

Dietrich Willers, *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm. Archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*. Antike Welt, Beiheft 16. Raggi Verlag, Basel 1990. 107 Seiten, 15 Tafeln, 28 Abbildungen.

"The most striking material sign of the revival of Athens under Hadrian was afforded by the emperor's gift of new buildings to the city. The scale and quality of Hadrian's endowment outstripped any other imperial gift to a provincial city" (A. J. SPAWFORTH/SUSAN WALKER, *Journal Rom. Stud.* 75, 1985, 92). It is easier to generalise than to be precise about the nature and the extent of Hadrian's contribution to the development, some would say the rebirth of Athens as a major provincial centre of the Roman Empire. The sources, which are scanty and not easy to reconcile with one another, may be briefly summarised. Pausanias is the earliest writer whose account has survived. The main relevant passage (1, 18, 6–9) is loosely constructed and not free from ambiguity. It begins with the Olympieion, where Hadrian is said to have dedicated (ἀνέθηκε) the temple of Zeus Olympios itself and the gold and ivory cult statue of the god. Four statues of Hadrian stood there, evidently outside the temple, two each of Thasian and Egyptian stone. The bronze statues known to the Athenians as 'the colonies' (ἀποικιοὶ πόλεις), occupied a site in front of the columns, and the whole circumference, about four stades long, was full of statues, for each city set up an image of Hadrian. The city of Athens excelled them all by erecting a colossal statue behind the temple. Pausanias then adds references to a bronze statue of Zeus, the temple of Cronos and Rhea, and a temenos of Olympian Ge, which lay outside the Hadrianic temenos wall but within the sanctuary area. Other buildings erected by Hadrian were a temple of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios (less plausibly a temple for each divinity), and a sanctuary common to all the gods. But Hadrian's most conspicuous gift was the hundred columns of Phrygian marble. The walls of the building were made in the same way as its stoas (that is presumably from marble); the rooms, made of alabaster, had gilded roofs and were decorated with sculptures and paintings. Books were stored in them. There was also a gymnasium named after Hadrian, containing a hundred columns from the Libyan quarry. In an earlier passage (1, 5, 5), which indicates that one of the Athenian tribes was named after Hadrian, Pausanias again mentions the common sanctuary of the gods, which contained a lengthy inscription in Hadrian's honour.

Cassius Dio (69, 16, 1–3) epitomised by Xiphilinus, remarks that Hadrian completed the Olympieion, where his own statue also sat, and dedicated a serpent which had been brought there from India. He celebrated the Dionysia in the capacity of chief archon, and gave permission to the Greeks to build the sanctuary for himself, called the Panhellenion, and established an *agon* in connection with it. Hadrian's role in completing and dedicating the Olympieion is briefly mentioned by three other sources, cited and discussed by Willers (p. 35–6). In the late empire the "Chronicle" of Eusebius/Jerome records a number of Hadrian's activities in Athens according to the years of his reign. In the 7th year (A. D. 123/4) he built a bridge over the Cephissus between Athens and Eleusis. In the 16th year (A. D. 132/3), after he had built many fine temples, he founded a festival and constructed a remarkable library (see S. FOLLET, *Athènes au IIe et IIIe siècle* [1976] 113–4). The "Historia Augusta" (Hadr. 13, 1–6) says that on returning to Athens after his African journey (of A. D. 128), he dedicated the buildings which he had begun at Athens, namely the temple of Olympian Zeus and the altar for himself, before proceeding to Asia where he also consecrated temples in his own name.

To this we may add the epigraphic evidence. An inscription from Epidauros (IG IV² 1, 384) is dated to the tenth year after Hadrian's first visit to Athens (i. e. A. D. 133/4) and to the third year since the dedication of the temple of Zeus Olympios and the foundation of the Panhellenion, which is thus dated to A. D. 131/2. Two other inscriptions refer directly to Hadrian's buildings. One is a letter of A. D. 131/2 addressed by the emperor to the members of the Areopagos, to the boule and to the Athenian people, which was found south of the Ilissos, in which he declared that in accordance with his intention to take every opportunity to confer public benefits on the city and to do honour to individual Athenians, τοῖς παισὶν/ὑμῶν τοῖς [τε νέοις τὸ γυμνάσιον δίδωμι πρὸς τῷ κόσμῳ/ὄν [γένεσθαι τῇ πόλει .4/5. τῶσαντα ἐπιδίδωμι - - - - - εὐ]τυχεῖτε (IG II² 2, 1102). A third inscription, in Latin, was erected by the emperor Antoninus Pius in A. D. 139/40 on the entablature of an Ionic portico at the front of the reservoir on Mount Lycabettos, which received the water from a twenty kilometer aqueduct which Hadrian had begun (CIL III 549 = ILS 337).

The following major buildings were probably or certainly built or completed during Hadrian's principate, although not necessarily directly at his instigation:

- 1) The temple of Zeus Olympios (finishing touches). Willers, p. 26–36.
- 2) The surrounding enclosure. Willers, p. 36–60.
- 3) 'Hadrian's Arch'. Willers, p. 68–92.
- 4) 'Hadrian's Library' or 'The Stoa of Hadrian'. Willers, p. 14–21.
- 5) The colonnaded front of a large building, probably a basilica, which stood at the NE corner of the Agora, almost abutting the north end of the Stoa of Attalos. The most recent report from the excavators of the Agora suggests a date in the early years of the second century A. D., perhaps at the beginning of Hadrian's principate (T. L. SHEAR JR., *Hesperia* 42, 1973, 134 ff.). Plan reproduced by Willers, p. 22 fig. 7.
- 6) The north wall and four piers of a building about 80 metres long which lies to the east of 'Hadrian's Library' and the Roman Agora, and has been variously identified as a temple, a stoa, and most plausibly as a basilica. J. TRAVLOS, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen* (1971) 439–43; plans in Willers, p. 19 fig. 4,5.
- 7) A 64 × 80 m peristyle south of the Ilissos, aligned with the Olympieion sanctuary, which has been identified as a gymnasium by TRAVLOS, *Bildlexikon* 340; 439; 579.
- 8) A 65 × 45 m peristyle courtyard containing a small temple, which lay to the south of the Olympieion but north of the Ilissos. The foundations, which are all that survive, have been dated by TRAVLOS, *Bildlexikon* 429, to the Hadrianic period on grounds of the building technique. Willers, p. 62.
- 9) A Roman bridge over the Cephissus on the road to Eleusis. Willers, p. 13 n. 32.

The archaeological remains are the main focus of attention in Willer's study. The chapter on the secular buildings is the briefest. He accepts the implication of the inscription IG II² 2, 1102 that Hadrian's gymnasium lay south of the Ilissos, but offers no comment on Travlos' attractive suggestion, recently supported by Walker and Spawforth (*op. cit.* 94 nn. 100–1), that it should be identified with building (7) in the list above. He adopts a traditional position on the 'Library', and contests the recent suggestion of W. MARTINI, *Lebendige Altertumswissenschaft. Festschr. H. Vetters* (1985) 188 ff., that the building was in fact Hadrian's 'Pantheon'. W. has no difficulty in identifying the chief weakness in Martini's argument, namely that Pausanias explicitly distinguishes between the Pantheon and the building with a hundred columns of Phrygian marble, which modern scholars have all identified with the existing remains of the 'Library' (p. 4). On the other hand he does not counter Martini's suggestion that the central hall in the east wing of the building is better reconstructed not as a library, with niches for books at three levels approached by a gallery, but as a ceremonial room with a three-storey re-entrant façade along the rear and side walls, comparable in position and design, for example, with the so-called Kaisersaal of Building M at Side (see A. M. MANSEL, *Die Ruinen von Side* [1963] 109–21). In fact it may also be false to accept a reconstruction of the east wing with two auditoria (Willers, p. 15 based on *Papers Brit. School Rome* 11, 1929, 50 ff.). The auditorium at the north end is guaranteed by recent discoveries (*Arch. Delt.* 24, 1969 A, 107 ff.), but an identical room at the opposite end seems superfluous. It may be better to think of a non-symmetrical arrangement, with an auditorium at the north end, a ceremonial room in the centre, where the sculptures (as at Side) and perhaps the paintings mentioned by Pausanias were mainly displayed, and a library at the opposite end, occupying a subsidiary rather than the dominant position in the room lay-out. One can compare the arrangement along the east side of the Asklepion at Pergamon, where the library built by Flavia Melitene takes a modest position at the north end. It is worth remembering that although the late "Chronicle" mentions a remarkable library, the eye-witness Pausanias only mentions the books as an afterthought to the rest of his description. W. indeed argues that the Athenian building was *sui generis* and no ordinary library, but does not pursue the matter further. Further detailed reconsideration of the architectural reconstruction of the east wing, and extended comparisons not merely with the temple of Pax at Rome, but with the large scale enclosed peristyle buildings of Asia Minor, where Side Building M offers the closest but by no means the only parallel, may lead us to look for a new name for Hadrian's library. The recent discovery of a statue of Nike on a globe from the building (*Journal Hellenic Stud. Arch. Reports* 1989, 10) emphasises that Imperial propaganda had a significant role to play in the sculptural programme. If we are embarrassed to use an invented modern term such as 'Kaisersaal', it is a comfort to remember that Pausanias was also unable to give a name to 'the hundred columns', when it was still a new feature on the Athenian landscape.

The main focus of W.'s study is the 'New Athens of Hadrian' around the Olympieion, a term probably used by Hadrian's own freedman, Phlegon of Tralles, and implied by the inscription on Hadrian's arch

(JACOBY, FGrH IIb, 1166 Fr. 19; with M. ZÄHRNT, *Chiron* 9, 1979, 393–8). His proposals for the temple of Zeus Olympios itself are conservative. Vitruvius 3, 2, 8 reports that in his day the Olympieion was an octo-style hypaethral temple, with a two-storey colonnade forming a portico around the inside of the cella. This implies that by the time of Augustus the temple, where work had been begun by Peisistratos and resumed by Antiochos IV in 176 B. C., was virtually complete. So little remains of the temple itself, apart from the familiar cluster of standing columns, that this interpretation rests almost entirely on the literary, rather than the architectural evidence. Most of the Corinthian capitals from the peristasis are taken to be hellenistic. W. is a little embarrassed to conclude that B. 14, stylistically the latest, appears to be of late Augustan, post-Vitruvian date. This does no damage to his main point, that there was little more left for Hadrian to do in 131/2 than to erect the cult statue inside the cella and hold a dedication ceremony.

There is much more to be said about the temenos, and here W.'s discussion marks a decisive advance. PH. VERSAKIS' study, 'Ο περίβολος τοῦ Ὀλυμπείου ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ (1910), provides W. with the information that instead of the usual porticos, Corinthian columns, analogous to those on the west exterior wall of the 'Library', stood on bases immediately in front of the wall, with pedestals between them, where statues could be placed. Here, suggests W., stood the inscribed bases designed to carry statues of Hadrian and set up by eastern provincial communities, which have been found in many parts of Athens, but especially in the area of the Olympieion (A. S. BENJAMIN, *Hesperia* 32, 1963, 57 ff.; Willers, p. 48–51). This reconstruction precisely fits Pausanias' description – ὁ μὲν δὴ πᾶς περίβολος σταδίων μάλιστα τεσσάρων ἐστίν, ἀνδριάντων δὲ πλήρης. ἀπὸ γὰρ πόλεως ἐκάστης εἰκὼν Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλείως ἀνάκειται (1, 18, 6). Another attractive suggestion is that the fragment of a three and a half metre high nude statue which can still be seen at the east end of the temple may be part of the colossal figure of Hadrian set up by the Athenians, which outshone all the others. The sanctuary of Zeus Olympios, therefore, is revealed as a cult centre as much for Hadrian as for Zeus. If indeed every space between the columns of the peribolos was occupied by a statue of the emperor, there would have been 129 figures encircling the temenos, to say nothing of the grander sculptures mentioned by Pausanias, surely the highest concentration of imperial sculptures in the Roman world. From here the step to identifying the great courtyard around the temple as the Panhellenion seems inevitable. This is surely what the epitome of Dio describes as τὸν τε σηκὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ Πανελληνιον ὀνομασμένον, which the emperor allowed (ἐπέτρεψε) the Greeks to build for him. Not only did the cities of the Greek world erect the statues, they were also responsible for the apparently rather hasty construction of the peribolos wall itself.

Two other arguments support the identification. Pausanias mentions the bronze statues known as the ἄποικοι πόλεις in front of the columns of the temple. Willers curiously prefers to think of these as statues of Hadrian which were named "umgangssprachlich" after the 'colonies' which set them up (p. 52), rather than follow the natural interpretation and see them as personifications of the 'colonies' themselves (so, most recently, SPAWFORTH and WALKER, *op. cit.* 93–4). The link with the Panhellenion in any case is forged by two inscriptions relating to Cibyra and Magnesia on the Maeander, which show that their status precisely as ἄποικοι πόλεις was central to their claim to membership of the Panhellenion (J. H. OLIVER, *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East. Hesperia Suppl.* 13 [1970] nos. 5 and 6, cf. *Journal Rom. Stud.* 75, 1985, 82). So the privileged inner circle of member states of the Panhellenion was honoured with a conspicuous row of statues at the centre of their own sanctuary. Other Greek cities had to be content with erecting a statue of the emperor around the perimeter wall. One city, Magnesia on the Maeander, was probably represented in both groups, for while it should have had its own bronze statue, it also set up a statue base for Hadrian, which appears to belong to the Olympieion group (IG II² 3305). The likeliest explanation is that the statue base was set up during Hadrian's lifetime, probably precisely at the sanctuary's dedication in 131/2, before Magnesia was admitted to full membership of the Panhellenion under Antoninus Pius. It is not excluded, however, that full members of the organisation also erected statues for the emperor around the perimeter alongside those of less privileged communities. Finally, if further proof were needed for identifying the Panhellenion with the Olympieion sanctuary, it surely comes from the Epidaurian inscription (see above) which treated the simultaneous dedication of the Olympieion and the foundation of the Panhellenion as the start of a new era.

A careful new study of the architecture of Hadrian's Arch complements the re-examination of the sanctuary. This makes it clear that the arch or gateway was not adorned with statues, as has previously been generally assumed. Its plan was adopted about fifty years later for a pair of gateways in the Sanctuary at Eleusis. The inscription which survives from one of these shows that it was built by the members of the Panhellenion as a

dedication to the gods and the emperor (cf. also *Journal Rom. Stud.* 75, 1985, 102). W. concludes very plausibly that the original Athenian building was also erected by the Panhellenion. It was built on a different alignment from the Olympieion sanctuary, perhaps owing to the constraints of existing buildings and streets. It is tempting to suppose that, like other ceremonial arches built in Hadrian's time (cf. Willers, p. 91–2), it was commissioned and erected not simply to mark the boundary of Hadrian's New Athens, but to provide the focal point of the Emperor's processional entry when he came to dedicate the finished temple in 131/132.

The sanctuary of Zeus Olympios was the physical focus of the Panhellenion's activities, and a major centre for the Imperial cult. The epitome of Dio states that he completed the temple, ἐν ᾧ καὶ αὐτὸς ἱδρυται. The natural interpretation of the Greek is that a seated statue of Hadrian was to be found not simply in the sanctuary but within the cella of the temple itself. There is also no reason to doubt the report of the "Historia Augusta", that the sanctuary also contained an altar for Hadrian himself. W. argues that there was almost certainly an altar of Zeus in the temenos, which would have served the cult before the temple was complete. A matching altar for the Emperor would be perfectly appropriate. Not only the surrounding temenos, therefore, but also the temple and the altars belonged both to Zeus and to Hadrian. They shared the sanctuary. If Zeus was the dominant partner, Hadrian was certainly the more conspicuous.

W. speculates that Hadrian's role may have been in part inspired by the example of Antiochus IV, who advertised his close association with Olympian Zeus in numerous ways (p. 101). However, Hadrian may have taken a clearer cue from Augustus. According to Suetonius, Augustus gave permission for eastern kings to make dedications to him in the Olympieion (*SUET.* Aug. 60). The sanctuary accordingly already had a role to play in emperor worship. Hadrian simply advanced further down the same road, when he made it the centre of the imperial cult, not simply for kings beyond the empire's frontiers but for all the Greek cities of the eastern provinces.

W. cites other sources to illustrate how far Hadrian had gone in promoting his own cult and assimilating his divine personality to that of Zeus. He is understandably cautious in interpreting the notoriously slippery evidence of inscriptions for the imperial cult, but the evidence from other major temples of the same period clearly presents a comparable picture to Hadrian's unabashed annexation of Zeus' shrine at Athens. At Pergamon recent discoveries at the Trajaneum, the great imperial temple and sanctuary which sat like a crown on top of the acropolis of the city, suggest that the original intention to build a temple dedicated to Zeus Philios and the divine Trajan, was modified after the latter's death so as to include Trajan and Hadrian as equal partners in the building. Zeus' cult made way for Hadrian, and he and Trajan were represented by two colossal five metre statues, seated on either side of the cella. There was no room, apparently, for a figure of Zeus himself (W. RADT, *Pergamon. Geschichte und Bauten, Funde und Erforschung einer antiken Metropole* [1988] 239–50). Hadrian's presence is even more pronounced in the great temple at Cyzicus, whose construction he helped to finance. According to Malalas a colossal marble statue of θεῖου Ἀδριανοῦ dominated the gable, and it was said that the Cyzicenes worshipped Hadrian as the thirteenth Olympian god (*SOCRAT.* hist. eccl. 3, 205). Ancient tradition and modern scholarship alike have looked on the building as Hadrian's temple. There is a good case for the argument that Zeus at least shared the dedication (S. R. F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [1984] 251–2), but it is impossible to deny that Hadrian was as prominent in the cult in Cyzicus as he was in the Olympieion at Athens (see the recent thorough study of E. WINTER and A. SCHULZ, *Historisch-archäologische Untersuchungen zum Hadrianstempel von Kyzikos*. In: *Asia-Minor-Studien* 1 [1990] 33–81). Here too he may have been treading in Augustus' footsteps, for Tiberius had been forced to punish the Cyzicenes by depriving them of their liberty, since they had failed to complete a temple for Augustus (*CASS. DIO* 57, 24, 6).

At a humbler level it is relevant to cite the inscriptions from Lydian Stratonicea to Ζεὺς Κυνηγέσιος Ἀδριανός and from Abdera in Thrace to Hadrian (with his full imperial titles) Ζητὶ Ἐφορίῳ, the former commemorating his hunting exploits in the forests of Mysia, the latter the settlement of a boundary dispute between Abdera and a neighbour (L. ROBERT, *Bull. Corr. Hellénique* 102, 1978, 437–42). The identification of the emperor with Zeus was promoted in every available context. W's new interpretation of the Olympieion at Athens fits perfectly into this background.

Hadrian's sanctuary for all the gods at Athens (the name Pantheon is not attested in antiquity, and the building has still to be convincingly identified) contained a lengthy inscription which praised him for declaring no wars, and for crushing the Jewish revolt, and listed in full the sanctuaries he had built, together with the offerings and buildings which he had given as gifts to Greek cities, and to barbarian com-

munities which had petitioned him. The information comes from a passage of Pausanias who, in words that are surely derived from the text of the inscription itself, described the emperor as the ruler who had made the greatest contribution to the happiness of every community and who had gone further than any other in honouring the divine world (1, 5, 5). WILAMOWITZ, *Hermes* 21, 1886, 623 compared this lost document to the "Res Gestae". The content of Augustus' "Res Gestae" is overwhelmingly political; this sample of Hadrian's self-representation was by contrast explicitly religious. In the cities of the Greek East, at least, the emperor's divinity and his relationship to the other gods was of crucial importance. It was no accident that his own divine person should occupy a central place in the grandest temples of the Greek world.

The length of this review speaks for itself. This is a stimulating and valuable investigation, which throws light not only on Athens but on the personality and policies of Hadrian himself. The Panhellenion in particular emerges in a new light, revealed not so much as a focus for a revival of Greek culture but as a centre of the Imperial cult. This conclusion is as relevant to the emperor as it is to the Greeks. Hadrian's Religionspolitik deserves a more prominent place in future studies than further discussion of his 'hellenism'.

Göttingen/Swansea

Stephen Mitchell