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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 32 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 gymnasium 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.


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, 40 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 Filgus 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 Diodorus 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). According to this text, a statue (ἄγαλμα) 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). 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). The latter addition seems more plausible, but Diodoros was considered the new founder of the

---


gymnasion after the Mithridatic destruction.\textsuperscript{14} 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.\textsuperscript{15} 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.\textsuperscript{16} 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.\textsuperscript{17}

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 gymnasium (“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.\(^{18}\) 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.\(^ {19}\) 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?)\(^{20}\) – and thus not in chronological order.\(^ {21}\) 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:\(^ {22}\) before the name of Philetairos (l. 17), and perhaps also before Attalos III (l. 19).\(^ {23}\) No conclusive proposal to fill in these lacunae has yet been made.\(^ {24}\) 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.\(^ {25}\)

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.\(^ {26}\)

### 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).\(^ {27}\)

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 Hepding 1907, 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 be mentioned under the agalmata following 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).\(^ {27}\)
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 (σοφομονόν) would require explanation.
24 It is possible that no other agalma is named in l. 18 before Attalos III, since only Hepding 1907 reads “Α’’ here, H. Müller later saw “ΑΝ’’; 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. Wörrle 2000, 553.
another statue base from the gymnasium (Fig. 5).  

According to the addition by Helmut Müller, this portrait was dedicated to Attalos I by a certain Menes-tratos. 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.  

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 gymnasium 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 gymnasium: this is the round base of a bronze statue of 78 cm in diameter, which was found in 1928 in

---


the east baths adjacent to the gymnasium (Fig. 7). 30

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 gymnasium 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 gymnasium 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, 31 even if the base shapes and writing differ in the details. But we do not know of any find from the gymnasium 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. 32

Apparently fragments only came directly crashing down from the Hera sanctuary above the gymnasium palaestra and the adjacent temple R. 33 This leaves us with an unproven but probable proposition: assume that there was an ancient installation of these statues in the gymnasium, either through the installation of older statues – most likely during the original decoration – or through the suggestion of an older donation inscription. 34

---


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 gymnasium: marble fragments of Nike figures (Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung no. S 167; S 151), Hepding 1910, 491–497. Grote 1992a, 180 pl. 15, 21; and Grote 1992b, no. 405, however, identifies Akroter figures in it from a ‘temple R’ west of the gymnasium, similarly to Rheidt 1996, 178.

33 Objects from the Hera sanctuary in the gymnasium: 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 gymnasium: fragment of a marble cult image, Radt 2011, 131 fig. 75 (found in the west baths of the gymnasium).

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 33, 1910, no. 45”), to the third century BCE. Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: “AM 32, 1907, no. 48 a”) also dates the base Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48a (fig. 5) to this period.
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 gymnasium 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 gymnasium 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 had 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 gymnasium 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, 263 note 123, 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, 165 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 Philateiros 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 Philateiros, of the Theoi Adelphi 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. Wörle 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. Eumenes II was also worshipped as Theos in conjunction with the Twelve Gods, in the waning years of the monarchy at the very latest. An urban ruler cult may have begun in Pergamon under Eumenes I, but this is disputed.

The situation is more modest for the Pergamon gymnasium, even though there were generally strong ties between gymnasium and the Hellenistic ruler cult. 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. If the agalma of Philetairos receiving the sacrifices was identical to one of the ruler statues in hall H, its installation 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 dynasty'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 naming of a room alone, however, confirms its excellent quality against the other statues, indeed those of a cult image in a gymnasion-centered ruler cult. Michael Wörrle has recently clarified the accentuated role of the Pergamene Philetairos priests in the political and religious fabric of the Pergamon polis as a whole.

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 uniform 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 debate. In addition to the obvious Philetairos, possible candidates 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 actually be apt – the ‘completeness’ of the genealogy, the kinship or adoption, their military accomplishments, or their historical relevance. But the epigraphic findings make it clear even without such designations that not all of the rulers depicted in the gymnasium were also objects 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 representation 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 dynasty. This way the Attalids became synnaoi theoi of Heracles at least visually, without necessarily becoming subjects of the cult themselves. If the cult statue of Philetairos...
Atairos 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. 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. 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. 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 Wörle has investigated. 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. 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, 261); 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 (τικίον) on the agora, but his priest offered sacrifices at the altar of Zeus that was adjacent to the golden τικίον; 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 ‘Elia 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 gymnasions 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 Wörle 2000; Wörle 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-
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 gymnasion. 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 gymnasion 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 Philetairos, portrait statues of Pergamon’s kings in full military dress were preserved in colossal format as visual synnaoi 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 gymnasion, the imperial likenesses never replaced the portraits of the Attalid kings. Instead, the new rulers received other, more second-tier places in the gymnasion.

69 Hepding 1907, 310 no. 48 b; Mathys 2014, 52; fig. 10; 138 Gy U8: “dreimal verwendet”.
70 Hepding 1907, 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 Filgis 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 gymnasion: Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1924, 167–168 no. 8; Schazmann 1923, 37–38.
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