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Some New Thoughts on Herodes Atticus’s Tomb, His Stadium of 143/4, and Philostratus VS 2.550

JENNIFER TOBIN

Abstract

In the early 140s Herodes Atticus rebuilt the Panathenaic stadium and constructed a temple to Tyché on the hill above. So closely was Herodes associated with this area that when he died in A.D. 179 the people of Athens buried him there. Across the stadium from the Tyché temple a sarcophagus, an inscription, and the ruins of a long narrow building have been thought to represent the remains of Herodes’ tomb. The date and the unfinished state of the sarcophagus, however, make it unsuitable for Herodes, and the inscription cannot be used in identifying the site of burial. The long building itself is not a tomb, but a monument built to house the Panathenaic ship that Herodes provided for the Panathenaic procession of 143/4. Herodes’ actual resting place may be in the running track, as would befit his elevated status.*

INTRODUCTION

Herodes Atticus, teacher, orator, and millionaire, is well known for the numerous buildings and statues donated throughout Greece, and to a lesser extent Italy and Asia Minor.† In his native Athens one of his greatest achievements was the renovation of the Panathenaic stadium and the addition of new buildings to complement the enrichment of the older structure. Pausanias, though usually fairly unenthusiastic about Roman buildings, gives a favorable account of the stadium:

Although not very attractive to hear about, but a wonder to see, is a stadium of white marble. Its magnitude might best be calculated from this: beginning in a crescent in the hills above the Ilissos, it extends to the banks of the river in two straight lines. Herodes the Athenian built this, and most of the stone of the Pentelic quarries was used up in the construction.²

Philostratus provides a more detailed description of the building:

And being honored with the liturgy of the Panathenaic festival, he said: “O Athenians, I will receive you and those Greeks who will be present and those athletes competing, in a stadium of white marble.” And saying this he completed in four years the stadium on the other side of the Ilissos, and constructed a work beyond all others, for no theater can compare with it. . . . The other side of the stadium is occupied by a temple of Tyché, with her statue in ivory to show that she directs all.³

Philostratus also mentions the stadium in reference to the will of Herodes’ father Atticus, in which Atticus promised the people of Athens one mina per person annually. Herodes, fearing his inheritance would slip away, managed to cheat the people out of their annuity.⁴ For this, Philostratus relates, the citizens of Athens never forgave Herodes:

This angered the Athenians, who felt they had been robbed of their legacy, and they never stopped hating Herodes, not even when he thought he was doing them the greatest services. Hence they declared the Panathenaic stadium was well named, since he had built it with money of which all the Athenians were being deprived.⁵

It is likely that Herodes built the stadium soon after Atticus’s death, which occurred around A.D. 138.⁶ The first Greater Panathenaia following his father’s demise was 139/40, and it is probable that at that time Herodes promised the refurbishment of the stadium. According to Philostratus, it was completed four years later, which would have been in 143/4.

* I would like to thank Judith Binder, John Camp, Diskin Clay, and George Huxley for reading my manuscript and helping me with various questions of Athenian topography. I am also indebted to an anonymous AJA reviewer both for editorial comments and helpful bibliographical references. My thanks also go to Alan Boegehold for advice on the Greek passages.


³ Philostr. VS 2.550.

⁴ Philostr. VS 2.549: “When the will was read, the Athenians came to an agreement with Herodes that by paying them each five minae outright he would redeem his obligation to keep up continued payments. But when they approached the banks to get the sum that had been agreed upon, then and there they had to listen to the recital of contracts made by their fathers and grandfathers, showing that they were in debt to the parents of Herodes, and they were held liable for counter-payments, with the result that some received payments of only a small sum, others nothing at all, while some were detained in the market place as debtors who must pay.”

⁵ Philostr. VS 2.549.

⁶ Ameling (supra n.1) I, 89–90.
The site of the Panathenaic stadium has long been known. The track is nestled between two hills whose slopes served as foundations for the banks of seats (fig. 1). In antiquity the north end of the track reached to the bed of the Ilissos River. The stadium was excavated by Ernst Ziller in 1869–1870 and shortly thereafter was rebuilt for the Olympic Games of 1896.\(^7\) Ziller, in addition to the seats and the running track, also investigated the two buildings on the surrounding hills, identified as the Temple of Tyche on the ArdeRTOS hill to the west of the stadium, and the Tomb of Herodes on the lower eastern hill. Since then, the stadium area received little attention until 1975, when Carlo Gasparri studied the remains of the stadium and the ruins on the hills above.\(^8\) Gasparri’s observations as well as his new and more accurate measurements have brought a clearer understanding of the appearance of the stadium, the Temple of Tyche, and the Tomb of Herodes. In this article I follow Gasparri’s findings, but I shall reevaluate the identity of the Tomb of Herodes.

THE TOMB OF HERODES

In Vitae Sophistarum, Philostratus devotes the first chapter of his second book to the biography of Her-

---


odes Atticus. He concludes the narrative with an account of Herodes' death:

He died at the age of about seventy-six, of consumption. And although he died in Marathon and had instructed his freedmen to bury him there, the Athenians bore him into the city, and all ages went out to meet the bier with tears and cries, as would children bereft of a good father. They buried him in the Panathenaic Stadium, and inscribed over him this brief and mighty epitaph: “Here lies all that remains of Herodes, son of Atticus, of Marathon, whose glory is worldwide.”

It is thought that Herodes was born around 103; thus the year of his death ought to be around 179. As Philostratus relates, he was not buried at his ancestral home of Marathon, but rather at the site of one of his greatest benefactions to Athens. Here, some 30 years before his death, Herodes had built the stadium of marble at which both Philostratus and Pausanias marveled.

The hill on the east side of the stadium was first identified as the site of the Tomb of Herodes by the traveler Dodwell in 1817 who, being aware of the passage in Philostratus and seeing some ruins on the hilltop, suggested that this was a likely spot for the tomb. His identification has never been questioned and its acceptance has been strengthened by the discovery of 1) a marble sarcophagus, 2) an inscription probably naming Herodes, and 3) the remains of a concrete and poros building from the Roman period. Let us examine each of these.

In 1904, downslope toward the stadium, a third-century A.C. tomb was found containing a marble sarcophagus. Within the sarcophagus was a lead sarcophagus and within that was one of wood. The well-preserved skeleton inside had a gold coin of Trajan Decius (A.D. 249–251) in his mouth, thus dating it to the mid-third century. The marble sarcophagus is the type known as a strigillated sarcophagus, studied as a corpus by Rodenwaldt in 1930. In his assessment, the type dates to the third century, and thus is in keeping with the date of the burial.

The sarcophagus is worked completely only on the front and left side. The right side has an unfinished molding at the cornice; the back is unworked (fig. 2). The cover is a block of marble, showing only the beginning signs of carving. The main face of the sarcophagus is carved to look like a kline with lion feet, and between the legs are two rows of carved S's. Another example that is closely comparable to this sarcophagus comes from the Kerameikos, which Rodenwaldt dated to the first half of the third century,
in keeping with three other dated examples. Rodenwaldt entertained the possibility, however, that the Kerameikos sarcophagus had been reused, since the lid appears to have been reattached with clamps, and there was a coin of Hadrian found inside in addition to third-century material.14

Gasparri tentatively suggests that the Kerameikos example was carved in the second century and therefore the sarcophagus from the stadium may also date from that period. Thus it could have originally held the remains of Herodes and later have been reused. The stadium sarcophagus, however, does not show any signs of reuse. Gasparri suggests that the lid to the sarcophagus could not have been original, since the decoration is only roughed out and appears to have been intended as a gable-style lid, which would not be typical for the strigillated sarcophagus type.15

The sarcophagus, at least on its right side, however, was itself not completed, and it thus appears that the sarcophagus, lid and all, was put to use in an unfinished state. I find it difficult to imagine that the people of Athens would have buried Herodes in an unfinished sarcophagus. Therefore, since the majority of sarcophagi of this type date to the third century, and since the burial within the stadium sarcophagus also dates to that time, it is prudent to consider the sarcophagus as a third-century monument and not to insist upon an association with Herodes.

Built into the wall surrounding the sarcophagus were found several inscriptions. One of these is carved on a pedestal or altar of white marble (height 0.95 m; width 0.49 m; depth 0.41 m). A molding is preserved at its base and its top is broken off, where, according to the excavator Andreas Skias, a plinth may once have been set. The letters are archaizing in that Attic epsilons are used for Ionic etas (fig. 3):16

\[
\begin{align*}
E & \text{[PRDÆEI]} \\
E & \text{POI} \\
\text{TΩI} & \\
ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΙ & \\
\text{[IΩ ΔΕΜΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ]} &
\end{align*}
\]

To He[rodes] the Marathonian hero, [the people dedicated it.]

What is obvious from an investigation of the stone is the fact that the first and last lines have been erased. The stone bears the carefully carved grooves where it is assumed that the name of Herodes and those responsible for the dedication had been placed. Although noticed by Skias, no one else has taken much interest in the defacement. Graindor thought that the names were erased through later reuse; however, no other names were inserted in their place.17 Since the stone was not reused as a separate monument but as a simple building block, one wonders why there was any need to erase the names on the stone. Rather, it may be conjectured that enemies of Herodes, and there were many of these, may have erased the names or herm shafts that warned against vandalism (IG II², 13188–13208; see also Ameling [supra n. 1] II, 23–29, 160–66). Some of the monuments were again reinscribed with further imprecations, and several had a third series of threats added. It would appear that even in his own lifetime Herodes was beset with enemies who either threatened or actually attacked these monuments. To protect them, Herodes inscribed them with increasingly severe curses. It would not be surprising, then, if this stone from the stadium honoring Herodes had been similarly defaced.

14 Rodenwaldt (supra n. 13) 131–32.
15 Gasparri (supra n. 8) 379–83.
16 Ameling (supra n. 1) II, no. 195; Skias (supra n. 12) 260.
17 Graindor (supra n. 1) 135.
18 For a similar instance of monuments relating to Herodes that were deliberately damaged see Tobin (supra n. 1) ch. 4. In this chapter I discuss a series of statues and herms set up by Herodes to honor his three favorites, Polydeukion, Memnon, and Achilles, who died prematurely. These monuments were initially inscribed merely with the name of the boy depicted, but later curses were added to the statue bases

19 Gasparri (supra n. 8) 376.
20 Gasparri (supra n. 8) 377.
in a sort of damnatio memoriae. Although seen by Skias, today the initial letter of Herodes' name is not visible, and although the epithet the “Hero of Marathon” is likely to refer to Herodes, the complete text of the inscription cannot be conclusively recovered.

Chiefly because of the inscription and the sarcophagus discussed above, a structure located on the top of the hill has been identified as Herodes' actual tomb. Unfortunately, the building has never been excavated and no finds have been reported from it. In one of the earliest known plans of the structure, commissioned by Fauvel, it is portrayed as a long narrow building, 62.36 × 17.54 m (fig. 4).

Ziller briefly described the building but gave no dimensions. In the most recent study, Gasparri presents new dimensions of 42.0 × 9.5 m. Although the hilltop is greatly overgrown, I have paced out the extent of the foundations and my rough measurements agree with those of Gasparri. In any case, we are dealing with a very long and narrow structure.

Today only the foundations exist, consisting of cuttings in the bedrock and scattered remains of concrete. The concrete is best preserved in the south, where huge slabs from the foundations still lie around the area (fig. 5). The concrete is identical to that used in the podium of the Tyche temple. To the north the bedrock was utilized, as is indicated by a long trench cut into it for the insertion of wall blocks (fig. 6). At the northwest corner of the structure, a poros block
is still in situ, where it is embedded on two sides in concrete (fig. 7). The top face of the stone shows a pry hole used in easing blocks on top of it, as well as a dowel hole for the attachment of an upper course. Also on the hilltop there are broken architectural pieces, undoubtedly from the marble superstructure. Unfortunately there is too little preserved to form an idea about the appearance of the building.

Atop the hill on the other side of the stadium are the remains of an Ionic temple set on a high podium of stone and concrete. The discovery of an inscription here naming Regilla (the wife of Herodes) as the first priestess of Tyche indicates that this is the temple mentioned by Philostratus that stood on one side of the stadium and housed an ivory statue. It is located above and midway along the west side of the stadium. A monumental staircase, today still partially visible, led from the top of the seats up to the temple. Although neither Philostratus nor Pausanias identify Herodes as the donor of the building, its approach by means of a monumental stairway reaching out of the stadium seats, the ostentatious dedication of an ivory cult statue (paralleled by other ivory dedications made by Herodes at the Temple of Poseidon at Isthmia), and the naming of his wife Regilla as first priestess of the cult would indicate that Herodes had commissioned the building, probably at the time of the construction of the stadium or soon after its completion. The so-called tomb is sited almost directly across the stadium from the Tyche temple and the two buildings seem to form an architectural unit with the stadium. The plan of Fauvel (fig. 4) shows that the so-called tomb, like the temple, was reached by a flight of stairs leading up from the stadium. Today there are no traces of the stairway leading to the “tomb,” although at the time of the discovery of the sarcophagus the bedding for some steps was found. Moreover, the same type of concrete was utilized in the two buildings. The inference from the study of the two monuments is that they were built at the same time, and not some 30 years apart, which would have been the case had the “tomb” been erected after Herodes’ death. It should be remembered that Herodes asked his freedmen to bury him at Marathon, and therefore would not have prepared such a structure in advance in Athens.

Gasparri expressed doubts that these long and narrow foundations supported a single building. Because of the inscription, however, he agreed with the previous scholarship that the building ought to be iden-
tified as the tomb of Herodes. 25 Nevertheless, the long and narrow structure has no parallels in tomb architecture. I think it is possible, through a close reading of Philostratus as well as a study of architectural parallels, to assign to this building a very different use.

THE PANATHENAIC SHIP

In his description of the Panathenaic stadium, Philostratus devoted much of the passage to the procession that inaugurated the stadium’s first festival:

κάκεινα περί τῶν Παναθηναίων τούτων ἰκονοπέπλον μὲν ἀνήφθαι τῆς νεώς ἡδίω γραφῆς ξίνη σύρετω τῷ κόλπῳ, δραμέν δὲ τὴν ναὸν συν ὑποζυγίων ἄγωντων, ἀλλ’ ὑπογείως μηχαναῖς ἐποιεθήνονσαν, ἐκ Κερεμεικοῦ δὲ ἀρασαν χιλία κόπτῃ ἀφείναι ἐπί τὸ Ἑλευθίνον καὶ περιβάλλοντα αὐτὸ παραμένει τῷ Πελασγικῷ κομμοῦντι τῇ παρᾷ τὸ Πυθίον ἔλθειν ὑπὸ τὸ ὅμολα ὁμάσται. Τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ θάτερα τοῦ σταδίου νεός ἐπέχει Τύχης καὶ ἀγάμα ελεφάντινον ὡς κυβερνώσης πάντα.

Moreover, I have been told the following facts concerning this Panathenaic festival. The robe of Athena that was hung on the ship was more charming than any painting, with folds that swelled before the breeze, and the ship, as it took its course, was not hauled by animals, but slid forward by means of underground machinery. Setting sail at the Kerameikos with a thousand oars, it arrived at the Eleusinion, and after circling that, it skirted by the Pelasigikon, and thus escorted passed by the Python, to arrive at where it is now moored. The other end of the stadium is occupied by a temple of Tyche. 26

The ship to which Philostratus refers is of course the ship-float that carried the robe of Athena toward its destination on the Acropolis. This ship was different from its predecessors, however, in that it moved by hidden machinery and was not dragged by animals. 27

The route of Herodes’ ship will be taken up below. For now, I turn to the question of its final mooring. We are told that the ship “passed by (παρὰ) the Python, to arrive at where it is now moored.” This passage has brought about some confusion since the locative of has often been taken as describing part of the Python, which would place the ship in or near that shrine. 28 The problem has been compounded by the editor’s placement of a comma after ἐλθεῖν. If we

25 Gasparri (supra n. 8) 377.
26 Philostr. VS 2.550.
27 See J.M. Mansfield, The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic Peplos (Diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley, 1985) 74–75.
28 So the passage was first translated by R.E. Wycherley, Agora III. Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia (Princeton 1957) 77. Later, however, he preferred the punctuation and translation followed in the present article (infra n. 29).
ignore this comma, or place it after Πόθιον, the passage can be translated as I have done above.29 Thus the ship “passes by the Python to arrive at where it is now moored.” Unfortunately, Philostratus does not say specifically where the ship finally came to rest, although in his day (around A.D. 210), the ship was still on display. His very next statement, however, gives a clue: “The other end of the stadium is occupied by a temple of Tyche.” This would imply that the author was standing on the hill opposite the Tyche temple.

As mentioned above, the dimensions of the building identified as the tomb of Herodes (42.0 × 9.5 m) are not satisfactory for a sepulchral building. These proportions, however, are similar to those known from shipsheds, such as at Piraeus (37 × 6 m), at Oenoiadai in Acarnania (47 × 6 m), and those at Apollonia in Cyrenaica (just under 40 m long and 6 m wide).30 The structure on the hill was certainly not a shipshed, but it may well have housed a votive ship. There is a strong Greek tradition of dedicating ships in or near sanctuaries, usually warships celebrating important naval victories.31 Examples of this include dedications of ships at Isthmia, Souion, and Salamis following the Persian Wars,32 and the Peloponnesian dedication of an Athenian warship to Poseidon at Rhion in 429.33 The remains of a building to house one such dedication have been found on the island of Delos. The Neorion, erected by either Antigonos Gonatas or Demetrios Poliorcetes, was a large multiroomed structure within the sanctuary of Apollo. The portion of the building that served to display a warship had the dimensions 45.650 × 4.845 m.34 Similarly on Samothrace the remains of a ship monument have come to light that may have also been erected by Antigonos Gonatas.35 Although Herodes’ Panathenaic ship was not a warship, it is possible to suggest that he dedicated it in the spirit of these other victory monuments, in a building of analogous dimensions to both the shipsheds and the Neorion of Delos. Thus our structure did not hold the remains of Herodes, but housed the ship used in Herodes’ Panathenaic procession. The building itself must have been ornate, perhaps with a facade of columns or a low balustrade through which to view the vessel. Unfortunately there is too little preserved to formulate any ideas on the appearance of the superstructure or the dimensions of the ship.36

THE PANATHENAIC PROCESSION

The route of the Panathenaic ship is clear. The vessel began its journey at the Kerameikos, presumably at the Dipylon Gate, and then traveled along the Panathenaic Way until it reached the Eleusinion, which it circled but did not enter.37 Next it skirted the Pelargikon. Since it must have passed along the west side of the Acropolis to reach its goal of the stadium, it appears that the Outer Pelargikon wall is meant.38 After reaching this point, it then passed by the Python. The general site of the Python is well attested; Pausanias places it south of the Olympicion, and a concentration of inscriptions relating to the shrine has been found in that area.39 From there it must have gone on to the Panathenaic stadium, perhaps making a triumphal entry at the stadium’s north end. This procession was hardly typical: the long and protracted journey (somehow achieved by hidden machinery) was not the normal course, but served to highlight Herodes’ magnificent benefaction to the city of Athens.

29 This interpretation is also followed by E.A. Gardner, “The Panathenaic Ship of Herodes Atticus,” CR 28 (1914) 225–26, who suggested that the ship came to rest near the stadium. Wycherley also recommends moving the comma from after Ἐθέντω to after Πόθιον; see R.E. Wycherley, “The Python at Athens,” AJA 67 (1963) 75–79.
31 For a brief discussion of ship dedications, see W.M. Murray and P.M. Petas, Octavius’s Campsite Memorial for the Action War (Philadelphia 1989) 115–17.
32 Hdt. 8.121.1.
33 Thuc. 2.92.5.

letter (Fall 1986) 13.
36 Since the dimensions compare well with those of the shipsheds, it is appealing to think that this ship was perhaps a trireme. Recent studies of triremes indicate that they probably measured no more than 36.0 × 5.5 m, and a ship of this size could easily have been accommodated within our structure. If Philostratus’s report is true, however, then the ship had 1,000 oars, far too many for a trireme, which usually had around 170 rowers. (See F. Walsh, Building the Trireme [London 1988] 100). Thus it is more likely that Herodes’ ship was either a scaled-down model of a massive 1,000-oared vessel, or perhaps merely an ornate ship-type float not modeled on any actual vessel.
37 For the Eleusinion, see Travlos 198–200; Mansfield (supra n. 27) 79 n. 98 suggests that the Eleusinion was perhaps the usual stopping place for the Panathenaic float.
38 See Wycherley (supra n. 29) 76–77; Travlos 52.
39 Paus. 1.19.1; Travlos 100–103.
At what point the ship was housed in the structure above the stadium is not known. Some years after the procession Pausanias mentions seeing a Panathenaic ship near the Areopagus, and it is possible he saw Herodes' ship, stored there until its final resting place at the stadium was completed. Alternatively, Pausanias's ship could have been a ship replaced by Herodes' vessel, or one used after Herodes' ship had been placed on display.

CONCLUSION

In the 140s Herodes rebuilt in marble the stadium on the south side of the Ilissos. At that time or some time later he also built the temple to Tyche and erected a structure destined to shelter the ship used in the stadium's inauguration. A large area of Athens was altered by this one project. It is no wonder that it was here the people of Athens chose to bury Herodes. But the question is now, where was his tomb? Since we no longer have a tomb building, and since the sarcophagus is likely to be a third-century monument, the only evidence for the burial site of Herodes is the inscription, found reused and mutilated. Since we know neither its original location or its actual text, there is little indication where in the stadium area Herodes was buried. Evidently, Herodes was intent on being buried at Marathon, so no preparation for a tomb at the stadium was made in advance. Philostratus does not mention an impressive tomb, but a "brief and mighty epitaph." He is not specific about the site of burial, except to say that Herodes was buried, literally, in the Panathenaic stadium (ἐν τῷ Παναθηναϊκῷ). As Gasparri points out, there are parallels for tombs under running tracks. In Thebes, according to Pausanias, the hero shrine of Iolaüs was under the running track, while the tomb of Pindar was in the hippodrome. Pausanias also says that at the starting line of the stadium at Olympia there was a monument that the Eleans claim was the tomb of Endymion. Thus Herodes, as the "Hero of Marathon," may have occupied an honored position under the track, analogous to these other illustrious individuals. We can think of him, then, as being laid to rest within the stadium with two of his benefactions to the city of Athens, the Tyche temple and the monument displaying his Panathenaic ship, towering above him. Flanked by these impressive monuments, Herodes needed no ornate tomb to preserve his memory.

Bilkent University
Faculty of Letters
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40 Paus. 1.29.1.
41 So argues Basch (supra n. 34) 346–47, who interprets the passage in Pausanias as meaning that the ship seen at the Areopagus was superseded by Herodes'. The indefinite tone of the passage, however, makes me doubt that Pausanias was making reference to Herodes' ship. Basch is probably correct, however, in his suggestion that the Panathenaic ship depicted on the Calendar Frieze (dated to the first century B.C., and now built into the Little Metropolis in Athens) may be the same ship seen by Pausanias. For the Calendar Frieze see E. Simon, Festivals of Attica (Madison 1983) 6, pl. 2.
42 In the past, the question of the identity of the two ships has caused a debate concerning the position of the Pythion. The problem concerns Pausanias's statement that he saw the Panathenaic ship on display near the Areopagus hill (supra n. 40). It was thought that if he saw Herodes' ship, which was associated with the Pythion, then a Pythion situated closer to the Areopagus would be more suitable than one near the Olympiaion. This brought about the suggestion that the cave of Apollo Hypoakraios on the north slope of the Acropolis was actually a second Pythion; see Travlos 91. Wycherley (supra n. 29) summarizes the arguments for a north slope Pythion, but doubts that there ever was one on the north slope of the Acropolis. Since the two ships need not be the same, and since, if my thesis is accepted, the final resting place of Herodes' ship has now been identified, the passage in Philostratus can no longer be used to help argue for a north slope Pythion.
43 Gasparri (supra n. 8) 392.
44 Paus. 9.23.1–2.
45 Paus. 6.20.9.