.
74 For more on the find see Schazmann 1923, 61; Auinger 2015.
75 On the duration of the cult of Hellenistic kings see Chankowski 2010, for Pergamon cf. Gauthier 1985, 48.
76 E.g., in room 57 of the middle terrace of the gymnasium: Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 167–168 no. 8; Schazmann 1923, 37–38.
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The Gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic Age to the Roman Empire: the Example of Rhodes

Summary

Several gymnasiarchiai are testified for Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Rhodes: a gymnasianarchos of the presbyteroi, another of the neoteroi, and a tribal office connected to torch races. Within the predominantly epigraphic sources, the most revealing are Hellenistic CV inscriptions, a unique feature of Rhodian epigraphic habit. They enable us to place offices chronologically within the sequel of individuals’ public functions, showing that each gymnasianarchia was held at a certain age. Comparing Hellenistic and Roman Imperial inscriptions reveals a remarkable continuity in the representation of the Rhodian gymnasiarchia, the single major divergence being a pronounced emphasis on the distribution of oil in the Imperial age.

Keywords: Gymnasiarchia, Rhodes, Hellenistic Age, Roman Imperial Age; Greek inscriptions/Greek epigraphy; CV inscriptions

Für das hellenistische und kaiserzeitliche Rhodos sind verschiedene Gymnasiarchien bezeugt: ein gymnasianarchos der presbyteroi, einer der neoteroi und ein Phylenamt, das mit Fackellau-


Keywords: Gymnasiarchie; Rhodos; Hellenismus; Kaiserzeit; griechische Inschriften/griechische Epigraphik; Lebenslaufinschriften
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From the Hellenistic age onwards, the gymnasium was not only one of the buildings a proper Greek polis could not do without, developing into an important public space called a “second agora” by Louis Robert. It was also one of the major institutions of a polis, organizing the military and intellectual education of the young citizens as well as the athletic activities of various age classes. Given this status, control of the gymnasium, usually exercised by an official named gymnasiarchos, should have ranked among the top priorities of polis governments. Despite this, the gymnasiarchia has received comparatively little systematic attention: Following Jean Delorme’s seminal investigation into the gymnasium, which is focused on archaeological questions, the office is illuminated by some recent articles as well as Olivier Curty’s very useful collection of Hellenistic decrees honouring gymnasiarchoi.

Due to the fact that especially in the epigraphic sources, gymnasiarchoi usually figure not so much as magistrates active in an administrative context but as public benefactors, spending parts of their private wealth to support the costly institution, the main focus of recent research into the office has been embedded in the discussion of how euergetism defined the interaction between the population of the polis and its elites. This article is a minor contribution towards a more balanced view of the relationship between magistracy and liturgy, based on a cluster of local evidence not analyzed in detail so far.

1 Magistracy and liturgy

Before looking into the Rhodian evidence, it is necessary to address the basic question of whether the gymnasiarchia is to be understood primarily as a magistracy (arche) or as a liturgy (leitourgia). In his article on the Hellenistic gymnasiarchia, Christof Schuler has proposed that the gymnasiarchia was established as a proper magistracy in the second half of the fourth century, but that an earlier ‘liturgical model’ remained active throughout the Hellenistic period. On the relationship between arche and leitourgia, he cites Friedemann Quaß’ definition of the gymnasiarchia as a ‘liturgical magistracy,’ meaning that while the gymnasiarchia was a public office of the polis, it also involved financial burdens imposed upon the magistrate. In contrast to Schuler, Olivier Curty sees the main distinction between types of the gymnasiarchia not in its liturgical aspects, but in the question of whether it was a magistracy of the polis or an internal function of the gymnasium. Focussing on the Hellenistic period, both Schuler and Curty adopt the widely accepted position that in the Roman Empire, the gymnasiarchia developed into a pure form of liturgy. As Louis Robert pointed out, parallel to the meaning of gymnasia in the Latin West, γυμνασιαρχεῖν could adopt the meaning of “to provide oil” in the Greek East also, and in some places the gymnasiarchia was one of the burdens that could be avoided by paying a summa bonorarum.

There is, however, one well-known problem with the evidence for financial expenses associated with office-holding in the Hellenistic and Imperial poleis: We usually cannot tell whether these expenses were demanded by law (which they should have been in the case of a proper liturgy) or were a result of voluntary munificence, in which case they should correctly be called euergeia. In everyday life, the difference between these two options was probably of no great import, since members of the elites may have been more swayed by the expectations of the citizenry and their peer group than by legal

---


4 Curty 2015, 382–291 and 344. Because the Rhodian evidence does not contribute to the discussion of this undoubtedly pertinent question, I will not address it in any detail. Cf. my criticism of Curty’s assumption that a decree for a gymnasiarchos enacted by an association of gymnasium users (e.g. neo) indicates that the honorand was a functionary of this group and not of the polis (Kah 2017).

5 Robert 1959, 736 n. 2 (Robert 1960, 628 n. 2); Robert 1943, 192–194; BE 1953, 194; BE 1983, 84; cf. Delorme 1960, 101 (arguing that spontaneous acts of generosity developed into obligations over the long term); Schuler 2004, 189–191; Quaß 1993, 320; van Bremen 1966, 68–73; Curty 2009, 3; Curty 2015, 293–294; Scholz 2015, 83–86. For the meaning of Latin gym- nasia cf. Fagan 1999 and Lafe 2013 (arguing that in the North African provinces, the term was used to designate athletic contest).
Generally on the relationship between magistracies and liturgies: Quaß κατακλείας ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων (I. Priene 114), l. 26–27: καὶ τὰς συναρχίας καὶ τὸν ἀντιγραφέα καὶ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον τῶν μηνίους τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον τῶν νεών καὶ πόλεως (?) καὶ τοὺς παιδονόμους καὶ τὸν ἀναγνώστην καὶ τὸν κήρυκα τῆς λειτουργίας διέκδικεν ἐν τῷ θεόν τόπωι.

And it is important to recall that with each annual 'Rhodes' to refer to the island and the polis, and this same group is referred to as 'the gymnasiarchia' in two later decrees.

As such, when looking at Greek magistrates one should keep in mind that many of them had to make expenses that would not be reimbursed by the polis. At the same time, a well-documented example for Rhodes is praised for accepting the office of gymnasiarchia.

Rhodes may be regarded as a problematic example for an investigation of the social evolution of the Greek polis from Hellenism to the Roman Empire, since, in a number of aspects, it was hardly typical: It was usually big, prosperous and powerful and, most importantly, it managed to combine a democratic constitution with a strong aristocratic elite throughout the Hellenistic age.

What makes Rhodes interesting in the context of the gymnasiarchia is a unique epigraphic habit that allows the hierarchy of public offices to be much better reconstructed than in other poles. Usually, the fact that a citizen had held a magistrate is documented by statue bases naming the honorand as an office holder, offerings with the dedicant bearing the respective title, or honorific decrees that praise a citizen for having performed excel-
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lently in a specific magistracy. From Rhodes, there is only a very small number of extant decrees, and of these hardly any are honorific. What we have instead is a considerable number of inscriptions, mostly on statue bases, recording the public *curriculum vitae* of the honoree. These inscriptions, which are typologically similar to the Roman Imperial *cursus* inscriptions, are first attested in the second century BC and continue into the Roman Empire. They list civic offices, military activities, priesthoods and other religious functions a citizen had performed, and they also name honours he (or occasionally she) had received from various corporate entities such as associations and foreign polities. These lists can be quite short or rather long, and they apply to adults of all ages.

In the late first century BC, honours gain predominance over offices, the latter being sometimes completely omitted from the Early Empire onwards. Most of these CVs seem to be ordered chronologically, and only some thematically.

In these CVs and other epigraphic evidence from Rhodes, three kinds of *gymnasiarchoi* are mentioned: a *gymnasiarchos* of the older men (*presbyteroi*), one of the younger men (*neotreis*), and a tribal *gymnasiarchos* (γυμνασιαρχος φυλακς). I will examine the status of these offices and how they were connected to partitions of the *polis*, starting with the two *gymnasiarchoi* distinguished as *presbyteros* and *neoteris* respectively. They can be identified with the *gymnasiarchoi* named in the plural in some other Rhodian inscriptions: two in a dedication (13), and an unspecified number in a catalogue of the board of leading magistrates (*synarchothai*) (9) and in the still largely unpublished collection of decrees concerning the Rhodian library (5). When named separately, both offices are usually denominated either with an adjective (e.g. *γυμνασιαρχος πρεσβυτερος*) or with a noun in the genitive plural (e.g. *γυμνασιαρχος πρεσβυτερον*), the two forms each office’s designation being assumed to be synonymous.

As is evident from their appearance among the *synarchontes* and the decrees regulating the library, these *gymnasiarchoi* were proper magistrates of the *polis*. As the title *gymnasiarchos* is occasionally qualified by the addition of the name of a festival (κατα Ρωμαια, Αλιεια or κατα Ρωμαια Αλιεια), the *gymnasiarchoi* are sometimes assumed to have been involved with the organisation of these festivals, adding a special liturgical aspect to the office. But this kind of connection is only attested twice for *gymnasiarchoi*, whereas the qualification κατα (μεγάλα) Αλιεια is attested for a number of other offices, including military functionaries like *strategoi* and *hegemones* for whom it is difficult to see how they could have been directly involved with a festival, especially on a regular basis. So while holding an office in a year when the pentaeteric *Helieia* (for the Rhomaia cf. Appendix II) were celebrated obviously generally carried some kind of distinction, there is no special connection to the *gymnasiarchia*.

---

9 There are some late Hellenistic decrees for lifetime achievements, but these usually emphasize the last offices held by the honoree, as these were normally the most prestigious. For instance, the extraordinary long decrees on the western wall of the *hura sta* in Priene mention surprisingly few offices held by their respective honorends (cf. Kah 2014, 158).

10 Cf. IG XII, 1, 890 (Lindos, ca. 161 AD: cf. Badoud 2015, 164–165 no. A 4); IG XII, 2, 1 (53 AD): 31 (second century AD).

11 For this type of document that still has to be researched in detail cf. Kah 2016, 254 with n. 6.

12 The Rhodian gymnasiarchae have been investigated rather cursorily: van Gelder 1900, 259; Cordiano 1997, 137–138; Schuler 2004, 166; Chankowski 2010, 199–200; Badoud 2015, 120–121. For public education in Rhodes in general cf. Bringmann 2002 and Drellos-Irakliodou 2014. A note on Greek terms: Rhodian inscriptions are usually written in the Dorian dialect used on the island. Since simply transcribing these dialect forms might lead to confusion (for example *physia, boule, hagemon*), I either use the standard Greek equivalents in the transcriptions (boule, hagemon) or I cite the Greek form (for instance ἡγεμον). I also do not transcribe inflected Greek words or phrases (such as *πρεσβυτέροι* and κατα μεγάλα Αλιεια). However, I retain the dialect forms in the transcriptions of names (e.g. Damagoras, Athisa Lindia and Halieia).

13 Numbers in bold type refer to the catalogue of epigraphic testimonia in Appendix I.

14 Hiller von Gaertringen 1894, 30; van Gelder 1900, 259; Maiuri 1925, 36; Chankowski 2010, 200. For the evidence see 11, l. 2, 10, l. 11 and 18, l. 8 (πρεσβυτέρος); 10, l. 6, 19, l. 14 and 26 (νεωτέρος); 8, l. 3 (πρεσβυ-

15 Contra Chankowski 2010, 200 ("Le deux gymnasiarques semblent ne pas être les ‘chefs’ du gymnase … mais assumer leur charge … uniquement pour préparer un groupe des jeunes à la participation aux fêtes"), combining two erroneous interpretations: of the character of the age groups, and of the meaning of the addition of a festival to the title (cf. below).

16 Gymnasiarchai of the *polis*: 11, l. 2: γυμνασιαρχος πρεσβυτέρος κατα Ῥωμαια and 13, l. 3–4: γυμνασιαρχοιν ταῖς κατὰ μεγάλα Αλιεια. There is also one attestation for a tribal gymnasiarchos (7, l. 15: γυμνασιαρχον πρεσβυτερον κατα Ῥωμαια and 13, l. 3–4: γυμνασιαρχοιν ταῖς κατὰ μεγάλα Αλιεια). Cf. an inscription from the second century AD, where the honoreand’s activities are listed separately as gymnasiarchos, agonothetes of the Halieia, and priest of Halios: 24, l. 3–6. Rhodian gymnasiarchoi involved in the organisation of festivals: Maiuri 1925, 47; Cordiano 1997, 138; Chankowski 2010, 200; Drellos-Irakliodou 2014, 44 with n. 35. Other offices linked to the Halieia: Segre and Pagliuca 1949–1951, 215 no. 75; tomon: Jacopi 1932b, 188–190, no 18, l. 16; SEG 39, 739 (Kontorini 1989a, 164–167, no. 73; Badoud...
Apart from one fragment from Megiste (28) and one from Loryma (3), epigraphic evidence for Rhodian gymnasiarchos is confined to the island itself.17 The earliest clear evidence for the two gymnasiarchoi of the polis is 5 from the second century BC. But the magistrates should predate this since the tribal gymnasiarchoi are documented in the early third century BC (1), and the two gymnasiarchoi of the polis can feasibly be restored in a fragmentary dedication dated to the first half of the third century (2).

The architecture of the Rhodian gymnasion is not documented very well. Archaeological research has identified a building on the eastern slope of the acropolis below the temple of Apollo as a large gymnasion, but – as far as I know – apart from the big stadium, not much of the complex has been excavated to date. Several dedications of ἐπιστάται τῶν παιδίων from a large peristyle building in the south-eastern part of the lower city indicate that it served as a palaistra for boys. Since the literary sources persistently speak of only one gymnasion in Rhodes, it is likely that only the building on the acropolis slope was called by that name in antiquity.18

Leaving the exact definition of the age groups aside for later inspection, I will begin not with one of the CVs mentioned, but with an equally extraordinary monument that strikingly illuminates the status of a Rhodian gymnasiarchos under the Roman Empire (26): In the late second century AD, the town of Lindos, one of the island’s three original cities that had formed the new polis of Rhodes in 408 BC, honored Publius Aelius Kallistratos, also called Plancianus – the “eternal, most ambitious eponymous gymnasiarchos neoteros in the great polis of Rhodos” – by erecting a group of no less than eight statues of him and some members of his family: his grandparents, his wife, his mother, his father, his uncle and his fraternal grandmother. On the base of each statue, his gymnasiarchia is described as being perpetual (δι’ αἰώνος) as well as eponymous. But the gymnasiarchos himself is not the most prominent figure on the monument: That place is held jointly by his uncle (26 e) and grandmother (26 g), who had promised the foundation to the polis of Rhodes and other beneficences to the Lindians. So, at first glance, these inscriptions conform closely to what is expected of a ‘liturgical’ gymnasiarchos in the Imperial age, the emphasis being on the provision of funds for the gymnasion, for which the magistrate in this case – obviously being rather young, with three grandparents still alive – did not even provide the money himself.19

An ‘eternal’ gymnasiarchia, meaning that there was...
a foundation providing money for the funding of the gymnasion in the future, is attested for Rhodes only in this text, and an eponymous gymnasiarchia just in one other. However, the accentuation of financial aspects, specifically the distribution of oil, is associated with both gymnasiarchiai of the polis in a number of other inscriptions since the middle of the first century AD. But in all instances, the office and the distribution, the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου, while being closely connected, remain two distinct entities. And there is no indication that the distribution was not a voluntary act of the gymnasiarchos. On the contrary: The frequent emphasis of the fact that the gymnasiarch had contributed oil for a whole year – in one instance (22) explicitly even for all 13th months of an intercalary year – suggests that at least the extent of the distribution was not taken for granted. And in a Rhodian decree of the first century AD regulating the distribution and the sale of oil, probably in the gymnasion, the gymnasiarchoi are not mentioned at all. Rather, the duty is assigned to unspecified men who were responsible for allotted days (29). If a gymnasiarchos defrayed the costs of the distribution, he was probably relieving these men voluntarily. So there is no indication that on Rhodes γυμνασιαρχεῖν ever came to mean ‘to distribute oil’ in itself. And supplying the gymnasion with oil had of course already been a issue in the Hellenistic age. For Rhodes, there is the well-known passage in Polybius documenting that Hieron and Gelon of Syracuse donated oil for the “choregia of providing oil to the users of the gymnasion” after the great earthquake of 227 BC, and evidence for the term θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου dates back to the first century BC.

Kallistratos’ young age at his gymnasiarchia has a parallel in another inscription from the Imperial age: In the middle of the second century AD, a man called Damagoras was gymnasiarchos neoteros in the year his father held the eponymous priesthood of Halios (23, l. 3–6). Yet if we look at the Hellenistic evidence, the picture is rather similar. A number of CV inscriptions make it possible to reconstruct patterns in the chronological order in which Rhodians exercised public functions, and some of these texts are detailed enough to estimate the approximate age of the office holder at certain stages of his CV. The best example is a block of a statue base from the first half of the first century BC, featuring the longest known Rhodian CV from the Hellenistic age (10). This inscription probably includes the most detailed report on the offices a single person held in a polis of the Hellenistic age. Since it is nearly impossible to translate the catalogues of technical terms while retaining (or at least imitating) the syntactic structure and the layout of the original, I instead provide tabular overviews which separately list the honorand, the dedicants and – most importantly – the individual offices and additional information related to them, and also sum up longer entries of minor interest in the present context, such as decorations bestowed upon the honorand.

The honorand, whose name can be restored as Polyklês based on the plausible assumption that he was the fraternal grandfather of the fourth dedicant, had held a number of military posts and high civic offices in Rhodes. During his career which reached its peak when he was chairman of the Rhodian council (pyrta- nis) in the First Mithridatic War, he had held all three aforementioned gymnasiarchiai, having been, in this order, tribal gymnasiarchos, gymnasiarchos neoteros and gymnasiarchos presbyteros. Leaving the first function aside for later inspection, the other two are clearly placed in dis-

---

20 For the meaning of οἰώνος (or δι’ οἰώνος) γυμνασιαρχεία see Robert 1960, 294–298 (Robert 1969, 810–814) and Robert 1966a, 83–85; cf. Scholz 2015, 87–88. The qualification of an office as ‘perpetual’ was not limited to the gymnasiarchia: Laum 1914, 46–50. While Blinkenberg was puzzled by the apparent contradiction between ἐπίσυμονος and δι’ οἰώνος in the denomination of the gymnasiarchia (l. Lindos II, 465, comm. to f.), Louis Robert believed that the problem could be explained easily (Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1); Based on his assumption that Kallistratos was honoured posthumously (see above), he argued that ἐπίσυμονος is used to demonstrate the link of the honorand’s name to the annual distributions made in his memory. But this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with the fact that a gymnasiarchos quite certainly appears in a dating formula alongside the priest of Athana Lindia on the Lindian statue base 25. Why and in which context this kind of epymonic dating was used remains unclear. It is improbable that the practice was confined to Lindos, since there is no discernible reason why the Lindians alone should have distinguished a magistracy held in the city of Rhodes in this way.

21 Polyb. 5.88.5: ‘ἔργων γὰρ καὶ Γέλων… ἐδόθην ἐποίημα κοσμίων τῆς ἁρυμίας τοῖς ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ χορηγίαις. As the sum of 75 talents of silver is disproportionately high, a reference to the restoration of the city’s fortifications has probably been lost in the textual tradition: Walbank 1957, 617–618. For the provision of oil to the Hellenistic gymnasion in general and the growing requirements put on local elites by the end of royal euergetism see Fröhlich 2009. The first reference to the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου in Rhodes is 15; the testimonials from the Imperial age are 18, 19, 22, 21 and 22; cf. the εἴσοδος to the Lindian mentioned in 26 c, l. 13–14 and g, l. 10–12.

22 10, l. 13: ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις. This war can be identified by the nauarchos Damagoras mentioned in l. 14, who is also known from narrative sources (cf. Kontorinis 1993, 94–96). For the dating of his latest offices cf. Appendix II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>honorand</td>
<td>Polykles – – –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosos, Polykles and Kalliarista, Polykles, son of Polykles, grandson of Polykles (grandchildren)</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military service on light and heavy warships (ἀφράκτα and κατάφρακτοι νάες) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>20–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsalaried commander (ἀγμίων ἁγμήθος) in the Lindian chora</td>
<td>4–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiarchos of a phyle and victorious at the Poseidania, Rhomaia and Halieia</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>25–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiarchos neoteros</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presided over elections of jurors by lot</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commander of a squadron of light warships (ἄρχων ἀφράκτων)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commander of a squadron of 'fives' (ἀγμίων πεντηρέων) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed by the People as commander of commanders (ἀγμίων τῶν ἁγμών)</td>
<td>8–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant in a sea battle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategos on the Mainland (Peraia) and re-elected twice</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiarchos presbyteros</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretary of the council (γραμματεύς βουλᾶς) and crowned by his colleagues in office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prytani in the war and crowned by his colleagues in office councillor of the nausarchos Damagoras</td>
<td>12–13</td>
<td>88–85 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phylarchos and victorious at the Epitaphia</td>
<td>14–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triarchos of a 'four' (τετρήρης) and victorious at the examination of the ship</td>
<td>15–16</td>
<td>55–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choregos of the pyrghiche</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triarchos of a 'four' (τετρήρης) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78 BC (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choregos at the tragedies and victorious at the Alexandria and Dionysia</td>
<td>17–18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honours honoured by various associations and communities</td>
<td>18–36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 CV in Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10).
distinct areas of his CV: He was *gymnasiarchos neoteros* in an early phase of his career after the general military service in the navy frequently recorded at the beginning of Rhodian CVs, a command in the territorial army ( ἱκετεύον ἵκετος) that is also associated with young men in two other inscriptions, and being tribal *gymnasiarchos*.23 When he was *gymnasiarchos presbyteros* he was evidently older, as he already had been *strategos* (στρατηγός) three times and was on his way to becoming secretary of the council and *prytanis*. For this stage of his career, we have a close parallel in another, fragmentary statue base (8); Before the *gymnasiarchia*, the honorand whose name is lost had been treasurer, *strategos* and *prytanis*; afterwards, he had commanded a heavy warship, been victorious as a *choregos* (χορηγός) and held the eponymous priesthood of Kamiros (*damiorgos*).

Combining the positions of the *gymnasiarchia* in the CV with the observation that the offices are sometimes qualified with adjectives leads to the conclusion that the *gymnasiarchos* belonged to the respective age groups. However, the alternative use of the genitive plural implies that they were not simply a team of one younger and one older magistrate, but that each was responsible for his own age group. In recent literature, the Rhodian *neoteroi* and *presbyteroi* have been interpreted as age classes of the Rhodian youth (perhaps influenced by the subclassification of *epheboi* into *neoteroi*, *mesoi* and *presbyteroi* in Chios and some other poleis), or as minors and adults.24 But there is no compelling reason to assume that on Rhodes the terms were used any differently from what was customary in the Greek world, the *presbyteroi* being the older citizens, the *neoteroi* the younger, the dividing line usually set at the age of 30.25 That the *neoteroi* were not called by the more frequent term *νεοί* may be a simple linguistic variation reflecting the contrast to *presbyteroi* implied in the denomination of the two *gymnasiarchia*. Or it may be connected to the fact that no *ephebeia* is attested on Rhodes, so that the *neoteroi* may have been comprised of the age classes called *neoi* and *epheboi* elsewhere.26

If the *gymnasiarchos* were members of the respective age groups using the *gymnasion*, this constituted a limiting factor in the control the *polis* exercised over the *gymnasiarchia*. In the case of the *gymnasiarchos* of the *neoteroi*, an obvious alternative would have been to select an older citizen to keep them in line.27 And it is highly likely that the groups active in the gymnasion generally formed exclusive circles within their own age classes. For Rhodes, this assumption is supported by a statue base for a man holding this office dated to ca. 82–76 BC (11), listing about 450 names of Rhodians who participated in erecting the statue and who therefore are generally identified as *presbyteroi*. Even if the exact size of the Rhodian citizenry in the first century BC cannot be determined, it is obvious that 450 can only have been a small percentage of all male citizens aged over 30.28

---

23 In Rhodian CVs, naval service is usually indicated by στρατηγούμενον ἐν τοῖς ἰπποσι συν ἐν τοῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσὶ or a similar formula (cf. Gabrielsen 1997, 95 and, for the evidence, 7, l. 10–11 and 12, l. 5–6). The posting as an unsalaried *hegemon* is also part of the CVs documented in 7 (l. 14: γενομένον ἴσημον ἐμπόθοι ἐπὶ τὸ γῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ ναυσί, positioned likewise in between the naval service and the tribal gymnasiarchia) and on a stone shield dedicated by a Carian *koinon* listing naval service as the only other function of the honorand (Blümel 1991, 175–175 no. 782; Bresson, Brun, and Varinilioğlu 2011, 188–189 no. 63, l. 4–7: γεγομένον ἴσημον ἐμπόθοι | ἐπὶ τα Ἀρτουβων καὶ Παραβλειας καὶ στρατευσάμενον ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί | ἐπί τε Αρτουβων καὶ Παραβλειας | Γάιος Ῥωμαῖ[ος] | ἐπί τα ἀφράκτοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί | θεοῖς | εὐνοίας ἕνεκα | ἐπί τα ἔνεκα). It is also mentioned in the dedication IG XII, 3, 71: Γάιος Ῥωμαῖ[ος] | στρατηγούμενος | ἐπὶ Ἄρτουβον καὶ Παραβλειας | τα ἀφράκτοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί, presbyteroi, tropoi, Chankowski 2010, 202 (age classes of the Rhodian youth); Badoud 2010, 133 no. D 8 (presbyteroi meaning ‘adult’ i.e. aged over 18 years); Badoud 2015, 120: “En l’absence de classe d’âge intermédiaire, le premier [sc. of the gymnasiarchia] était responsable des mineurs, le second de majeurs”.
24 For the terms *neoi* and *neoteroi*, see Forbes 1933, 60–61 (referring to I. Sestos 1, l. 71, where *neoteroi* is employed instead of οὖν καὶ ἔμπροσθιον used otherwise in the decree); Knoepfler 1979, 176; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 77; Dreyer 2004, 214; van Bremen 2013, 33–34 (with n. 9: “Neoteroi was used only in opposition to presbyteroi”); cf. Fröhlich 2013, 82–84; Kennell 2013; Curty 2015, 63 with n. 83. For the arguments against an *ephebeia* in Rhodes see Chankowski 2010, 198–206 with Kah 2014, 268. According to Chankowski’s convincing argumentation, the *epheboi* mentioned in 1 are a case in point, since in the early Hellenistic age the term usually denoted the members of an *ephebeia* and not an age group in athletic contests. Therefore, the divergent Rhodian usage indicates that the Rhodians did not have the institution at this time, and there are no later epigraphic attestations to an *ephebeia* apart from local institutions in the subject Peria (cf. n. 17).
25 For the *neoi* as a “disruptive element” in the *polis* cf. van Bremen 2013, 33–44.
26 For 11 cf. Appendix II. According to various demographic models, individuals over 50 years of age made up between half and three-quarters of a pre-modern adult male population (cf. the literature cited in Kah 2014, 161 n. 90), and the Rhodian citizenry must have been substantially larger than 2000. A similar small sample is documented in a decree of the *presbyteroi* of Iasos, probably from the second half of the second century BC, indicating a total of 74 ballots cast in the voting (I. Iasos 93; Fröhlich 2013, 106–107 no. 2, l. 23). Parallel accounts in decrees of the *polis* of Iasos specify between ca. 800 and 1100 votes in the assembly (for the evidence see Fabiani 2012, 114–115, Fröhlich 2013, 80 n. 86 and Kah 2014.
It is interesting to compare an instance where an honorand of an inscription is called γυμνασιαρχός νεωτέρων in his CV (12): The man in question, called Pausanias, son of Leon, was active in the first half of the first century BC, and must have been rather young when his statue base was commissioned by the council of Rhodes, as most of the functions listed are typical of the early part of a public career: victory in a boys’ wrestling contest, from the boule (SEG 55, 1251; Curty 2015, 330–333), in contrast to voting results numbering between ca. 900 and 2000 documented for the assembly of the associated polis of Kolophon (Duplouy 2013).
service in the navy, command of a light warship (ἀφορακτον), and the gymnasarchia of the neoteroi. Assuming the CV is ordered chronologically, one could argue that it is unlikely that Pausanias was trierarchos of a regular warship while still being a neoteros. So it is possible that he became gymnasarchos of the neoteroi later, the designation γυμνασιαρχός νεωτέρων indicating that he did not belong to this age group himself anymore. Yet the positioning of the command of a small two-banked warship and the phylarchia before general military service in the navy is difficult to reconcile with a chronological order. In most other CVs, the military service is the first entry, only occasionally preceded by activities of boys (such as the wrestling victory here). One solution might be that the first three entries all cover activities of the honorand as a minor, since an explicit attestation of a phylarchos of men might indicate that there were phylarchos of boys as well. However, the CV’s chronological order could simply be jumbled.

In any case, it does not seem possible to explain the variation γυμνασιαρχός πρεσβυτέρων in a similar way. Since the office holder can hardly have been too young to be a presbyteros, the only alternative explanation would be that he was too old. But even accepting the assumption that there was a maximum age for the presbyteros – which is, as far as I know, neither supported by the sources in general nor by the Rhodian evidence – this explanation would not conform to the only attestation of the term γυμνασιαρχός πρεσβυτέρων which appears in a seemingly chronologically ordered CV before the command of a heavy warship and several other public offices (8, l. 3), virtually excluding the possibility that the honorand was already elderly at the time.

The third gymnasarchia attested on Rhodes is the office of γυμνασιαρχός φυλάττων φυλάττων. In two other inscriptions: In 7, the honorand Lysimachos was probably in his late twenties or early thirties, as he was already married and had two daughters, while his public career was still limited to his service in the navy, a posting as ἄγχυμον ἁμαρτωλος in the territorial army on the island and the tribal gymnasarchia. In the second inscription (4), the tribal gymnasarchia is named first in a compact selection of public functions cumulating in the offices of tamias, strategos and prytanis.

In the CV of Polykle (12, l. 7–8), the entry γυμνασιαρχός φυλάττων is combined with victories at agonistic festivals. Two fragmentary victory lists of the Great Erethimia from the early third century BC show that the tribal gymnasarchia were connected with the torch race teams (1). The official named first together with the victorious tribe is not the gymnasarchos but the phylarchos, the latter function being attested more often in Rhodian CV inscriptions. It is usually listed with victories at agonistic festivals and seems to have been performed by older men, like the gymnasarchia of the presbyteroi. Since in other places, torch racing teams were organised by lampadarchoi, the Rhodian phylarchia and the tribal gymnasarchia should be local variations of this liturgy. As there were two races, one of andres and one of ephebos, Vassa Kontorini has proposed that the phylarchos was responsible for the former group, the gymnasarchos for the

29 Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 262 no. 6: Πάφλος Δύσης | Ιστοπός | φοληργήσας ἀνδρῶν | και νικᾶς | Διό Ολυμπία. There were torch races of ephebos in Rhodes, but the official in charge of their teams was probably the tribal gymnasarchos (cf. p. 282–283). If the honorand of 12 was phylarchos of boys as a minor, he must have been something like the team captain, and the trierarchia of the two-banked ship mentioned before (12, l. 2–3: τριεραρχησάσθα | ἀδροπόσιον, to be complemented by πλοῖον or ναός) might have been a similar position in a boys’ boat race. The term deviates from the usual, well-attested Rhodian naval nomenclature, with only a single parallel in IGR IV, 1116, l. 4 (τριεραρχησάσθα | ἀπό ἐπίκωπον πλοῖον δικρότοον) that is conspicuous by asserting that the dikrōtos was a ship (πλοῖον) as well as equipped with oars (ἐπίκωπον), both characteristics being self-evident in a warship. I am not convinced by the interpretation offered by Gabrielsen 1997, 122–125, that these expressions designate privately owned warships, especially since the scant attestations do not correspond to the widespread use of these kinds of vessels assumed by Gabrielsen.

30 An inattentive redaction of the inscription might also explain the entry stating that the honorand had been crowned by (several) synarches (12, l. 7–8: συναρχιᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν | στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν) although the inscription mentions only one office (the gymnasarchia) that could have been part of such a board of magistrates.


32 The festivals named are the Poseidania, the Rhomaia and the Halieia (l. 5–6), indicating that Polykle had either been tribal gymnasarchos repeatedly or (since that should be indicated by the addition of a multiplicative adverb) that the festivals named had all been held in a single year. In this case, the Halieia mentioned should be the lesser annual version of the festival (cf. SIGIV 3, 1067 comm. at l. 12; Arnold 1936, 435; Morelli 1959, 97), since the pentaeteric μέγιστον Ἀλέξιον (cf. e.g. l. 1) were celebrated within two years distance of the Rhomaia (cf. the reconstruction of the Rhodian festival cycle in the first century BC by Badoud 2015, 133–134).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>honorand</th>
<th>Lysimachos, son of Aristeidas</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dedicants</td>
<td>Aristeidas, son of Aristeidas (father)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gorgon, Aristeidas, Philinna, Timakrate (brothers and sisters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulakrate, daughter of Isidotos (wife)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulakrate and Gorgo, daughters of Aristeidas (daughters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isodotos, son of Aratogenes (father in law)</td>
<td>2–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military service on triboi and heavy warships</td>
<td>κατάφρακτοι νᾶες</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and honoured by an association of soldiers and crowned with a golden crown</td>
<td>Παναθηναϊστᾶν στρατευομένων κοινόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsalaried commander (ἀγεμὼν ἄμισθος) in the chora on the island (Rhodes)</td>
<td>10–13 20–30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasiarchos of a phyle (in a year with the) Halieia megala</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 4 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 192–192 no. 19 (7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>honorand</th>
<th>Eudamos, son of Dexicharis</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dedicant</td>
<td>Gorgon, son of Timokles, adoptive son of Diokles (ward of Eudamos)</td>
<td>2–3 4–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public offices and functions</td>
<td>gymnasiarchos of a phyle</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trierarchos</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commander over Karia (ἀγεμὼν ἐπὶ Καρίας)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treasurer (tamias)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strategos on the mainland (Peraia)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prytanis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 5 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 192–193 no. 20 (4).
latter.\textsuperscript{33} That seems plausible, but it is curious that the tribe’s name is recorded only with the phylarchos, giving the impression that he and the gymnasiarchos belonged to the same phyle. Since the two victorious teams can hardly have been from the same tribe on a regular basis, it should also be considered that both officials belonged to the team of the andres, making the gymnasiarchos some kind of team captain.

Another unexplained point is why the tribal officials were called gymnasiarchoi in the first place. Their attested area of activity, their youthful age and their subordinate position to the phylarchoi virtually exclude the possibility that they were responsible for local gymnasia. Furthermore, there is no evidence for such institutions in the first place. The urbanised tribal centres of Lindos and Kamiros may have had some kind of facilities for physical training that remain unknown due to the limited archaeological exploration of these sites. The foundations promised by the family of Kallistratos in the late second century AD illustrate the situation in Lindos, distinguishing a ‘perpetual’ gymnasiarchia for the polis from equally ‘eternal’ annual distributions of oil (ἐλαιοθέσια) for the Lindians (26 e, l. 6–16 and g, l. 5–3). Thus, the latter apparently had need of oil without possessing an institutionalised gymnasion. And the lalysis did not have any reason to have a gymnasion of their own in the first place, as lalysos had evolved into a village after the synoikismos in 428 BC, with the majority of the population migrating to the new city of Rhodos. Finally, the possibility that the tribal gymnasiarchia refers to a local institution antedating the synoikismos is rendered improbable by the evolution of the gymnasiarchia in general. So the reason for this denomination of the function remains enigmatic.

In any event, the tribal gymnasiarchoi demonstrates that apart from the magistracies of the polis, one also has to take into account the possibility of offices of subdivisions such as tribes. In this context, it is interesting to observe that the tribal gymnasiarchia not only appears in the context of the phylai of the city of Rhodes, but also in a victory list of an association (6). In a close parallel to the victory lists mentioned above, the catalogue has seven entries dated by an agonothetes, followed by the victorious phyle, the phylarchos and the gymnasiarchos. The association had obviously copied a part of Rhodian public organisation on a lesser scale: Like the polis, the koion was divided into three phylai, named after its founder, his wife and his daughter-in-law, and held games with contesting tribal teams.

3 Conclusion

The Rhodian evidence shows that while the distribution of oil was an increasingly important aspect of the gymnasiarchia under the Roman Empire, there is no indication that it was ever seen as primarily liturgical. In the inscriptions, the distribution is added to the office and treated as a voluntary munificence. Other aspects of the office remained unchanged: Since the Hellenistic age, the Rhodians had two annual gymnasiarchoi, one for the younger men (neoteroi) and one for the older men (presbyteroi). While these officials were magistrates of the polis, their positions in Rhodian CVs show that they were recruited from the respective age groups, limiting the control the polis could exercise over the gymnasion. The third Rhodian gymnasiarchia was a tribal office exercised by young men in cooperation with an older official, the phylarchos, both offices being mentioned only in the context of organizing teams for torch races. Combined with the fact that these tribal offices were copied by a Rhodian koion, this variation demonstrates that not every attestation of a gymnasiarchos has to be connected to a gymnasion or a public magistracy.

A further perspective for research offered by the Rhodian CVs would be a review of the status of the gymnasiarchia within the magistratures of a polis, the commonly held opinion being that the gymnasiarchia was one of the most important offices of the Hellenistic polis but lost some of its standing under the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33} Kontorini 1975, 109–111; cf. Schuler 2004, 166 and Chankowski 2010, 202 discussing only the gymnasiarchia. For the lampadarchia in general see Oehler 1924 (cf. the evidence from Priene cited above). The phylarchos is also mentioned in 10, l. 14–15 and 12, l. 3. For further epigraphic evidence cf. l. Lindos I, 222, comm. to l. 4–5 and Kontorini 1975, 109.

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. Scholz 2015, 89–90. The surprisingly low number of texts in the new collection of Hellenistic decrees for gymnasiarchoi (Curty 2015) actually encourages to question the importance of the gymnasiarchia in this age. Even allowing for the fact that Curty did not include decrees giving no information about the activities of a gymnasiarchos or fragmentary texts, the number of only 40 – including three excerpts from decrees for an honorand who had held a greater number of offices from Priene (no. 24–26), and to be enlarged by the addition of seven decrees from Pergamon only listed in a short appendix (Curty 2015, 335–336) – seems quite mod-
Contrasting with this, evidence for the *gymnasiarchia* in the Rhodian CVs seems to stay remarkably unchanged over time. While the few references to the tribal *gymnasiarchos* are all from Hellenistic inscriptions, both *gymnasiarchoi* of the *polis* feature in CVs from the second century BC to the second century AD. The rich Rhodian material would make it possible to contrast the nine CVs mentioning the *gymnasiarchia* to those which do not. The overall number of CVs in Rhodian inscriptions being at least several dozen, *gymnasiarchoi* are obviously mentioned in just a fraction of them. It would take a detailed investigation of this type of inscription to reveal the information necessary to put this observation into perspective, such as the chronological development of the CVs and the public functions listed in them, or the selective criteria discernible from their composition.

est, compared with, e.g., the ca. 180 known decrees for foreign judges (cf. Cassayre 2010, 131–154 with a preliminary catalogue). The geographical distribution of the decrees also needs to be investigated further, since those cities represented in the collection mostly contribute just a single text, while a lot of *poleis* with an otherwise rich epigraphic documentation are conspicuously absent (cf. Kah 2017).
Appendix I: Epigraphic sources

(A) The Rhodian gymnasiarchoi


face A: ετε ρεός [Διο]πεθεὸς και ιεροποιῶν τῶν σὺν Ἀγησιπόλει, Ἄγασιμένευς,


φ[λαμπάδι ἀπὸ πράτας ἑφήβων | SEG 15, 499.

In l. 1 is not sufficiently justified, since the parallels are from Mobolla (cf. n. 17) and there is no indication that Loryma had magistracies of its own, much less a gymnasion or an ephebeia. The remains could also be restored as one of a number of other offices indicated by a participle (e.g. στραταγβήσαντος) if Chankowski who abstains from restoring l. 1 and Chankowski 2010, 445. The inscription could have named two magistrates making the offering or one dedicant with a short CV.

Based on the form of the Sigma reproduced by Chaviaras, Bresson hesitantly dates the inscription to the fourth or third century BC (“les eta ouverts” must be a misprint since there is only one Eta in the preserved text and the letter form cannot be characterised as “open” anyway). The mention of the gymnasiarchos makes a fourth-century date improbable, and if the inscription comprised a CV, this should date it to even later than the third century.

In l. 3, Bresson retains the restoration [Ἀπόλλων]ων proposed in the editio princeps, but Blümel, arguing that a dedication to Apollon made by a gymnasiarchos is unlikely, considers reading – – – ὙΩΝ [– – –].


In l. 6–11: καὶ γυμνασιάρχαντας φιλαξ | καὶ τριμαρχίςάντας | καὶ γενομένου ἀγεμόνος ἐπὶ Καρίας | καὶ τμιεύσαντος | καὶ στραταχγήσαντος ἐν τῶι πέραν | καὶ προτανεύσαντος.

5 Collection of decrees concerning the library (βιβλιοθήκη), Rhodos, second century BC.

Two fragments of originally at least four slabs, arranged two-by-two (cf. Rosamilia 2014, 332–334 and 353). Frg. a, containing minor remains of two decrees is part of the slab on the upper left, frg. b (still unpublished) is the lower-right slab carrying the right half of the text of three decrees. On the inscription, see Rosamilia 2014.

The inscriptions have been palaeographically dated to the second century. There are some historical arguments for a date after 168 BC (Wiener 2002, 334 with n. 38) that will have to be reappraised once frg. b has been published in full. The narrowing of the date to 140–120 BC proposed by Rosamilia 2014, 354–355 is based on a weak prosopographical parallel only.

Frg. a: Maiuri 1925, 7 no. 4; Rosamilia 2014, 349–355.

Frg. b: Papachristodoulou 1986 (excerpts and photo); Papachristodoulou 1990 (description and photo); cf. SEG 37, 699; Bringmann 2002, 72–73; Hoepfner 2002, 68–72 (with a hypothetical identification and reconstruction of the building); Chankowski 2010, 199 n. 278; Coqueugniot 2013, 134–136; Drelis-Iraklidou 2014, 44; Rosamilia 2014, 332–349.

In the second and third decree of frg. b, the first two lines after the date contain the phrase εἰς τῶι
The gymnasiarchs are mentioned several times in other parts of the decrees: Frg. a, l. 6 (cf. Maiuri 1925, 32–35 no. 20; Badoud 2015, 398 no. 31).

The plural probably refers to the gymnasiarchs presbyteros and the gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic age to the Roman Empire.

The list has seven entries following the pattern ἐπί ἀγωνοθέτων κατὰ πόλεμον καὶ γενόμενον ἁγεμόνα ἄμισθον ἐπὶ τᾶς χώρας καὶ πρυτανεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῶι πολέμωι καὶ στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶι συναρχόντων (cf. Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18). For the date cf. Appendix II.

8 Fragment of a statue base, Rhodos, second or first century BC: Maiuri 1925, 35–36 no. 21 with corrections by Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 311 n. 2.


Maiuri’s restoration and [στραταγεσσαντα ἐπι] τας χωρας in l. 1 is short, and the spacing between KA and the lower end of a vertical stroke indicated by his drawing fits KAT better than KAI. In l. 4, Maiuri has πεντη[μειωσαν] (with PENTE in the drawing) but when a type of ship is added to the title of a trierarchos in Roman inscriptions, it is always named in the singular.


11 Statue base, Rhodos, ca. 80–70 BC (?): IG XII, 1, 46; Badoud 2015, 399–424, no. 3. For the date and further details see Appendix II.


mentioned on 17 must be at least some years later, but since the base is broken at the bottom it is also possible that a long CV followed, dating the base closer to the middle of the first century BC.

18 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, 45 AD: IG XII, 1, 829; I. Lindos II, 384 d; Badoud 2015, 439–441 no. 63. On the date see Habicht 1990 (SEG 40, 668).


19 Statue base with CV, Lindos, ca. 70–120 AD: I. Lindos II, 454.

l. 13–16: γυμνασιαρχήσαντα νεώτερους και ποιησάμενον | τάν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου και ἄρχαντα | ἄρχας.

Blinkenberg’s date of 80–100 AD (accepted by Badoud 2015, 239 no. 823 without discussion) is based on his supplement and ἰερατεύσαντα – – – τοῦ | Αὐτοκράτο[ρος] [Καίσαρος Δομειτια] | νοῦ in l. 17–18. In the commentary, he admits that the restoration is uncertain and other emperors’ names are also possible. He argues that Domitian fits the palaeography of the inscription best, but Ὀμίσθενε | νοῦ (which may be to long) or Τραία | νοῦ (possibly preceded by Νέρων instead of Καίσαρος) would be chronologically well within the margin of error of even a rather precise palaeographic dating.


l. 8–16: γυμνασιαρχήσαντα νεώτερους και ποιησάμενον | τάν | θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου | ἐν τῷ ἀγόμενῳ ἀγῶνα ἐν Νεαπόλει και ἐν ἐπανελείας | και προ[σφοράς].

21 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, between 80 and 90 AD: Pugliese Carratelli 1939–1942, 154–155 no. 14;
pl. XII; Bresson 2004, 228–230 no. 2; SEG 54, 723.

I. 5–14: γυμνασιαρχήσαντα | νεωτέρων και ποιη-
σάμενον ταύταν θείον του έλλατον | είχε [την] ιερατεύσαντα | Αδείας 
λίνθιας και Δόκι Πολιέως η[αι Αρτάμοιος | 
Κεκίης και πρε-
σβέσαντα πλευρά[ῶς | πο[η]τ] [τη] τούς Σέ-
βατούς και ποτ[ι]ν [υ]πάτους και | ποτ[ι] πρότοποις και 
τυχόντα τά[ς] Ρωμ[αίων πολι[τε]ίας και[τ]] γενό-
υμ[ον] ἀρχηγόδωρον ἰερ[ωνήσαντα | και] τ[ρ]απετεύσαντα και Π[οί]]
πάμε[ν] [νοθετήσαντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῶν Ἁλείων ἀγῶνο-
νοθετήσαντα | τοῦ Προπάτορος Ἡλίων κατὰ 
τοῦ Ἐρ(ειναῆ) | [Πόπ]λιον Αἴλιον Ἁγήτορα βʹ | [ἐ]πιγυμ-
[α]σιαρχοῦ τοῦ δεῖνος].

The honorand whose name is lost is probably T. Flavius Aglochartos, honoured in 20 (as proposed by Bresson 2004, 230–232) since both CVs exhibit a number of similar entries: honours by the three tribal centres, the gymnasiarchia of the neutoroi and the theésis of the élaiou, the priesthood of Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus, the embassies, and participation in epangeliai and proeisphoriai. However, both CVs also show some differences, which may be due to their respective redactions. But since neither the identical functions nor their sequence are uncommon, it is not impossible that the bases belonged to statues of two separate honorands with similar CVs.


I. 5–8: τριμαρχήσαντα, ιερατεύσαντα | τῶν 
Αὐτοκρατέρων, γυμνασιαρχήσαντα ποιη-
σάμενον ταύταν θείον τοῦ έλλατον ἐπί μήνας δεκαπεντετραεμ. ἀγῶνοι], νοθετήσαντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῶν Ἁλείων ἀγῶνοι, 
τοῦ Ἐρ(ειναῆ) | Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Ἁγήτορα βʹ | [ἐπ' ἰερέως ταύταν διὰ 
τὸν δι’ ἑλλατοῦ ἐπαγγελμέ 
νοθετήσαντα τοῦ δεῖνος].

For the intercalary 13th month in Rhodian chronology see Badoud 2015, 138–140.

23 Statue base with CV, Lindos, middle of the second century AD: I. Lindos II, 482 (see Appendix III).

I. 2–5: ιερατεύσαντα | τοῦ προπάτορος Ἀλίου κατά 
τὸ δ[η]στερον, τοῦ νῦν αὐτοῦ Δαμα] [γόραν δη' γυμνασιαρχή 
νεωτέρων ο[ν] ιερατεύσαντα γενόμενον κατὰ τὸν ε[ινα] 
τὸν τὰς προπάτος αὐτοῦ ἱερωσύνας.

I. 8–10: χρονολογήσαντα, γυμνασιαρχήσαντα 
πρεσβυτέρων [ον πρεσβυτέρων], γράμμα[τ]εστάντα ἄρτο-
λάς, ταμιεύσαντα, στραταγονήσαντα, ποιη-
σάμενον τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου | [Πόπ]λιον Αἴλιον Ἁγήτορα βʹ | [ἐπ' ἰερέως ταύταν διὰ 
τὸν δι’.

Part i (set below the bases): ἐπὶ γυμνασιαρχοῦ νεωτέρου | Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Καλλιστράτου τοῦ καὶ Πλαγκιανοῦ Ἀντιπατροῦ Ἐρευνάεως.

The uncle Publius [elius] Theon, son of Zenodotos alias Theon, had also been gymnasiarchos, a fact only mentioned on the base of the statue of the grandmother Aelia Zenodote (g, l. 6). Since he is not called γυμνασιαρχήσας, strictly he should have held the office at the time the bases were dedicated, resulting in a ‘family team’ of uncle and nephew officiating in both gymnasiiarchias in the same year. But the use of the noun could also be explained as resulting from Latin influence (cf. the comment on 24).


Face a, l. 1–6: ὠν [θεσίας] | γυμνασιαρχήσας (??).


The kind of monument the fragment belonged to cannot be determined, since the editio princeps offers no information beyond the letters themselves and the find-spot in a private house, and the stone itself seems to be lost. The remains can be restored either as a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας or one of γυμνασιαρχήσας, probably referring to a Rhodian gymnasiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

(b) The gymnasion in Rhodes

29 Decree regulating the furnishing of oil, Rhodes, first century AD: IG XII, 1, 3; SIG3 III, 974; Badoud 2015, 360–361 no. 17.


Part i (set below the bases): ἐπὶ γυμνασιαρχοῦ νεωτέρου | Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Καλλιστράτου τοῦ καὶ Πλαγκιανοῦ Ἀντιπατροῦ Ἐρευνάεως.

The uncle Publius [elius] Theon, son of Zenodotos alias Theon, had also been gymnasiarchos, a fact only mentioned on the base of the statue of the grandmother Aelia Zenodote (g, l. 6). Since he is not called γυμνασιαρχήσας, strictly he should have held the office at the time the bases were dedicated, resulting in a ‘family team’ of uncle and nephew officiating in both gymnasiiarchias in the same year. But the use of the noun could also be explained as resulting from Latin influence (cf. the comment on 24).


Face a, l. 1–6: ὠν [θεσίας] | γυμνασιαρχήσας (??).

The kind of monument the fragment belonged to cannot be determined, since the editio princeps offers no information beyond the letters themselves and the find-spot in a private house, and the stone itself seems to be lost. The remains can be restored either as a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας or one of γυμνασιαρχήσας, probably referring to a Rhodian gymnasiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

Appendix II: Dating IG XII, 1, 46 (11) and Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10)

A monument of special interest for the Rhodian gymnasiiarchias is IG XII, 1, 46 (11), a statue base for Asklapidas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασιαρχήσας, probably rendered as Asklaipiadas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασιαρχήσας, perhaps referring to a Rhodian gymnasiiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

A day-by-day list of contributors deriving from this or a similar regulation is IG XII, 1, 4 (Badoud 2015, 361–366 no. 18).

30 Fragmentary regulations concerning the pentathlon, Rhodes (in the vicinity of the gymnasion), first century AD (?); Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 289–290 no. 65; Moretti 1956; SEG 15, 501.

Col. I, l. 18–20: [γγγγγγγγγγγγγγγγ] [– – –]ς γυμνασιαρχήσας (??). The scant remains of the first column allow no certain restorations. In l. 19, supplementing a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας as well as one of γυμνασιαρχήσας, one could consider either a genitive singular (with τάς) or the supplement χρείας, giving the passage a more general sense.

Appendix II: Dating IG XII, 1, 46 (11) and Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10)

A monument of special interest for the Rhodian gymnasiiarchias is IG XII, 1, 46 (11), a statue base for Asklapidas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασιαρχήσας, probably referring to a Rhodian gymnasiiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

A day-by-day list of contributors deriving from this or a similar regulation is IG XII, 1, 4 (Badoud 2015, 361–366 no. 18).

30 Fragmentary regulations concerning the pentathlon, Rhodes (in the vicinity of the gymnasion), first century AD (?); Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 289–290 no. 65; Moretti 1956; SEG 15, 501.

Col. I, l. 18–20: [γγγγγγγγγγγγγγγγ] [– – –]ς γυμνασιαρχήσας (??). The scant remains of the first column allow no certain restorations. In l. 19, supplementing a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας as well as one of γυμνασιαρχήσας, one could consider either a genitive singular (with τάς) or the supplement χρείας, giving the passage a more general sense.

Appendix II: Dating IG XII, 1, 46 (11) and Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10)

A monument of special interest for the Rhodian gymnasiiarchias is IG XII, 1, 46 (11), a statue base for Asklapidas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασιαρχήσας, probably referring to a Rhodian gymnasiiarchos since it is very unlikely that the small island had a gymnasion of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a gymnasiarchos would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.
There is one additional basic point of criticism: A cornerstone of Badoud 2015, 132. A Rhodian embassy to the senate including the orator Roscius in the year 80 BC (Cic. Brut. 90 [312]: *eodem tempore Moloni de domus operam; dictatore enim Sulla legatus ad senatum de Rhodiorum praemium venerat*). Accordingly, Schmitt 1957, 182 dates the visit to 81 BC, but it might have been even later. Therefore, it is not certain that the Roman decision was made soon enough for the Rhodians to turn the Rhomaia of 82 BC into a special event. 

37 Despite having been *gymnasiarchos presbyters* himself, the honorand of 10, Polykles, is not mentioned in 11. Assuming that the catalogue in 11 names all *presbyters* alive or at least active when the statue was erected, the simplest explanation is that Polykles was already dead at this time. Following Maiuri, Badoud dates 10 to ca. 82 BC, so that it could predate 11 slightly. But this date is difficult to maintain: As mentioned above, Polykles reached the pinnacle of his political career during the First Mithridatic War (88–85 BC), and he held at least five public functions afterwards, one of them a posting as *trierarchia* in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον: 10, l. 17). While dating this *trierarchia* to 85 BC is not impossible, it would mean that three of the functions mentioned before – a *phylarchia*, a command of a *tetrereis* Polykles had apparently not performed κατὰ πόλεμον, and a *choregia* (10, l. 14–16), each combined with a victory in a competition – have to be compressed into a period of just three years. Thus it seems more plausible that these activities should be dated after 85 BC and that the war mentioned was one of the Roman campaigns against ‘pirates’ between 78 and 67 BC or the Third Mithridatic War (74–63 BC). This would date Polykles’ statue to ca. 70 BC, arguing that if 11 is to be dated at least a short time later, one should reconsider the proposal made by van Gelder and Benediktsson.

39 Maiuri 1923, 22; Badoud 2015, 212, no. 122.
Appendix III: I. Lindos II, 482 (23)

The office of gymnasiearchos is mentioned twice in a part of a CV on a fragmentary statue base found on the acropolis of Lindos and published by Christian Blinkenberg as I. Lindos II, 482. The inscription has now been dated by Nathan Badoud to the middle of the second century AD (Badoud 2015, 237 no. 841). With the correction proposed by Badoud 2015, 186 n. 429 the text reads as follows:

\[\tau\alpha\varsigma\ Α\theta\alpha\varsigma\ νας\ τ\alpha\varsigma\ ε\nu\ Αχα\varsigma\ αι\varsigma\ π\ο\varsigma\ [\epsilon\iota,\ \delta\alpha\mu\ιω\υ\varepsilon\γ\iota\varsigma\] -
ta \tau\varepsilon\ ε\nu\ Καμ\ivarepsilon\ ρ\xi\varepsilon\ ι\varepsilon\ι\varepsilon\ι\varsigma\ kai\ \tau\varepsilon\ \[\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\ Τε\varepsilon\ι\varsigma\] -
to\upsilon\ \pro\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon
to\upsilon\ \pro\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon
\[τ\alpha\varsigma\ Α\theta\alpha\varsigma\ νας\ τ\alpha\varsigma\ ε\nu\ Αχα\varsigma\ αι\varsigma\ π\ο\varsigma\ [\epsilon\iota,\ \delta\alpha\mu\ιω\υ\varepsilon\γ\iota\varsigma\]
\[τ\alpha\varsigma\ Α\θ\α\varsigma\ ν\varsigma\ τ\upsilon\ ε\nu\ Αχα\varsigma\ αι\varsigma\ π\ο\varsigma\ [\epsilon\iota,\ \delta\α\mu\ι\ω\γ\iota\varsigma\] -
ta \tau\varepsilon\ ε\nu\ Καμ\ivarepsilon\ ρ\xi\varepsilon\ ι\varepsilon\ι\varepsilon\ι\varsigma\ kai\ \tau\varepsilon\ \[\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\ Τε\varepsilon\ι\varsigma\] -
4  \[\tau\alpha\varsigma\ Α\theta\alpha\varsigma\ νας\ τ\alpha\varsigma\ ε\nu\ Αχα\varsigma\ π\o\varsigma\ [\epsilon\iota,\ \delta\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\] -
to\upsilon\ \pro\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon\o\upsilon
8  \[\chi\rho\varepsilon\φ\omega\f\iota\varsigma\kappa\iota\varsigma\varsigma\alpha\iota\varsigm
The gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic age to the Roman Empire

For ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Ῥωμαίων in l. 10 cf. SEG 39, 749 (Kontorini 1989a, 145–148 no. 62; cf. Badoud 2015, 187 no. A 90), l. 1–3: ἱερεὺς Ἡλίου καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης τοῦ ἀγῶνος τῶν Ῥωμαίων. The oddity that the son’s office is inserted into the father’s CV retaining the accusative of the main list (instead of using a genitivus absolutus, for instance) remains, but I do not see how this could be solved in any case. Otherwise, the inscription contains a typical Rhodian CV listing a gymnasiarchia, with all probability that of the presbyteroi, alongside other public functions.

Appendix IV: The gymnasiarchia of Nisyros

In addition to the evidence for the gymnasiarchiai of Rhodes proper, there is one inscription mentioning a gymnasiarchos active on Nisyros. Situated north-west of Rhodes, the island had been incorporated into the polis of Rhodes probably at the very end of the third century BC, forming a damos of its own. A CV inscription on a statue base dated to the first century AD documents that the honorand, a member of the local damos, had served in the (Rhodian) navy, had been crowned several times by the council (of Rhodes), had been priest of the Emperors in Nisyros, damiourgos and gymnasiarchos in Nisyros and had distributed oil for 13 months. Since it is evident from the text that the gymnasiarchia is a local institution and not one of Rhodes, I did not include it in the catalogue in Appendix I.

The inscription is the sole evidence for a gymnasiarchia on Nisyros or one of the other islands belonging to the Rhodian state (cf. the commentary to 28). As far as I know, there is no archaeological record of a gymnasium on Nisyros (or, for that matter, for a temple of a local Imperial cult). Based on this scant evidence, there is no way to determine whether the gymnasiarchia was a relic from the independent polis of Nisyros of the third century BC or, like the imperial cult, a new development of the first century AD. The CV itself reveals a special position of Nisyros: Following the Rhodian model in its overall arrangement, it offers some apparently local variations, one of them in the description of the distribution of oil: The text from Nisyros has θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον, whereas the Rhodian inscriptions use ποιησάμενος τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἔλαιου, and there is no parallel text from Rhodes where the recipients of the distribution are named, much less enumerated as distinct groups (cf. the evidence discussed in note 21).

41 IG XII, 3, 124, l. 1–11: Γνωμαγόραν Δωροθέου | Νεισύριον | στρατευσάμενον ἐν τριημιολίᾳ, ἄ νομα Εὐανδρία Σεβαστά, καὶ στεφάνω θέντα ἅπαν Εὐανδρίας καὶ δαμιουργήσαντα καὶ γυμνασιαρχήσαντα{ν} ἐν Νισύρῳ καὶ θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον πᾶσι ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς κατοίκοις ἐν Νεισύρῳ καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδαμεῖσιν ἐπὶ μῆνες (l. μῆνας) ηγ. For the historical evidence for Nisyros as a part of Rhodos see Pachristodoulou 1989, 47.

42 The other variation is the description of the honorand’s merits concerning the local associations heading the otherwise conventional list of honours awarded by associations at the end of the CV (l. 11–12: γενόμενον εὐάρεστον πᾶσι τοῖς κοινοῖς τοῖς ἐν Νισύρῳ), the term κοινόν being a synonym for κοινόν rarely found in inscriptions generally and never on Rhodes.
Tab. 6  CV in I. Lindos II 482 (23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[priest] of Athana in <em>Achaia polis</em> (Ialysos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>[damiorgos] to Hestia and Zeus (Teleios) in Kamiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[priest] of the Halios in the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>[his son Damagoras] <em>gymnasiarchos neoteros</em> (or of the <em>neoteroi</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>in the year of his father’s (eponymous) priesthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>priest of Athana Polias, Zeus Polieus and Herakles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–7</td>
<td>commander of the territory (ἀγεμὼν τᾶς χώρας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>temple-treasurer (ἰεροταμίας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>superintendent of the archive (<em>chreophylax</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>gymnasiarchos</em> (<em>presbyteros</em> or of the <em>presbyteroi</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–9</td>
<td>secretary of the council (<em>γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>treasurer (<strong>tamian</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>strategos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10</td>
<td><em>prytanis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>agonothetes of the <em>Rhomaia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ambassador to emperors as well as (to governors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–12</td>
<td>participating in major <em>proeisphorai</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 7  CV in IG XII 3, 104.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Ginomagoras, son of Dorotheos, from the <em>damos</em> Nisyrioti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>military service on the <em>trihemiolia</em> named Euandria Sebasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>crowned several times by the (Rhodian) councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>priest of the imperial cult in Nisyros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>damiorgos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11</td>
<td><em>gymnasiarchos</em> in Nisyros and distributing oil for 13 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interpreting the Plural ‘Gymnasia’ within the Context of Ruler Cult: Buildings or Festivals?

Summary

Gymnasiarchy turned into an euergetic magistracy of a few wealthy families in late Hellenistic and Roman periods. Inscriptions from Asia Minor record iterated gymnasiarchies over several years and even monthly or daily periods of office, and describe gymnasiarchs who supervised several, even as many as 7, gymnasia simultaneously. The scanty archaeological evidence challenges the idea that so many gymnasia really constituted buildings within a single polis-territory. This paper suggests to interpret such multiple gymnasia in the sense of event cycles or small-scale periods of gymnasiarchy within the festivities of ruler cult. Already in Classical times, γυμνάσια could be generally taken to mean bodily exercises. A similar meaning may apply to the epigraphic record from the Roman East.

Keywords: Gymnasiarchie; Moschion; Cratippus; Pasparos; Nikephoria

I am grateful to Monika Trümper (Berlin), Daniel Kah (Stuttgart), Michael Wörrle (Munich), Ulrich Mania (Istanbul), Francesco Ferruti (Rome) and Ralf von den Hoff (Freiburg) for their discussion and helpful criticism of this paper. Furthermore, I would like to thank Nina King for her accurate reading of this article. The key argument put forward and developed in this study is based on an idea expressed in a previous paper by the author published in Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 188, 2014, 171–180.
According to a recently discovered inscription from Roman Syria, a gymnasiarchy that spanned several provinces existed alongside the traditional civic gymnasiarchies. This gymnasiarchy was related to the ruler cult. During the same time in Pergamon, a priest of the imperial cult appears to have held the function as ‘gymnasiarch of the Sebasta Rhomaia in the five gymnasia’.

Also, the formulation used in another Pergamene career inscription, according to which an office-holder was in charge of no fewer than ‘six gymnasia’ within the context of the provincial games of Asia also sounds somewhat unusual. Are such deviations from the standard designations of civic gymnasiarchs just exceptional cases? Research to date has mainly – and for the Classical and Hellenistic Periods – legitimately studied ‘the gymnasium’ (always expressed in the singular) within the context of its architectural features and development. Whether differences based upon the respective geographical or institutional conditions play a role is seldom investigated.

The epigraphic tradition raises many questions concerning the different use of the term γυμνάσιον from Hellenism to the Roman Imperial period. In particular, if we examine gymnasiarchies within the context of supra-regional ruler cults and consider the different usages of the plural ‘gymnasia’ from Classical times onwards, the prevalent view that 1.) the competence of gymnasiarchs was restricted to the territories of individual poleis and, 2.) the term γυμνάσιον was exclusively used to denote buildings, starts to crumble.

1 A supra-regional gymnasiarchy in Syria

An honorary inscription from Tyre dated to the local year 169 (= 43/44 AD) represents the first explicit evidence of a “gymnasiarch of the four eparchies”, 4 δώδεκα ν. τοῦ ΘΞΡ ἐτος τῶν Δ ἐπαρχιῶν / τὸ ΘΞΡ ἐτος (‘Diodoros, son of Idas, was gymnasiarch of the four eparchies, (local) year 169’). The ambiguous Greek term ἐπαρχίαι (or provinciae in Latin) refers primarily to the administrative sub-divisions within the gubernatorial province of Syria (such as Phoenice or Commagene). However, studies to date have suggested that gymnasiarch’s services usually did not cover groups outside a particular polis, as stated by previous scholars such as H.-I. Marrou or P. Gauthier. W. Ameling even suggests that ‘acting for the gymnasium does not apply to any group beyond the polis’ in contrast to this, the new Tyrian inscription mentions four eparchies as the area of authority covered by the gymnasiarch Diodoros; this area went far beyond Tyre. The clarifying clause τῶν Δ ἐπαρχιῶν in the inscription has proved to be an addition made by another stonecutter in a comparably careless execution, as the inscription seems to be simply a graffito. It is not possible to determine when this addition was made. In any case, someone wished to specify the extraordinary area of responsibility of Diodoros’s office after his magistracy as gymnasiarch.

This interesting testimony from Tyre doesn’t stand alone in Syria’s epigraphic documentation: an inscription from Gerasa (today’s Jerash, in Jordan) provides the earliest parallel reference for such supra-civic offices in the context of ruler cult in Roman Syria. The stele, dat-

---

1 See most recently the comprehensive survey of Curty 2015 on the Hellenistic inscriptions honouring gymnasiarchs.
3 Gehirke 2004, 413, points out that the situation was more varied and complex: “Eher könnte man von ‘Hellenistischen Gymnasien’ statt von ‘dem Hellenistischen Gymnasium’ sprechen. Anders gesagt: Die grundlegende und primäre Problematik im Forschungsfeld Gymnasion besteht jetzt eher darin, das Feld von Gemeinsamkeiten und Differenzen abzustecken [...]. Hierin sehe ich eine wichtige Aufgabe”, cf. also 418–419.
4 I. Tyros II 53–54 no. 54 incl. fig. 44 a–d; Vitale 2014, 172–174 incl. fig. 1; also cf. Rey-Coquais 1981, 30; Sartre 2004, 173–174; most recently Daubner 2015, 159–162. Year 169 is based on an enumeration of years from the moment of its acquisition of autonomia in 126/125 BC.
5 In Asia Minor and Syria, in particular, a gubernatorial provincia/ἐπαρχίαι was subdivided into several administrative sub-provinces that were likewise called provinciae/ἐπαρχίαι. On this particular territorial arrangement of the Roman administrative geography and the corresponding denominations of the administrative units, cf. Marck 1993; Ziegler 1999, 137–138; Butcher 2003, 114; Marek 2003; Sartre 2004, 179; Marek 2010, part. 449–453; Vitale 2012a, passim; Vitale 2013, 43–48; in detail Vitale 2016, 85–89.
7 Ameling 2004, 130: “Handeln für das Gymnasium gilt keiner über die Polis hinausreichen Gruppe”.
8 Sartre 2004, 178, reaches the logical conclusion “que Tyr abrite des concours communs aux quatre éparques, mais que ce n’était pas encore le cas sous Claude”. Under Claudius, the gubernatorial province of Syria contained only three eparchies, namely SyriaPhoeniceCilicia, as Caligula had already returned Commagene to his friend Antiochos IV. as a kingdom in 38 AD and Judea was not involved in organising the provincial imperial cult. However, during the first century AD, Cappadocia may at least temporarily have formed one of the “four eparchies” of Syria in question.
ing from the early part of Hadrian’s reign, names Diogenes, son of Emmegeanos, as a “(former) priest of the four eparchies in the metropolis Antiocheia” (ἱερασάμενος τῶν τεσσάρων ἐπαρχείων ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μητροπόλει). Likewise, the respective centres of the provincial imperial cult and workplaces of the γυμνασίαρχοι or ιερεῖς τῶν ἐπαρχείων bore similar titles. For example, Laodicea had literally the privilege of being “metropolis of the four provinces”, as shown by city coinage Laodicea metropolis IIII provinciarum.

2 Multiple gymnasia on the provincial level in Pergamon

Comparable numerical descriptions of areas of responsibility within the context of the provincial ruler cult, such as those found in the Syrian inscriptions for Diodoros and Diogenes, can be found in several provinces of Asia Minor. In particular, the function of gymnasiiarchs, who could supervise several “gymnasia” at once or one “gymnasium” for the entire province, is attested within the context of the provincial imperial cult in inscriptions from Pergamon, one of the earliest metropoleis of the province of Asia. During the 1st century AD, for example, Pergamon – the former royal seat of the

9 SEG 7, 847 = Jones 1928, 157 no. 16; on this, cf. the extensive commentary in Sartre 2004, 167–186. In Syria – similarly to the koinon of Galatia under Augustus – the highest priestly offices were not referred to literally as ἁρχιερεύς, ‘arch-priesthood’, but merely as ἵερας, ‘priesthood’. Despite the different wording of ἵερας versus ἁρχιερεύς, it is obvious that the functions of the ‘ordinary’ priesthood were equivalent to those of the so-called ‘arch-priesthood’ in other provinces. In fact, the epigraphical evidence of the title ἱερασάμενος (τοῦ κοινοῦ) τῆς ἐπαρχείας in Thrace provides an exemplary touchstone for our argument; IGBulg 5, 5592, ll. 3–4; cf. SEG 55, 1377, 1386. In an agonistic inscription for the athlete Artemidoros, dating from the Flavian period, Antioch is already referred to as the host city of the joint provincial games in association with the κοινὸς Σωρίς Κλίσις Φοινίκας ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ (IAG 183–186 no. 67, ll. 15–16).

10 The title appears abbreviated as METR(O) IIII – METR IIII PROV – METROPOL IIII PR; cf. Meyer 1987–1988, 89–90, no. 115, 116, 119, 122, 129; Lindgren and Kowas 1985, 111 no. 2098; see the full discussion by Vitale 2013, 125–112 and, more recently Vitale 2013, 96–99; Vitale 2014, 172–174. Accordingly, in the period from Emperor Claudius to the first half of the third century AD, like Antioch or Laodicea, the Phoenician city of Tyre, workplace of a “gymnasiarch of the four eparchies”, served as the metropolis of an administrative area covering several eparchies. We know of at least one other case of ‘pan-provincial’ organization, the provincial assembly of the so-called trei eparchiai (Cilicia-Isauria-Lyciaonia), which was not restricted to the individual sub-provinces alone but covered the whole territory of the gubernatorial province. E.g. Tarsos, in inscriptions and coins, styled itself ‘first and greatest and most beautiful metropolis set before the three eparchies of Cilicia, Isauria and Lyciaonia, twice neokoros’ (ἡ πρώτη καὶ μεγίστη καὶ καλλίστη μητρόπολις τῶν τριάν ἐπαρχείων Κλίσις ἰπποκρήτης δυναστείας ἱερασάμενος καὶ βέβαιος), in competition with Anazarbos that claimed identical privileges; for Tarsos: IGR 3, 879–880; IGR 13; for Anazarbos: Sayar 2000, 25–26 no. 15; cf. Sayar 2002, 18–19 no. 9 (Caracalla); 25–24 no. 11 (Macrinus); 24–25 no. 12 (Elagabal). See the summary in Vitale 2013, 29–30, 43–48; according to Sartre 2004, 168, besides Arabia and Syria, this “supra-provincial” commonality would have had to include the neighbouring gubernatorial provinces of Judea and Cilicia; see Vitale 2012a, 62–65 on the provincial koinon of Asia and Vitale 2012a, 315–319, on the provincial assembly of the so-called trei eparchiai (Cilicia-Isauria-Lyciaonia).

11 On the amount of source material, see Daubner 2015, 149–150.


13 Macedonia: Nigdelis 1995, 179–182; Lycaonia: IGR III, 495; cf. Fouilles VII, no. 69 and 233; Cyprus: Nigdelis 1995, 181 incl. n. 60. However, Nigdelis 1995, 181, notes that this liturgy did not exist in all eastern koina in the same way.


15 Already pointed out by J.-P. Rey-Coquais in L. Tyros II, 34.

Attalids – presents C. Iulius Sacerdos as the “gymnasiarch of the twelfth Sebasta Rhomaia in the five gymnasia” (γυμνασιάρχος τῶν δωδεκάτων Σεβαστῶν Ῥωμαίων τῶν πέντε γυμνασίων).\(^\text{17}\) M. Tullius Cratippus was appointed as “gymnasiarch in the common/federal games of the province of Asia for the six gymnasia” (γυμνασιάρχος ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ασίας τῶν ἐξ γυμνασίων) between 18/17 BC and 1.4 AD.\(^\text{18}\)

Even though the Tyrian gymnasiarchy “of the four provinces” does not correspond word for word to these multiple gymnasiarchies from Pergamon, they do have in common a close connection with the provincial imperial cult and to the events associated with it. The combination of C. Iulius Sacerdos’s titles in particular provides tangible evidence for identifying ‘provincial’ gymnasiarchies in Pergamon: as ‘temple warden’, προσκυνητής της οὐσίας τῆς Ρώμης, of the imperial temple of the Goddess Roma and priest of Tiberius, Sacerdos was simultaneously “gymnasiarch of the five gymnasia within the twelfth Sebasta Rhomaia”.\(^\text{19}\) The Sebasta Rhomaia are attested in inscriptions from 20 BC to the 2nd century AD.\(^\text{20}\) According to Cassius Dio these ‘holy competitions’ were inaugurated in the year 29/28 BC.\(^\text{21}\) Most probably, they are an older and/or alternative designation for the ‘common (provincial/federal) games’ (the so-called κοινῆς Ἀσίας)\(^\text{22}\). The Sebasta Rhomaia were not just a civil festival, but explicitly organised by the κοινὸς Ἀσίας τῶν μεγαλῶν τῶν πάντων / γυμνασίων.\(^\text{23}\) If we assume a penteteric sequence of the Sebasta Rhomaia, the twelfth edition superintended and, probably, also financed by Iulius Sacerdos must be dated to the year 14/16 AD. Logically, before Iulius Sacerdos held his office, other gymnasiarchs were responsible for the previous eleven Sebasta Rhomaia. This suggests that a specific gymnasiarch in Pergamon was set up for the regular holding of events within this context (besides the presidency over the provincial assembly and the provincial ‘arch-priesthood’ as well as other federal/provincial offices). Up to the late 2nd century AD, we are able to list seven festivals which were organised in Pergamon in connection with the ruler cult.\(^\text{24}\) At least every year, province-wide festivals for the ruler cult were celebrated. Does the excessive number of ‘five (or seven; see below) gymnasia’ in Pergamon refer to such games? Did a ‘gymnasiarch of the five gymnasia’ supervise all the gymnasia users, especially the participating athletes, and the contests of five provincial festivals?

The respective festival or the cycle in which it was held seems to have been decisive in defining such ‘specialised’ gymnasiarchies. Perhaps, there were two levels of gymnasiarchial office-holding: one level of provincial gymnasiarchies and another level of merely civic gymnasiarchies.

Such multiple and supra-regional office holdings, which were linked to the ruler cult, constituted a significant difference to the early Hellenistic forms of gymnasiarchy, which formerly was a regular one-year magistracy limited to one gymnasia.\(^\text{25}\) As the phrase ἐκ τῶν ιδίων (“from his/her own funds”) appears in the imperial honorary decrees for gymnasiarchs comparatively more frequently than during Hellenism, scholars attribute these changes primarily to the increasing economic problems of the polis elites – ‘Mangel an Amtsträgern’ –\(^\text{26}\) suggesting that the gymnasiarchy developed into an euergetic-liturgical office held by a few wealthy families.\(^\text{27}\) In fact, several (either consec-
that from the early Hellenistic period of the 4th century BC onwards, a model of magistratical gymnasiarchy developed that differed from the liturgical gymnasiarchy of classical Athens (Schuler 2004, 172–178); over the course of the Imperial period, this office took on a more energetic and liturgical character once more and became the concern of a few wealthy families (for example, towards the end of the 3rd century AD in Egypt, the gymnasiarchy was even awarded on a daily basis to different wealthy families (for example, towards the end of the 3rd century AD in Egypt, the gymnasiarchy was even awarded on a daily basis to different.

A difficulty remains that our inscriptions, which mainly describe the career steps of gymnasiarchs, tell us almost nothing – compared with other magistracies – about the institutional position and the election or appointment procedure of gymnasiarchs during Hellenism and Roman times: we cannot determine reliably whether provincial gymnasiarchies and/or gymnasiarchies over multiple gymnasia constituted a permanent function, a magistracy of its own; or, alternatively, on given occasions the respective civic gymnasiarch was regularly responsible not only for the board and lodging of the usual civic users of the gymnasium, but also for all the province’s participating festival delegations, for other foreigners and for the Roman. However, an honorary inscription from the Macedonian polis Beroia provides a strong indication that, in at least the Macedonian provincial koinon, a regular charge as ‘provincial/federal gymnasiarch’ existed in the late 1st century AD along with other, well known, provincial/federal functions (e.g. ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων). The honorand, T. Claudius Pierion, was literally and δις γυμνασιάρχος δόγματι συνεδρίων Μακεδονίας καὶ πρώτως τῆς ἑπάρχειάς. Depending on our reading of the word order, the decision seems to reveal that he was appointed by the decision of the delegates of the Macedonian koinon to his office of gymnasiarch. This example fits well with
the definition of gymnasiarchies as an ὑπηρεσία ἔθνικη in Hadrian’s constitution.

3 Multiple gymnasium on the civic level in Asia Minor

There are many epigraphic examples of multiple gymnasiarchies which do not reveal any direct link to the ruler cult or to province-wide events. However, they all point to a specific aspect of provincial gymnasiarchies: the listing of several gymnasium could also express cycles of events or terms of office (most likely monthly terms). During Hadrian’s reign, for example, a “gymnasiarch over the seven gymnasium” (γυμνασιάρχος τῶν ἡκ. γυμνασίων)34 named Tib. Claudius Menogenes officiated in Pergamon. During the 1st century AD, the “participants of the third gymnasion” (μετέχουντες τοῦ τρίτου γυμνασίου) in the Lydian city of Thyateira honoured Tib. Claudius Antyllos, the “(former) gymnasiarch of all gymnasium” (“γυμνασιαρχής πάντων τῶν γυμνασίων”).35 In these cases, as in further cases of ‘three’, ‘four’ or ‘all’ gymnasium in Isos, Perge or Miletus, some scholars argue that the honorands presided over different age categories, perhaps in different premises (παιδίς εἰρήβοι νέοι πρεσβύτεραι).36 As it happens, the services provided by a multiple gymnasiarch could have had beneficiaries other than just “age groups”, as seen e.g., in an honorary inscription from Miletus, where τῶν πολειτῶν are mentioned too,37 or an inscription from Kaunos that honours the “(former) gymnasiarch of all age groups and every class”.38

Nevertheless, the mention of several γυμνασία need not necessarily and exclusively refer to several different ‘gymnasium’ in the sense of buildings or rooms for different age categories/groups of users. In the inscription from Thyateira, for instance, it is striking that the μετέχουντες (i.e., the “participants of the third gymnasium”) are not specified as a particular age category. The expression “third gymnasium” implies a rank or an order, which does not fit for buildings. A funerary inscription on a marble base from Traileis dating from the second half of the first century AD provides a prime touchstone for this argument: “[Claudius Epigionianon] financed from his own funds the first four-month period of the three gymnasia.”39 According to this, the gymnasiarch financed a four-month period, namely the “first”: An entire year has 12 months that is exactly “three” four-month periods, which apparently correspond to the τρία γυμνασία within the same phrase. This plural form cannot refer to buildings but refers to time periods of a gymnasiarch’s office.40

It is especially four-month terms of office that are illustrated by several inscriptions from Western Asia Minor. A so-called prophets inscription from Didyma attests a four-month gymnasiarchy (ἐπὶ τετράμηνον) over three different groups of users at one time.41 Contemporary honorary inscriptions from Magnesia report separately both a four-month (τετράμηνον) and a two-month (διμήνον) term of gymnasiarchal office for Moschion, son of Moschion.42 In Stratonikeia even daily terms of office are witnessed: An inscription of Aelia Glykynna and

34 I. Tralleis 75, ll. 6–9: (…) γυμνασιαρχήσας πάντων τῶν γυμνασίων
35 SEG 4, 425 = Milet I 7, 337 no. 265; also Nilsson 1955, 34; Blümel I. Iasos on no. 84; Schuler 2004, 190.
37 Cf. in general Marrou 1965, 173–174 incl. note 24; A. Rehm on Miletus I 7, 337 no. 265; also Nilsson 1955, 34; Blümel I. Iasos on no. 84; Schuler 2004, 190.
38 SEG 4, 425 = Milet I 7, 336, 338 no. 265, ll. 8 11: γυμνασιάρχος τῶν νέων, γυμνασιάρχος τῶν πολειτῶν, γυμνασιάρχος τῶν πολειτῶν (…)…
39 Marek 2006, 319–326 no. 130 IIIc, ll. 4–5: γυμνασιαρχήσας πάντων τῶν τριάν γυμνασίων τὴν πρώτην τετράμηνον ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων (…)…
40 I. Traileis 75, ll. 6–9: (…) γυμνασιαρχήσαντα τῶν τριάν γυμνασίων τὴν πρώτην τετράμηνον ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων (…)…
41 I am indebted to Christian Marek (Zurich) for this idea.
43 I. Magnesia 164, ll. 5–7: καὶ γυμνασιαρχήσας τετράμηνον τῆς / πόλεως ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων, ὀρθῶς δὲ καὶ ἴδιον γεροσκόπος / γυμνασιαρχήσαντα; see on the career of Moschion the discussion by Robert 1967, 103–105; Strubbe 1987, 48 n. 51; Quass 1993, 267; Fernoux 2007, 181–182.
her husband Ti. Claudius Aristeas Menander (from the end of the second century AD) describes them as having been the “first” (πρώτοι) in the city who held their (contemporaneous!) gymnasarchies just during the two days of the annual procession called the κλειδός πομπή at the site of Hekate’s cult in Lagina in Stratonikeia.44 A further inscription from the early third century AD mentions “the key-bringing on the insurmountable day of the goddess in the sacred month”.45 Therefore, we can plausibly infer that Aelia Glykinnna and Ti. Claudius Aristeas Menander took their office as gymnasarchs not only for two days (as emphasized by the inscription I. Stratonikea 701) but formally for the whole duration of the “sacred month”: the gymnasarchy of Aelia Glykinnna and Ti. Claudius Aristeas Menander was most probably a one-month magistracy. Thus, aside from different groups of users, a gymnasarch could also preside over many events or finance monthly (or even daily?) small-scale periods of office respectively which were likewise called gymnasia.46

4 Different usages of the plural gymnasia
(classical period third century AD)

Similar different, technical-formulaic usages of the term gymnasion, especially in its plural form in the Greek East, had long been known from the Late Classical and Hellenistic literary records, as shown by F. Ferruti and YT. Tzifopoulos.47 For instance, in relevant text passages of Plato,48 Aristotle and the early imperial Greek geographer Strabo, the plural γυμνασία could refer specifically to ‘bodily exercises’.49 Particularly in connection with Cretan gymnastic traditions of military training Aristoteles observes that slaves in Crete were conferred almost the same rights as free citizens, “except that they are forbidden gymnastic exercises (γυμνασία) and the possession of arms”.50 Some centuries after Aristoteles, Strabo also stresses the fact that freeborn Cretans “were accustomed from childhood to the use of arms, and to endure fatigue. Hence they disregarded heat and cold, rugged and steep roads, blows received in gymnastic exercises and in set battles (ἐν γυμνασίοις και μέχρις)”.

The alternative usage of the term γυμνασία, taken as meaning ‘bodily exercises (primarily for military purposes)’, is comparable to the different usage of the plural term δρόμοι (the singular form δρόμος originally meaning “racing track”) in Classical Crete. According to the Byzantine grammarian Aristophanes (3rd century BC), the ephebes in Crete were simply called ἀπόδρομοι because, in contrast to an adult δρόμος, they weren’t sufficiently trained for the “common footraces” (κοινοὶ δρόμοι).52 Accordingly, the Suda, a 11th-century Byzantine lexicon, even explains that in Crete the plural terms δρόμοι and γυμνασία were used with the same mean-

45 I. Stratonikeia 704, ll. 7–9: (…) γυμνασιαρχήσθησθαι ἐν τῇ τῇ περι- πολίᾳ / πάσας τὰς τῶν ἑστιάσεως / ἐν τῇ κλειδαγωγίᾳ τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέρας ἀναιπερβλήτως (…); translation by Williamson 2013, 217 n. 38.
46 Regular offices which lasted just for several months are not a novelty for the Eastern Asia Minor and, above all, they are not limited to Roman imperial time: In an honorary decree of the demos of Erythrai from 277/275 BC nine ándres áγιοι and φιλότιμοι, who helped to defend the city against the Galatians, are attested to have served as stratiégoi in “the first four-month period”! Probably, each of the three four-month periods (which, together, constituted a whole magistracy-year) was alternately taken over by three of the nine strategai; cf. Ed. pr. A.M. Fontrier, Correspondance: inscription d’Erythrae, Fontrier 1879, 388–392, ll. 2–8 = Syll² 410: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ στρατηγήσαντε τὴν πρώτην / τε- τραήμερην ἐν ἱεροποιοῦ Ἡγησαγόρου, Ὠμίλων Αἰτρωκλίους, Απάνθρος Διονύσιος, Ἀποκλήρονος Ἀπελλάδηνος, Ὀμίλων Αἰ- τρωκλίους, Ἀθανάσιος Ἰωνὸς, Ἀναξικράτης Θρασυβούλου, Ἐκα- τότες Γιάννου, Πέτρος Παπεθολου, [חי]πελλίκους Πεταθίγουρος, Μισσίνας Ἐνδήμου, Λη[σ]αμου/ [Προτ]ου, (…).
48 See in Pl. Leg., 625c–d the discussion between an Athenian and Clinias from Crete on the various forms of constitution: Ἐνδήμου, Λήναιος / Ἡρογένου Ἀθηναῖος Διονυσίου, Ἀναξικράτης Θρασυβούλου, Ἑκατράμηνον ἐφ’ ἱεροποιοῦ Ἡγησαγόρου, Σῖμος Ἀπολλωνίου, Φύρσων Ἱα- ννίου, (…). ἐπείδη οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ στρατηγήσαν τὴν πρώτην / τετραήμερην ἐν τῇ πόλει / τῇ τῆς κλειδαγωγίᾳ τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέρας ἀναιπερβλήτως, ἑκατράμηνον ἐφ’ ἱεροποιοῦ Ἡγησα- γόρου, Σῖμος Ἀπολλωνίου, Φύρσων Ἱάννίου, Ἐνδήμου, Λη[σ]αμου/ [Προτ]ου, (…).
49 See in Pl. Leg., 625c–d the discussion between an Athenian and Clinias from Crete on the various forms of constitution: Ἐνδήμου, Λήναιος / Ἡρογένου Ἀθηναῖος Διονυσίου, Ἀναξικράτης Θρασυβούλου, Ἑκατράμηνον ἐφ’ ἱεροποιοῦ Ἡγησαγόρου, Σῖμος Ἀπολλωνίου, Φύρσων Ἱάννίου, (…).
51 Strab. 10.4,16 = C 480: πρὸς ὁ δὲ τὸ μὴ διελθαν ἀλλὰ ἀνδρείαν κρατεῖν ἐν παιδῶν ὅπλοι καὶ πόνοι συνέφερεν, ὡσεὶ καταφερόντων καίματος καὶ φύσεως καὶ τραχείας ὁδοῦ καὶ ἀνάντους καὶ πληγῶν τῶν ἐν γυμνασίοις καὶ μέχρις ταῖς κατὰ σύνταγμα.
52 Slater 1986, 31–32. The distinction between the ephebic ἀπόδρομοι and the adult ἀπόδρομος is e.g. expressed in an inscription from Gortyna, mid-4th century BC, ICrete IV, 72, col. VII, ll. 29–47. In the same way as δρόμος, the meaning of the singular δρόμος can shift: according to Sophocles’ tragedy, “Electra”, Orestes won the δρόμος within the Pythian Games (Sop. El., II 681–687). In this case, δρόμος means a particular athletic competition, namely the footrace, but not the racecourse in itself (cf. also the inscriptions ICrete I, 19, 34, II. 39–43 and ICrete III, 4. 4. ll. 11–13); likewise, Ferruti 2004, 287 and Pleket 2014, 36, translate δρόμος as “footrace” in this context.
ing. However, this non-architectural word usage of "γυμνάσια" does not apply only to the situation in Classical Crete because it’s not a question of local epigraphic habit or linguistic phenomenon within a specific period of time. Rather, it is a more general problem of our philological understanding. For the word γυμνάσια already existed as a term in the general use for 'bodily exercises' in late Classical literature, for example in Herodotus, talking about Tisamenus’s training for athletic contests (ὁ μὲν δὲ ἀμετρῶν τοῦ χρηστηρίου προσεῖχε γυμνασίους ὡς ἀναιρησόμενος γυμνίκως ἐγώναις), or in Hippocrates’s reflections on the treatment of dislocated limbs, particularly legs (όντω δὲ καρτερὸν γίνεται τὸ ύγιὲς σκέλος: ἐν τε γὰρ τῇ φύσει διατάται, καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια προσκρατέυει αὐτὸ). Some centuries later, analogous variations in meaning for the Latin transcription 'gymnasiarum' are traceable in the epigraphic habit of Roman North Africa, particularly Africa proconsularis. The interest in Greek athletics emerged mainly during the first and second century in these exclusively Latin speaking regions. This phenomenon was connected to Africa's great prosperity and improving political position, especially in the reign of Septimius Severus. According to the 2nd century Latin author Tertullian from Carthage, “acting Greek” became fashionable also in clothing style. As already pointed out by G. G. Fagan and R. Lafer, the closer philological analysis of African inscriptions from the period between the reigns of Trajan and Probus reveals that also the gymnasia commemorated there cannot be just buildings or rooms. On the contrary, according to the inscriptions these gymnasia were ‘dedicated’ (dedicare), ‘staged’ (praestare and exhibere), ‘offered’ (praebere), ‘ordered’ (decernere), ‘issued’ (edere) or, expressly, ‘financed’ (insimere); accordingly, the gymnasia are always 'given' as benefactions to the populus or to other groups and sometimes games, meals and cash handouts are specified.

Thus, in our epigraphic record from late Hellenistic and Imperial Asia Minor and Syria too, the Greek term γυμνάσιον did shift in meaning depending on where it appeared; its meaning was contextually, not absolutely, determined. Especially in regard to the six [reign of Augustus], five [reign of Tiberius] and seven [reign of Hadrian] gymnasia attested in Pergamon, the idea both of several gymnasia buildings or of different age groups is problematic for the reason alone that we have no archaeological or literary explicit evidence for so many buildings or age groups. The chronological order of our attestations, six or five or seven gymnasia, does not necessarily correspond to a presumptive steadily growing number of gymnasia buildings in the polis-territory of Pergamon. At the most, we could assume that, besides the four traditional age categories, other groups of gymnasia users (e.g. festival delegations, Romans, foreigners) had been added to the official group of recipients of gymnasiarchical services but, with this explanation, the inconsistency between the numbers of groups still remains a difficulty.

Nevertheless, e.g. J. Delorme, L. Robert, H.-I. Marrou and W. Radt relate the high number of gymnasia to buildings within the polis territory of Pergamon.
Based on the formulation of an honorary decree for Diodoros Pasparos, four gymnasium buildings were located in Pergamon (Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 152 no. 1, l. 58: [- - - ὅπως μὴπέτε ἐπι]ίποι τὴν εἰς τὰ τέσσερα γυμνᾶς - - - ]). Due to the poor state of conservation of the inscription – the text sections directly before and behind the relevant passage are completely damaged –, we cannot safely say to what context these four gymasia are to be related within the career of Diodoros. With respect to the problematic source situation, W. Radt points out that the location of such a large number of gymasia remains an unsolved problem, not to mention the ‘seven gymasia’ of Tib. Claudius Menogenes. Given the ambiguity of the term γυμνάσια, perhaps our suggestion to interpret multiple gymasia in the sense of event cycles within the festivities of ruler cult or gymasiarchical office-periods respectively, would provide, in many questionable cases, a possible answer to the controversa quaestio, at least in regard to architectural archaeology.

The ‘four gymasia’ of Diodoros Pasparos may be put in relation with our body of imperial-period examples of multiple gymasiarchies taken from the context of supra-regional ruler worship, for in a further inscription Diodoros Pasparos is honoured by decree of the demos because, among other things, he served as gymasiarch in the twenty-ninth Nikephoria, that is, the cyclical games and sacrifices instituted by the Attalid kings after their victories over the Galatians and celebrated in honour of ‘victory-bearing’ Athena. The mention of the Nikephoria in these few inscriptions is not intended solely as ‘formulaic’ date information for Diodoros’ gymasiarchies, as suggested for example by L. Meier and A. Chankowski,66 for a large number of Pergamene inscriptions combine the prytanis and a priest in the official dating formula (ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως).67 Rather, the mention of the Nikephoria refers to the gymasiarch’s concrete involvement in this specific festival, most probably in its agonistic features.68 At least one of Diodoros’ four gymasiarchies thus seems to have been held within the Nikephoria. As R. von den Hoff has recently shown,69 the Attalid kings are materially present in the Pergamene ‘Great gymasion’ in terms of sculptural and epigraphic remains – significantly, the relevant statues all appear to be wearing military uniform. Apparently, in Pergamon the gymasion was also a place where the Attalid dynasty was worshipped. This Worship was probably related to the Nikephoria.

5 Closing remarks

It is not surprising that as dynastic festivals, the Nikephoria have their origin in the ruler cult, too. According to Cassius Dio’s review of the genesis of the province-wide imperial cult in Asia Minor, Pergamon was one of the first poleis to possess an officially recognized site for the emperor’s divinization and worship.70 Therefore, the staging of the imperial cult in Pergamon in particular required that the services of the gymasiarch be expanded accordingly.71 Probably, for the same reason the office of a ‘gymasiarch of the four eparchies’ emerged...
in the province of Syria. However, in light of the scant sources from all other poleis, we need still more epigraphical testimonies for the conclusive answer to the question of whether such “provincial” gymnasiarchies were only created *ad hoc* or were established as regular official functions. However, the fact, that imperial inscriptions frequently mention multiple “gymnasia” as superintended by the same office holder, cannot be exclusively explained by the existence of so many different gymnasion buildings within the relevant city territory or so many groups of gymnasion users. Rather, the relatively high numbers of gymnasia may be related to the growing number of cyclical games and festivities on the provincial level in the respective centers of ruler cult on the one hand and to the growing number of merely monthly period offices of gymnasiarchy on the other hand. As also Classical and Hellenistic literary sources demonstrate, the term ‘gymnasion’ could assume different meanings depending on the context.
Bibliography

Ameling 2004

Behrwald 2000

Bertrand 1982

Burrell 2004

Butcher 2003

Campanile 2007

Chankowski 1998

Conze and Schuchhardt 1899

Curry 2015

Daubner 2015

Deininger 1965

Delorme 1962

Drecoll 1997

Eck 2007

Fagan 1999

Fayer 1976

Fernoux 2007

Ferruti 2004

Freyburger-Galland 1997

Frontrier 1879

Gauthier 1995

Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993
Das hellenistische Gymnasion


Interpreting the plural ‘gymnasia’ within the context of ruler cult

Nilsson 1955

Oehler 1912

Pleket 2014

Quass 1993

Radt 1999

Reitzenstein 2011

Remijsen 2015

Rey-Coquais 1981

Robert 1962

Robert 1967

Rocci 1974

Şahin 2004

Sartre 2004

Sayar 2000

Schäfer 2000

Scholz 2015

Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904

Schuler 2004

Sherwin-White 1973

Slater 1986

Strubbe 1987

Tzifopoulos 1998

Vitale 2012a

Vitale 2012b

Vitale 2013

Vitale 2014
Vitale 2016

Weiler 2004

Williamson 2013

Wörle 2007

Ziegler 1999

MARCO VITALE

is lecturer in Ancient History (epigraphy, numismatics) in Basel and Zurich. He obtained his PhD in 2010 with a book on the administration and city leagues of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor (Eparchie und Koinon). He published a further monograph on ancient Syria (Koinon Syria). His most recent book (habilitation thesis) on the textual and visual representations of subject peoples during Hellenistic, Imperial and Late Roman times appeared in 2017 (Das Imperium in Wort und Bild).

PD Dr. Marco Vitale
Universität Zürich
Historisches Seminar, Abteilung Alte Geschichte
Karl-Schmid-Strasse 4
8026 Zürich, Switzerland
E-Mail: marco.vitale@uzh.ch
Within the series, monographs and volumes of all fields of ancient studies are published. These publications form the results of research conducted within the Excellence Cluster Topoi. The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations, a research association between the Freie Universität Berlin and the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin as well as the partner institutions Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte and Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz.

The series is part of the research platform Edition Topoi and fully accessible at www.edition-topoi.org.

**Ulrich Mania** studied Classical Archaeology and History of Art at the University of Halle. His published dissertation deals with the sculpture and functional installations of the Red Hall in Pergamon. He was a team member of the excavations in Pergamon and Priene for many years, and Assistant Professor at the universities of Kiel and Bonn. After a three years as academic visitor at the University of Oxford he became research associate of the German Archaeological Institute Istanbul in May 2015.

**Monika Trümper** is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.